COUNCIL CORRESPONDENCE UPDATE TO JULY 18, 2014 (NOON)

Referred for Action

(1) July 12, 2014, regarding “Fw: Whack the Moll – Collingwood vs. the Glenmore Park – SUPPLEMENT” (Referred to Director of Planning, Land Development and Permits for consideration and response)

(2) July 14, 2014, regarding Construction in Lower Caulfeild (Referred to Director of Planning, Land Development and Permits for consideration and response)

(3) Metro Vancouver, July 14, 2014, regarding “Metro Vancouver 2040: Shaping our Future Amendment Request from the City of Port Moody – Moody Centre Transit Oriented Development Area and Murray Street Boulevard Area (Referred to Director of Planning, Land Development and Permits for consideration and response)

(4) July 15, 2014, regarding “Ambelside Park” (Referred to Director of Parks and Community Services for consideration and response)

(5) City of North Vancouver, July 15, 2014, regarding Affordable Housing on the North Shore (Referred to Mayor and Council for consideration and response)

(6) July 17, 2014, regarding “Permissive Property Tax Exemptions” (Referred to Chief Financial Officer for consideration and response)

(7) July 17, 2014, regarding “Public Washroom at Sandy Cove Municipal Park” (Referred to Director of Parks and Community Services for consideration and response)

(8) Ministry of Agriculture, July 14, 2014, regarding Agricultural Land Commission Act Consultation Sessions (Referred to Director of Planning, Land Development and Permits for consideration and response)

Received for Information

(9) Committee and Board Meeting Minutes – Board of Variance – June 18, 2014; Memorial Library Board – June 18, 2014

(10) Metro Vancouver, July 9, 2014, regarding “Caring for the Air, Metro Vancouver’s 2014 Report on Regional Air Quality”

(11) 10 submissions, July 10 – 15, 2014, regarding Ferry Building / Art Gallery

(12) July 13, 2014, regarding “BC Rail Properties Ltd. vs. Sunset Lane/ Recent Updates!”

(13) July 13, 2014, regarding “Promotional Articles of the District of West Vancouver – (British Columbia)”

(14) 2 submissions, July 13 - 16, 2014, regarding Advertisements with Foreign Languages

(15) July 16, 2014, regarding Proposed Development Permit No. 13-067 (for 765 Marine Drive/Park Royal North) (Referred to July 21, 2014 regular Council meeting)

(16) 2 submissions, July 17, 2014, regarding “Re: Collingwood noise exemption”
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Responses to Correspondence

Please read this email in conjunction with my letter “Whack the Moll – Collingwood vs. the Glenmore Park” issued yesterday July 11, 2014 (see below).

Soon after the release of that letter neighbours also brought to my attention that Collingwood regularly uses the tennis courts to transport their construction materials... Attached additional two photos illustrate results of that practice. These are not just paint scratches. This is difficult to repair damage of the court surface. WE EXPECT THAT THE DISTRICT WILL HOLD COLLINGWOOD LIABLE FOR THAT DAMAGE!

Why did the District agree to such practice and give to Collingwood the key to the park maintenance gates?

Did that permit to use public tennis courts for the purpose of Collingwood construction include the requirement that whenever they use tennis court for transportation of construction materials the court surface must be first covered with plywood to prevent any damage?

We pay property taxes for the maintenance of these tennis courts. Collingwood is getting property tax exemptions. HOW RIDICULOUS IS THAT!

----- Forwarded Message ----- 
From: Mayorandcouncil@westvancouver.ca <mayorandcouncil@westvancouver.ca>; "msmith@westvancouver.ca" <msmith@westvancouver.ca>
To: "mayorandcouncil@westvancouver.ca" <mayorandcouncil@westvancouver.ca>; "msmith@westvancouver.ca" <msmith@westvancouver.ca>
Cc: "educ.minister@gov.bc.ca" <educ.minister@gov.bc.ca>; Nina Leemhuis <nleemhuis@westvancouver.ca>; Brent Leigh <bleigh@westvancouver.ca>; Sarah Almas <salmas@westvancouver.ca>; "mkoke@westvancouver.ca" <mkoke@westvancouver.ca>; Bob Sokol <bsokol@westvancouver.ca>
Sent: Friday, July 11, 2014 9:35:29 AM
Subject: Whack the Moll - Collingwood vs. the Glenmore Park

see attached letter and photos
Dear Mayor and Councillors
I received the attached reply from Ms Mayne on June 4th - however having left West Vanc June 2nd and not returning til the 23rd - I did not reply to her til July 4. The issues about which I wrote to you on May 10 are to my mind - and to those of several other neighbours in Lower Caulfeild too - still unanswered and outstanding .... and the issue raised by of an in depth report be made on the issues raised at seems to be being avoided.
The recent LCAC meeting to look at the proposed home to be placed on seems inoffensive .... but then so did and and a review of both of those would reveal an inordinate amount of problems for everyone.

Your comments would be much appreciated by myself and others in this area.

sincerely,

West Vancouver, BC

Dear Ms Mayne,

I am in receipt of your email in response to my letter of May 10th to the Mayor and Council which then referred the matter to the Director of Planning, etc for response in ten working days.

I note your comments about the development at being a long and frustrating process - which as it stands is a long way from finished - and has been the subject of many many emails and shutdowns during the years it has been a "job site". You speak to the Lower Caulfeild Guidelines which were reviewed at my instigation to Council under Pamela Goldsmith-Jones starting back in 2006. I attended every meeting that was held in regard to the New Guidelines.

Your assertion that a builder can vary the building he builds from the agreed architects plans at will and get "staff" approval for this is a very serious issue indeed. The plans in the case of were agreed in January 2012 and we - the residents of Lower Caulfeild - expected the house to be changed to reflect those plans. In the event, the owner determined to add rooms, vary the plans at will and the advised at every step of the way by email and other means, Staff did nothing. Inspections were made but there was no enforcement of the plans. The endless differences and issues were eventually brought to Councils notice - by myself - at which time the Director of Planning had no other option than to shut down the work site. The innumerable differences to the
plans should have been physically removed and enforcement made by the Director and his staff that this occurred, but obviously he was unwilling to do same and instead threw the matter back to the LCAC in January 2013 - tho it is not in their purview to deal with this. As such the builder "got away" with massive overbuilding.
I raised an issue with Staff in Sept 2013 with regard to part of the overbuilding at which I look every day from [s. 22(1)] When workers then enlarged the offending issue, I raised the matter again and again with staff --- to get no response or action. If this is your "responded to various building infractions ...in an appropriate manner" - then there is something seriously wrong with the process and with staff.
In response to your second paragraph, it is acknowledged by everyone down here and the members of the LCAC committee too ( at this weeks meeting) that staff failed miserably in their inspections at [s. 22(1)] and did not enforce the plans as approved - but seemingly they are not accountable - to Council / residents or anyone - and direction is non existant.

As a footnote, I am sad to note that your email to me does not differentiate much from the one you sent to [s. 22(1)] of [s. 22(1)] - which does not answer his or my suggestion that a report be commissioned to look into the numerous issues raised by the renovation at [s. 22(1)] [s. 22(1)] so that they are on record and can be referred to in the future. I think it imperative that this be done as we have had too many "slips" in past years with buildings in this West Vancouver's ONLY Heritage Conservation Area.

I will look forward to your reply to this and hopefully some constructive comment vis a vis the requested report.

sincerely,

[s. 22(1)]

---

From: Cindy L. Mayne [mailto:clmayne@westvancouver.ca]
Sent: Wednesday, June 04, 2014 3:07 PM
To: [s. 22(1)]
Subject: Council Correspondence: [s. 22(1)]

[s. 22(1)]

Thank you for writing to Mayor and Council, I have been asked to respond on their behalf.

Staff agrees that the development of [s. 22(1)] the site has been a long and frustrating process for all involved. The Heritage Alteration Permit for [s. 22(1)] was originally approved in [s. 22(1)] under the Heritage Alteration Permit Guidelines existing at that time. In July 2012, Council adopted new guidelines which were the result of a lengthy process involving the entire Lower Caulfield neighbourhood. The new guidelines are clearer and provide better direction for property owners and the District.

In your letter you ask two specific questions:

*When a set of plans are approved by the Lower Caulfeild Advisory Committee and the drawings stipulate a certain size (for a room, post balcony – whatever), when that building is built and the result is at odds with the architect’s drawings, what action does West Vancouver take?*

When construction takes place that is not the same as what is shown in the approved plans, staff reviews the substance of the variance and makes a determination as to whether the changes are substantively different
than what was approved. This evaluation is based upon a number of factors including whether the variance impacts a substantive issue that was raised during the LCAC review process. As you know, on this project the owner made numerous changes in the field to the approved plans. Some of those changes were rejected by staff, some were approved by staff and others were sent back to the LCAC for their review and consideration. As stated earlier, this was a particularly problematic project. The District conducted did many site inspections and responded to various building infractions under the permitting process in an appropriate manner.

When did the Lower Caulfeild residents and the Advisory Committee give “staff” the right to determine what should and should not be acceptable to plant in Lower Caulfeild. If the LCAC has approved a design, is it right that staff should approve something very different without consultation at all with the LCAC or with residents in the Lower Caulfeild Area – and specifically with any of those whose line of sight might be interfered with? If so, is the work of the LCAC of any value? Should it be disbanded?

Council has delegated to staff the responsibility to issue Heritage Alteration Permits and oversee their implementation. During any project, changes are made in the field or are contemplated based upon site conditions that are only identified during the construction process. As explained above, the course of action taken by staff depends upon the change that has been requested or has been made. If changes are only allowed to plans if all changes are reviewed by the LCAC and/or the public, the development process would not be workable and projects would take significantly longer, further impacting the neighbourhood.

During the guideline review process that lead to the new guidelines in July 2012, the community was asked if they felt that maintaining the LCAC was important. The District heard that it was important and thus the new guidelines were implemented and the LCAC committee stands. The work of the LCAC is valued and is important to the neighbourhood and to staff.

Thank you for your continued interest in Lower Caulfeild. Council recently reappointed three members of the Committee and it is likely that the committee will meet to review a new project in the coming months. Working together with the new guidelines, the committee and the neighbourhood, staff is confident that there is clear direction so that future development is supportive of the features and values that help to make Lower Caulfeild a unique place.

Regards,

Cindy Mayne on Behalf of Bob Sokol
Administrative Assistant to the Director of Planning | District of West Vancouver

604-925-7178 | westvancouver.ca
JUL 14 2014

Mayor Michael Smith and Members of Council
District of West Vancouver
750 - 17th Street
West Vancouver, BC V7V 3T3

Dear Mayor Smith and Members of Council:

Re: Metro Vancouver 2040: Shaping our Future Amendment Request from the City of Port Moody - Moody Centre Transit Oriented Development Area and Murray Street Boulevard Area

In accordance with section 857.1(2) of the Local Government Act, and sections 6.4.2 and 6.4.5 of Metro Vancouver 2040: Shaping our Future (Metro 2040), this letter provides notification to affected local governments and other agencies of a proposed amendment to the regional growth strategy. As per the sections noted, the Greater Vancouver Regional District (GVRD) Board is required to provide a minimum of 30 days to all affected local governments and relevant agencies to comment on proposed amendments.

In May 2014, Metro Vancouver received a request from the City of Port Moody for two Type 3 amendments to Metro 2040 to change the regional land use designation for 8.3 hectares of land from Industrial and Mixed Employment to General Urban for the Moody Centre Transit Oriented Development Area and Murray Street Boulevard Area. This request also includes the addition of a Frequent Transit Development Area for part of the area. The requested amendment is associated with the City of Port Moody’s proposed new Official Community Plan Bylaw 2014, 2955, which received third reading on April 22, 2014.

A Type 3 amendment to Metro 2040 requires an affirmative 50%+1 weighted vote of the GVRD Board at each reading of the bylaw; there is no regional public hearing. For more information on regional growth strategy amendment procedures, please see Metro 2040 sections 6.3 and 6.4. For more information on the proposed amendment, please refer to the attached report.

The proposed Metro 2040 amendment was initiated by the GVRD Board on July 11, 2014, and the corresponding Greater Vancouver Regional District Regional Growth Strategy Amendment Bylaw No. 1209, 2014, was given first and second readings. Following the comment period, the Board will review all comments received, and will consider third reading and final adoption of the amendment bylaw.

You are invited to provide written comments on this proposed amendment to Metro 2040. Please provide your comments in the form of a Council or Board resolution, as applicable, and submit to

4330 Kingsway, Burnaby, BC, Canada V5H 4G8 • 604-432-6200 • www.metrovancouver.org

Greater Vancouver Regional District • Greater Vancouver Water District • Greater Vancouver Sewerage and Drainage District • Metro Vancouver Housing Corporation
chris.plagnol@metrovancouver.org by September 17, 2014. If you have any questions with respect to the proposed amendment, please contact Eric Aderneck, Senior Regional Planner, by telephone 778-452-2626 or email eric.aderncek@metrovancouver.org.

More information about the proposed amendment and a copy of Metro 2040 can be found on the Metro Vancouver website at:
www.metrovancouver.org/planning/development/strategy/Pages/default.aspx

Sincerely,

Chris Plagnol
Acting Corporate Officer

RECOMMENDATION
That the GVRD Board:

a) Initiate the regional growth strategy amendment process for the City of Port Moody’s proposed amendments for the Moody Centre Transit-Oriented Development Area and Murray Street Boulevard Area;

b) Give first and second readings to “Greater Vancouver Regional District Regional Growth Strategy Amendment Bylaw No. 1209, 2014”; and

c) Direct staff to notify affected local governments as per Metro Vancouver 2040: Shaping our Future section 6.4.2.

PURPOSE
To provide the GVRD Board with the opportunity to consider initiating the proposed Type 3 minor amendment to Metro Vancouver 2040: Shaping our Future (Metro 2040) requested by the City of Port Moody for the Moody Centre Transit-Oriented Development Area and Murray Street Boulevard Area.

BACKGROUND
On April 22, 2014, the City of Port Moody gave Official Community Plan Bylaw 2014, 2955 third reading. On May 13 and June 10, 2014, Port Moody Council passed separate resolutions requesting amendments to Metro 2040 for different sites to reflect their new designations in the proposed new OCP. Metro Vancouver will process and consider these applications separately, with individual reports and associated bylaws.

The Port Moody requests consist of the following sites with noted Metro 2040 designations:

- Moody Centre TOD Area – 3.5 ha, Mixed Employment to General Urban and the addition of a Frequent Transit Development Area;
- Murray Street Boulevard Area – 4.8 ha, Industrial and Mixed Employment to General Urban;
- Andres Wines Site – 1.3 ha, Industrial to General Urban; and
- Mill and Timber Site – 14.7 ha, Industrial (with a Special Study Area overlay) to General Urban and removal of the Special Study Area overlay.
These are all Type 3 minor amendments, and require a regional growth strategy amendment bylaw receiving an affirmative 50%+1 weighted vote by the Metro Vancouver Board at each reading, including adoption, to proceed. This report considers the Moody Centre Transit-Oriented Development Area and Murray Street Boulevard Area ('subject site') amendment applications together.

A draft version of this report and its attachments were presented to the Regional Planning Advisory Committee at its June 20, 2014 meeting, as required by the Metro Vancouver Regional Growth Strategy Procedures Bylaw No. 1148, 2011.

DISCUSSION

Port Moody OCP Update Process
In January 2011, Port Moody Council amended its Official Community Plan (OCP) to call for zero to minimal residential growth due to uncertainty around the Evergreen Line. In February 2012, Port Moody started the process to prepare an updated OCP. The focus of this OCP update was to determine appropriate land uses and development forms around the planned Evergreen Line rapid transit stations (Inlet Centre and Moody Centre, and a potential future western station) and the adjoining transit corridor (Attachments 1 & 2).

During the development of the OCP, which currently stands at 3rd reading, Metro Vancouver staff worked with Port Moody staff to provide comments on the draft Port Moody Regional Context Statement (RCS). Metro Vancouver will process Port Moody’s updated Regional Context Statement pending the initiation of the amendment process for the proposed Metro 2040 amendments.

Subject Site Information
The subject site includes a number of different properties, generally smaller parcels with older industrial and commercial buildings. The surrounding lands include light industrial, commercial and retail uses, with a waterfront park and marina to the north. The table below provides information about the subject site and application (Table 1 and Figure 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Subject Site Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Size (approx)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Area** | North – Rocky Point Park  
West – Industrial (Mill and Timber site), and various light industrial and commercial uses  
East – Electronic Avenue  
South – Spring Street |
| **Current Site Land Use** | Mix of older low rise small scale commercial and light industrial uses. No residential uses currently exist. |
| **Current OCP Designation** | 2011 OCP: ‘Industrial Business’  
2014 OCP: ‘Moody Centre Transit Oriented Development’ and ‘Mixed Employment’ |
| **Current Municipal Zoning** | M1 - Light Industrial |
| **Agricultural Land Reserve** | The site is not within the ALR. |
| **Regional Sewerage Area** | The site is within the GVS&DD Sewerage Area. |
| **Regional Urban Containment Boundary** | The site is within the Urban Containment Boundary. |
| **Current Metro 2040 Designation** | Mixed Employment (7.2 ha) and Industrial (1.1 ha) |
| **Proposed Metro 2040 Designation** | General Urban |
| **Proposed Development** | No specific development proposal, however the OCP envisions transit-oriented mixed-use development 4 – 12 storeys. |
The Port Moody amendment request is to change the regional land use designation from Mixed Employment to General Urban for 7.2 hectares / 17.8 acres of the site, and from Industrial to General Urban for 1.1 hectares / 2.7 acres. It is also requested to designate the southern part of this area as a Frequent Transit Development Area (FTDA). This amendment would accommodate the OCP vision for a mixed-use development with 4-12 storey buildings in the Moody Centre area and 6 storey buildings in the Murray Street area (Attachment 3).

The subject site and surrounding lands currently includes a variety of older lower density industrial and commercial related buildings. Some of the industrial buildings in the area were constructed decades ago, and could be considered to be functionally obsolete and under-utilized. The new OCP supports the redevelopment of this area to reflect the Evergreen Line. This OCP vision includes a mix of residential and commercial and other related uses, with substantial increase in densities, with buildings up to 4-12 storeys.

**Vision for the Moody Centre Transit Oriented Development Area**

As part of the updated OCP, a new vision for the Moody Centre Transit Oriented Development Area has been developed, which sees the area redeveloping with an increased concentration of commercial, office and residential uses, with the proposed Moody Centre rapid transit station at its
core. The vision for the area is described as follows according to the Port Moody Report (Attachment 4a):

“As part of the updated OCP (Bylaw No. 2955), the land use designation for this area has changed to Moody Centre Transit-Oriented Development which applies to the development of a higher density mix of residential, retail, office, services, civic, institutional, recreational and cultural uses within a 400 metre radius of the proposed station. A maximum of 12 storeys is generally permitted within this area, however, additional density and height allowances will be considered in exchange for the provision of community open space.”

**Vision for the Murray Street Boulevard Area**

As part of the updated OCP, a new vision for the Murray Street Boulevard Area has been developed which sees the area evolving into an attractive, pedestrian friendly environment with a mix of uses including light industrial, commercial, office, as well as residential. The vision for the area is described as follows according to the Port Moody Report (Attachment 4b):

“A new Mixed Employment land use designation has been applied to the south side of Murray Street between Mary Street and Electronic Avenue. This designation includes the development of a combination of uses including light industrial, commercial, office and residential.”

“Building forms up to 6 storeys are permitted provided that the first storey consists of employment related non-residential uses. Second storey job space is strongly encouraged where feasible and where such uses are compatible with adjacent residential uses.”

**Transit-Oriented Development and Frequent Transit Development Area**

The Moody Centre Transit-Oriented Development Area is identified as a new Metro 2040 Frequent Transit Development Area (FTDA). The OCP provides a high level vision statement for the area; no detailed area planning, however, has yet been completed nor has a development concept been proposed.

**Port Moody Application Rationale**

Given the area’s proximity to the new rapid transit station, as well as other transit service and amenities, Port Moody proposes a variety of transit-oriented, relatively dense residential and commercial uses for the area. The subject site is bisected by the CPR rail right-of-way and at-grade Evergreen Line guideway, and encompasses the new Moody Centre rapid transit station and existing West Coast Express commuter train station.

The proposed Metro 2040 amendment is intended to fulfill the vision and aspirations of the City to revitalize and redevelop this historic area reflecting new transportation infrastructure, as well as to assist in meeting growth objectives from Metro 2040 through the creation of a high density mixed-use urban community close to transit and amenities. The City’s rationale is based on the area’s proximity to the Moody Centre Evergreen Line station and the West Coast Express station (generally within 400 metres), an aim to promote transit-oriented development, expansion of the range of employment generating uses to include commercial and other uses, and establishment of a residential population to support local businesses. In addition, Port Moody notes the small lot configurations with shallow depths within the Murray Street area presents challenges for redevelopment under the site’s current designation.
**Metro 2040 Considerations**

Evaluation of the proposed amendments based on the relevant sections of *Metro 2040* is presented below.

**Goal 1 Create a Compact Urban Area**

*Focus growth and development in Urban Centres*

A core concept of *Metro 2040* is that population and-employment growth be contained within the existing urban area to 2040, and within the Urban Containment Boundary, and specifically that growth be focused to Urban Centres and Frequent Transit Development Areas (FTDAs) to support efficient regional land use patterns, the efficient provision of urban infrastructure, and the development of complete, transit-oriented communities.

Although the subject site is not within the Port Moody Municipal Town Centre (Inlet Centre), it is located in Moody Centre, the historic downtown of the community and is also partially within a proposed new Frequent Transit Development Area. The site is near a confirmed Evergreen Line rapid transit station (Moody Centre), existing West Coast Express station, and bus transit service. No detailed information about the potential development densities, yields, or designs has been provided other than a building height limit of 4-12 storeys.

*Metro 2040* advocates that, where possible, major development be located within Urban Centres and FTDAs. The proposed uses for the site are consistent with these *Metro 2040* objectives.

**Goal 2 Support a Diverse Regional Economy**

*Promote land development patterns that support a diverse regional economy and employment close to where people live*

*Metro 2040* supports a diverse regional economy with employment close to where people live. Where possible, office, retail, institutional and other significant employers should be located within Urban Centres or FTDAs. The vision for the area is for mixed-use development, with both residential and commercial / employment uses. Locating these types of employment uses at a location such as this that is well serviced by transit is appropriate, although the extent of the commercial and employment component of the potential development is as yet unknown.

**Protect the supply of industrial land**

Protecting the industrial land supply is a key *Metro 2040* strategy to maintain the region’s ability to grow and attract investments and jobs. The Industrial and Mixed Employment designations protect lands for industrial uses, while major office and retail developments are directed to Urban Centres and Frequent Transit Development Areas.

The proposal is to re-designate from Industrial to General Urban for 1.1 hectares / 2.7 acres, and from Mixed Employment to General Urban on 7.2 hectares / 17.8 acres. The site is currently used for various light industrial and commercial activities. Active industrial operations are located to the north-west at the Mill and Timber saw mill.

Re-designating lands from Industrial and Mixed Employment to General Urban to accommodate a residential and commercial development would reduce the limited supply of industrial lands in the region, and should only be considered in unique cases based on a strong planning rationale. In this
case, the amount of land is small and is near a new rapid transit station and redeveloping area, providing for the opportunity for high density development of various forms. Conversion of these lands would recognize that Port Moody seeks to fundamentally change and redevelop this area to support the addition of rapid transit infrastructure. As such, although the requested amendment will result in a loss of 8.3 hectares of Industrial and Mixed Employment lands, the OCP vision for the area, its location in the historic centre of Port Moody, the proximity to a confirmed rapid transit station, and identification of a Frequent Transit Development Area to support the focusing of growth and density are all community and regional benefits. The location is appropriate to support growth, and municipal and Metro 2040 objectives.

Risk of proliferation of subsequent associated Metro 2040 amendments
When considering an amendment to a regional land use designation, it is important to consider whether accepting this request will lead to a proliferation of additional associated requests. In the case of the subject site, it is one of multiple current requested land use designation changes in the Moody Centre area. The site is bounded by lands that are General Urban to the south, east, and part of the west, and Conservation and Recreation to the north. The Mill and Timber saw mill is located to the northwest, but is separated by a road. If the lands are developed and designed appropriately to minimize potential conflict with the active saw mill across the street, it is unlikely that the conversion of this site would lead to the proliferation of more applications in the area.

Goal 4 Develop Complete Communities
Meeting housing demand
Metro 2040 supports the development of a diversity of housing supply options within each community to meet the demands of a growing population. There is currently no specific development proposal for the subject site, although the OCP indicates mixed-use in the range of 4-12 storeys. It is not clear what form, tenure or prices the housing units would be, although market ownership is typical for the area. Multi-family residential development on the site would contribute to an increased supply of housing close to amenities and rapid transit within the community, an essential part of building complete communities. Locating higher density development near the Evergreen Line stations is consistent with this Metro 2040 strategy. Comprehensive planning and development should consider the entire area and be designed to integrate with the new rapid transit station to maximize transit utilization and urban design potential.

Metro 2040 supports the development of compact, mixed-use, transit, cycling and walking oriented communities. Port Moody’s new OCP recognizes the potential for revitalizing the Moody Centre area. It sets the policy basis for the continued evolution of this area to support the completion of the Evergreen Line in 2016 and to transform the area into a more diverse, mixed use, viable location through allowing for an increase in the local population base through densification. This vision for Moody Centre is consistent with Metro 2040’s complete community objectives.

Goal 5 Support Sustainable Transportation Choices
Encourage transit, walking and cycling
The intention of Metro 2040 is for a region supported by an efficient transit, walkway, and bikeway system to reduce vehicle use. Coordinating land use and transportation planning is required to maximize the benefits from transit investment. This means designing efficient and attractive
stations and integrating surrounding land uses with the transit infrastructure. Where possible, high
density development should be located near rapid transit stations.

The subject site is near a number of bus routes along St. John Street, as well as the Port Moody
West Coast Express Station which provides commuter service to downtown Vancouver, and the
new Evergreen Line Moody Centre Station (mostly built at-grade) which will be completed in mid-
2016. This new rapid transit service is expected to increase transit ridership rates in the surrounding
areas, and is within a 5 minute walk of the site. The proposed amendment is generally consistent
with Metro 2040 objectives to locate higher density development near rapid transit infrastructure.

ALTERNATIVES
1. That the GVRD Board:
   a) Initiate the regional growth strategy amendment process for the City of Port Moody’s
      proposed amendments for the Moody Centre Transit-Oriented Development Area and
      Murray Street Boulevard Area;
   b) Give first and second readings to “Greater Vancouver Regional District Regional Growth
      Strategy Amendment Bylaw No. 1209, 2014”; and
   c) Direct staff to notify affected local governments as per Metro Vancouver 2040: Shaping our
      Future section 6.4.2.
2. That the GVRD Board decline the City of Port Moody’s proposed amendments to Metro
   Vancouver 2040: Shaping our Future for the Moody Centre Transit-Oriented Development Area
   and Murray Street Boulevard Area.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS
There are no financial implications for either of the alternatives presented.

REGIONAL PLANNING IMPLICATIONS
This requested amendment to Metro 2040 by the City of Port Moody is a Type 3 minor amendment.
If the GVRD Board chooses Alternative 1, initiates the amendment process, and gives 1st and 2nd
Reading to Regional Growth Strategy Amendment Bylaw No. 1209, 2014 (Attachment 5),
notification will be sent to affected local governments, a notice will be placed on the Metro
Vancouver website and an opportunity to comment will be provided. The application could return
to the Board in autumn 2014 with an opportunity to consider comments received and possible
adoption of the Bylaw.

If the GVRD Board chooses Alternative 2, the proposed amendment to Metro 2040 will not proceed.
Port Moody’s Regional Context Statement as presented in the new OCP, now at third reading,
shows the subject site as General Urban. Therefore, if the amendment is declined, Port Moody will
need to make changes to the Regional Context Statement to align it with the Board’s decision prior
to submitting it to Metro Vancouver for acceptance.

SUMMARY / CONCLUSION
The City of Port Moody has requested an amendment to Metro 2040 to re-designate the Moody
Centre Transit-Oriented Development Area and Murray Street Boulevard Area from Mixed
Employment and Industrial to General Urban and to add a Frequent Transit Development Area on
part of the site.
The request is a Type 3 minor amendment to the Metro 2040 bylaw, requiring an affirmative 50%+1 weighted vote by the GVRD Board. Port Moody is also requesting other amendments to Metro 2040, which are being processed separately.

The 20.5 acre site currently contains various older buildings which are used as light industrial and for various forms of commercial activities. Although no detailed planning work has yet been completed for the area, Port Moody proposes a mixed-use development of between 4-12 storeys, signaling the intent for higher density, transit-oriented development. Although the requested amendment will result in a loss of 8.3 hectares of Industrial and Mixed Employment lands, the OCP vision for the area, its location in the historic centre of Port Moody, the proximity to a confirmed rapid transit station, and identification of a Frequent Transit Development Area to support the focusing of growth and density are all community and regional benefits. The location is appropriate to support growth, and municipal and Metro 2040 objectives.

Staff recommends Alternative 1, that the requested amendment process be initiated. Staff supports the opportunity for municipalities and other agencies to provide comment through the notification process. The proposed amendment provides significant benefit to Port Moody and is generally consistent with Metro 2040's goals and objectives.

Attachments (Doc. #9606577):


3. Map of City of Port Moody Requested Moody Centre TOD Area and Murray Street Boulevard Area Metro 2040 Regional Land Use Designation Amendment.

4. Letter to Chris Plagnol, Acting Corporate Officer, Metro Vancouver, from Kelly Ridley, City Clerk, City of Port Moody, dated June 2, 2014 titled: “Request for Amendments to Regional Growth Strategy Resulting from Proposed Changes to the City of Port Moody’s Official Community Plan”, with attachments:

Murray Street Boulevard Area and Moody Station Transit-Oriented Development Area

*Metro 2040: Shaping our Future City of Port Moody Amendment Request*

- Industrial to General Urban (approx. 1.1 hectares)
- Mixed Employment to General Urban (approx. 7.2 hectares)
- Add Frequent Transit Development Area

Produced by Metro Vancouver
June 4, 2014
EVRG LINE SBB-AREAS

A Westport
B Spring Street Promenade
C Heritage Commercial District
D Murray Street Boulevard
E Oceanfront District
F Moody Centre Station Transit Oriented Development
G Inlet Centre Station Transit Oriented Development

LEGEND

- Multi-Family Residential
- Mixed Use - Inlet Centre
- Mixed Use - Moody Centre
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June 2, 2014

File No. 13-6430-08

Chris Plagnol
Acting Corporate Officer, Metro Vancouver
4330 Kingsway
Vancouver, BC V5H 4G8

Dear Mr. Plagnol:

Re: Request for Amendments to Regional Growth Strategy Resulting from Proposed Changes to the City of Port Moody’s Official Community Plan

This is to advise that at the Regular Council meeting of May 13, 2014, Port Moody City Council passed the following resolutions:

THAT the Metro Vancouver Board be requested to amend the Regional Growth Strategy by changing the regional land use designation of the Andres Wines site from Industrial to General Urban and that this report be forwarded to Metro Vancouver as part of this request.

THAT the Metro Vancouver Board be requested to amend the Regional Growth Strategy by changing the regional land use designations for Areas A and B identified in the Murray Street Boulevard in Attachment 1 of this report from Industrial to General Urban and Mixed Employment to General Urban, respectively, and that this report be forwarded to the Metro Vancouver Board as part of this request.

THAT the Metro Vancouver Board be requested to amend the Regional Growth Strategy by changing the regional land use designation of the Spring Street properties identified in Attachment 1 of this report from Mixed Employment to General Urban and that this report be forwarded to the Metro Vancouver Board as part of this request.
Request for Amendments to Regional Growth Strategy Resulting from Proposed Changes to the City of Port Moody's Official Community Plan
June 2, 2014

Council requests that Metro Vancouver consider amending the Regional Growth Strategy as outlined in the three attached reports dated May 4, 2014 from Mary De Paoli, Acting General Manager of Development Services.

Should you have any questions or require further information, please contact Mary De Paoli directly at 604-469-4702 or mdepaoli@portmoody.ca.

Yours truly,

Kelly Ridley
City Clerk

cc: Heather McNeill, Regional Planning Division Manager, Metro Vancouver (via email)
Eric Aderniek, Senior Regional Planner, Metro Vancouver (via email)
Kevin Ramsay, City Manager (via email)
Mary De Paoli, Acting General Manager of Development Services (via email)
City of Port Moody
Report/Recommendation to Council

Date: May 07, 2014
Submitted by: Development Services – Planning Division
Subject: Request for Regional Growth Strategy Amendment – Moody Centre Transit-Oriented Development Area

File No. 6430-08

Purpose
To seek Council endorsement for a request to amend the Regional Growth Strategy, *Metro 2040*, for a portion of Spring Street to reflect this area’s new Moody Centre Transit-Oriented Development designation in Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 2955, now at Third Reading.

Background
At the April 22, 2014 Regular Council meeting, the following motions were passed:

THAT *City of Port Moody Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2014, 2955, being a bylaw to adopt an Official Community Plan for the City of Port Moody be now read a third time.

THAT pursuant to Section 666 of the Local Government Act, the City of Port Moody Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2014, No. 2955, be submitted to the Metro Vancouver Board for acceptance of the Regional Context Statement.

THAT the Regional Growth Strategy Amendment Process associated with the policies and land use designations in Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2014 No. 2955 be initiated.

As there are four Regional Growth Strategy (RGS) land use designation amendments (all Type 3) associated with OCP Bylaw No. 2955, each is being submitted separately, as Metro Vancouver will process these concurrently with separate reports/bylaws in order to allow for individual consideration and decisions.

As per the Regional Growth Strategy Procedures Bylaw No. 1148, any member municipality may request an amendment to the RGS. Such requests shall be submitted to Metro Vancouver accompanied by a resolution of the member municipal Council endorsing the requested amendment and a report explaining the purpose of and rationale for the requested amendment.

Analysis
OCP and RGS Land Use Designations
A map showing the location of the subject properties is included as Attachment 1. The area includes those properties on the north side of Spring Street between Moody Street and Electronic Avenue. It is bounded on the north by the Canadian Pacific Railway right-of-way and the Evergreen Line guideway. This area also encompasses the proposed Moody Centre SkyTrain station and the existing West Coast Express commuter train station. This portion of Spring Street was designated in the 2000 and 2011 OCPs as Industrial Business. As part of the
updated OCP (Bylaw No. 2955), the land use designation for this area has changed to Moody Centre Transit-Oriented Development which applies to the development of a higher density mix of residential, retail, office, services, civic, institutional, recreational and cultural uses within a 400 metre radius of the proposed station. A maximum of 12 storeys is generally permitted within this area, however, additional density and height allowances will be considered in exchange for the provision of community open space.

The RGS designation for this portion of Spring St. is Mixed Employment which is intended for industrial, commercial and other employment related uses to help meet the needs of the regional economy. Residential uses are not intended for RGS Mixed Employment areas. The new OCP Moody Centre Transit-Oriented Development land use designation for this area includes residential and therefore necessitates an amendment to the RGS to change the regional land use designation from Mixed Employment to General Urban. The RGS designation General Urban is defined as "areas intended for residential neighbourhoods and centres and are supported by shopping, services, institutions, recreational, facilities and parks."

The Moody Centre Transit-Oriented Development Area which includes the subject properties is also identified as a new Frequent Transit Development Area (FTDA) in the updated OCP.

The current and proposed land use designations for the north side of Spring St. identified in the Moody Centre Transit-Oriented Development area in Attachment 1 are summarized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed OCP Designation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current RGS Designation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested RGS Designation Change:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Development:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OCP Vision/Rationale for the Moody Centre Transit-Oriented Development Area

The subject properties are part of a larger area designated as Moody Centre Transit-Oriented Development. They include properties along the north side of Spring St. between Moody Street and Electronic Avenue which are currently occupied by a mix of small scale commercial and light industrial uses. No residential uses currently exist here. As part of the updated OCP, a new vision for this area has been created which sees it redevelop with an increased concentration of commercial/office and residential uses and the proposed Moody Centre transit station at its core. The rationale for this vision is summarized below:

- Capitalizing on the area's proximity to the Moody Centre Evergreen Line station and the West Coast Express station (within 100-400 metres) to promote transit-oriented development;
- Expanding the range of employment generating uses to include commercial, office, civic, institutional, recreational and cultural uses;
- Establishing a residential population to support local businesses; and
- Co-locating a wide range of uses within a 5 minute walking distance to a transit and commuter train station to reduce reliance on vehicles.
Report/Recommendation to Council
Request for Regional Growth Strategy Amendment – Moody Centre Transit-Oriented Development Area
May 07, 2014

An excerpt of OCP Bylaw No. 2955 outlining the vision for the Moody Centre Transit-Oriented Development area is included as Attachment 2.

Timeline for RGS amendment process
Potential timeline targets for the RGS amendment process associated with this request are outlined below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Step in RGS Amendment Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 14</td>
<td>Formal RGS amendment request submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 20</td>
<td>Referral to Regional Planning Advisory Committee for comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 4</td>
<td>Review by Regional Planning &amp; Agriculture Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 25</td>
<td>Presentation of RGS amendment bylaw to Metro Vancouver Board and initiation of notification and comment period to affected local governments (typically 30 days but may be extended to mid/late September given the summer break)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of July</td>
<td>Submission of Regional Context Statement (start of 120 day response period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Metro Vancouver Board consideration of RGS amendment bylaw final readings (acceptance/denial)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Metro recommends that the Regional Context Statement be submitted for Metro Board consideration after the RGS amendment process has been initiated by the Board. The RGS amendment bylaw, with comments received from the notification process, could then go back to the Regional Planning & Agriculture Committee and Board for consideration of final bylaw readings, and if successful, also acceptance of the RCS. This sequencing will ensure that both processes can be completed in a timely and efficient manner.

The requested regional land use change for the identified properties is considered to be a Type 3 minor amendment to the RGS, requiring that an RGS amendment bylaw receive an affirmative 50%+1 weighted vote by the Metro Vancouver Board at every reading, including adoption, in order to proceed. Adoption of this RGS amendment, as well as the three other requested amendments associated with OCP Bylaw No. 2955, and the RCS would happen at the same Board meeting. This could occur in October and Council could adopt the OCP thereafter.

If not all four of the proposed RGS amendments are approved by the Metro Vancouver Board, a new RCS would need to be submitted. Depending on the nature of the resulting changes to the proposed OCP, an additional municipal public hearing process may be required. This would impact the timing of the OCP’s final adoption.

Communications
Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 2955 is the result of a series of public input opportunities including a design charrette, a survey and feedback form, 6 public input sessions, four town hall meetings and hundreds of email and written submissions. A Public Hearing on Bylaw No. 2955 was held on April 22, 2014.
Report/Recommendation to Council
Request for Regional Growth Strategy Amendment – Moody Centre Transit-Oriented Development Area
May 07, 2014

The RGS amendment requested in this report involves review by relevant Metro committees and Metro Board initiation of a notification and comment period to affected local governments. The requested regional land use change for the Mill and Timber site is considered to be a Type 3 minor amendment to the RGS which does not require a regional public hearing.

Budgetary Impact
The OCP Update process has been funded through the Development Services operating budget which has now been spent.

Council Strategic Plan Objectives
The 2012 OCP update process is consistent with the goals of Planning for the Future and Engaging the Community highlighted within the 2012 Port Moody Council Strategic Plan.

Sustainability Implications
When completed, the updated OCP will provide a renewed vision for the future of areas affected by the Evergreen Line that is transit-oriented, allowing people to drive less and walk, cycle and use transit more.

Policy Implications
The updated Official Community Plan will provide policies to guide the long term future of the City of Port Moody regarding land use.

Alternatives
As directed by Council.

Recommendations
THAT the Metro Vancouver Board be requested to amend the Regional Growth Strategy by changing the regional land use designation of the Spring Street properties identified in Attachment 1 of this report from Mixed Employment to General Urban and that this report be forwarded to the Metro Vancouver Board as part of this request.
Report/Recommendation to Council
Request for Regional Growth Strategy Amendment – Moody Centre Transit-Oriented Development Area
May 07, 2014

Prepared by:
Mary De Paoli, MCIP
Acting General Manager of Development Services

Approved for Submission to Council:
Kevin Ramsay
City Manager

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corporate Review</th>
<th>Initials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Services (Human Resources, Information Services, Legislative Services)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Communications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services (Cultural Services, Facilities, Recreation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Parks Services (Engineering, Parks, Operations)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Rescue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Services (Planning, Building, Bylaws &amp; Licensing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Review</th>
<th>Initials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List relevant committees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council Agenda Information</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Council Meeting</td>
<td>Date: May 13, 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15.5.6 MOODY CENTRE STATION TRANSIT-ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT

The focal point of this area is the proposed Moody Centre station. An increased concentration of commercial and residential uses is located here and identified as those properties designated as Moody Centre Station Transit-Oriented Development. This designation calls for the development of higher density, mixed use, pedestrian friendly development within a 400 metre radius of the proposed station. Building forms include low and mid rise forms and a mix of residential, retail, office, service, civic, institutional, recreational and cultural uses. A variety of building heights is permitted to a maximum of 12 storeys. Lot consolidation into a minimum of one acre parcels is encouraged as part of any rezoning. Additional density and height allowances will be considered in exchange for community open space designations.

The vision for this area includes:

- Creating flexible outdoor spaces that can accommodate a variety of uses
- The creation of urban plazas and the careful orientation of uses around this public space
- Integration of public art into public spaces
- Providing mid-block pedestrian/cyclist links along longer blocks to break down the scale of the block and create additional links to provide access from existing streets to existing and planned amenities
- Encouraging opportunities to integrate mini parks as part of larger developments
- Encouraging a range of housing options – housing that is accessible, affordable, and suitable for all income levels, seniors, families and those with mobility challenges
- Encouraging upper floors to be set back from St. Johns Street
- Providing weather protection and pedestrian scaled amenities to facilitate walking
- Providing at-grade shops and services creating active edges
- Encouraging a significant amount of employment related uses in upper storeys
- Incorporating landmark features as part of larger scale developments
- Careful attention to incorporating landscaping to create a softer, green edge to the built environment
- View corridors shall be encouraged as part of any new development application for this area
- All new developments will include parking to support their own building, commuter parking and visitor parking for Rocky Point Park.

Policy directions in this section apply to the area outlined in the map above.
City of Port Moody
Report/Recommendation to Council

Date: May 04, 2014
Submitted by: Development Services – Planning Division
Subject: Request for Regional Growth Strategy Amendment – Murray Street Boulevard Area

Purpose
To seek Council endorsement for a request to amend the Regional Growth Strategy, Metro 2040, for the Murray Street Boulevard area to reflect its new Mixed Employment designation in Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 2955, now at Third Reading.

Background
At the April 22, 2014 Regular Council meeting, the following motions were passed:

THAT City of Port Moody Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2014, 2955, being a bylaw to adopt an Official Community Plan for the City of Port Moody be now read a third time.

THAT pursuant to Section 866 of the Local Government Act, the City of Port Moody Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2014, No. 2955, be submitted to the Metro Vancouver Board for acceptance of the Regional Context Statement.

THAT the Regional Growth Strategy Amendment Process associated with the policies and land use designations in Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2014 No. 2955 be initiated.

As there are four Regional Growth Strategy (RGS) land use designation amendments (all Type 3) associated with OCP Bylaw No. 2955, each is being submitted separately, as Metro Vancouver will process these concurrently with separate reports/bylaws in order to allow for individual consideration and decisions.

As per the Regional Growth Strategy Procedures Bylaw No. 1148, any member municipality may request an amendment to the RGS. Such requests shall be submitted to Metro Vancouver accompanied by a resolution of the member municipal Council endorsing the requested amendment and a report explaining the purpose of and rationale for the requested amendment.

Analysis
OCP and Regional Land Use Designations
A map showing the location of the Murray Street Boulevard area is included as Attachment 1. The area extends approx. 1 km along the south side of Murray Street from Mary St. eastward to Electronic Avenue. It is bounded on the south by the Canadian Pacific Railway right-of-way and the Evergreen Line guideway and to the north by Rocky Point Park. The entire Murray Street Boulevard area was designated in the 2000 and 2011 OCPs as Industrial Business. As part of the new OCP (Bylaw No. 2955), the land use designation for this entire area has changed to...
Mixed Employment which applies to the development of a combination of uses including light industrial, commercial, office as well as residential. Redevelopment up to a maximum of 6 storeys is permitted, provided that the first storey includes employment related non-residential uses.

The RGS designation for the western section of the Murray Street Boulevard (Area A in Attachment 1) is Industrial which applies to areas primarily intended for heavy and light industrial activities. Limited commercial uses that support industrial activities are considered appropriate; however, residential uses are not intended within RGS Industrial areas. As a result, the new OCP Mixed Employment designation for Area A necessitates an RGS amendment to change the RGS designation from Industrial to General Urban. The RGS General Urban designation applies to “areas intended for residential neighbourhoods and centres and are supported by shopping, services, institutions, recreational, facilities and parks.”

The RGS designation for the eastern section of the Murray Street Boulevard (Area B in Attachment 1) is Mixed Employment which is intended for industrial, commercial and other employment related uses to help meet the needs of the regional economy. Residential uses are not intended for RGS Mixed Employment areas. The new OCP Mixed Employment designation for Area B does include residential uses and therefore necessitates an RGS amendment from Mixed Employment to General Urban for this area.

The current and proposed land use designations for Areas A and B in the Murray Street Boulevard area are summarized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Context</th>
<th>Area A</th>
<th>Site Context</th>
<th>Area B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed OCP Designation:</td>
<td>Mixed Employment</td>
<td>Proposed OCP Designation:</td>
<td>Mixed Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current RGS Designation:</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>Current RGS Designation:</td>
<td>Mixed Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested RGS Designation Change:</td>
<td>General Urban – approx.0.67 ha</td>
<td>Requested RGS Designation Change:</td>
<td>General Urban – approx.3.7 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Development:</td>
<td>No specific development application.</td>
<td>Proposed Development:</td>
<td>No specific development application.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OCP Vision/Rationale for the Murray Street Boulevard
The Murray Street Boulevard area is currently occupied by a strip of small scale light industrial uses along a busy arterial, Murray Street, which serves as a major commuter route for traffic between the northeast sector and Burnaby/Vancouver. As part of the updated OCP, a new vision for this area has been developed which sees the area evolve into an attractive, pedestrian friendly environment with a mix of uses including light industrial, commercial, office, as well as residential. The rationale for this vision is summarized below:

- Recognition of property constraints in this area including small lot configurations with shallow depths (41-53 metres) and the limitations this imposes on future light industrial growth;
- Expanding the range of employment generating uses in the area to include commercial and office uses, in addition to light industrial;
Establishing a residential population to support local businesses;
- Co-locating residential, employment, commercial and recreational activities to reduce reliance on vehicles;
- Capitalizing on the area’s proximity to the Moody Centre Evergreen Line station (within 100-400 metres) to promote transit-oriented development;
- Capitalizing on the area’s proximity to Rocky Point Park and the setting’s status as a desirable place to work, live and play.

An excerpt of OCP Bylaw No. 2955 outlining the vision for the Murray Street Boulevard and supporting policies is included as Attachment 2.

Timeline for RGS amendment process
Potential timeline targets for the RGS amendment process associated with this request are outlined below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Step in RGS Amendment Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 14</td>
<td>Formal RGS amendment request submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 20</td>
<td>Referral to Regional Planning Advisory Committee for comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 4</td>
<td>Review by Regional Planning &amp; Agriculture Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 25</td>
<td>Presentation of RGS amendment bylaw to Metro Vancouver Board and initiation of notification and comment period to affected local governments (typically 30 days but may be extended to mid/late September given the summer break)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of July</td>
<td>Submission of Regional Context Statement (start of 120 day response period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Metro Vancouver Board consideration of RGS amendment bylaw final readings (acceptance/denial)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Metro recommends that the Regional Context Statement be submitted for Metro Board consideration after the RGS amendment process has been initiated by the Board. The RGS amendment bylaw, with comments received from the notification process, could then go back to the Regional Planning & Agriculture Committee and Board for consideration of final bylaw readings, and if successful, also acceptance of the RCS. This sequencing will ensure that both processes can be completed in a timely and efficient manner.

The requested regional land use changes for the Murray Street Boulevard area are considered to be Type 3 minor amendments to the RGS, requiring that an RGS amendment bylaw receive an affirmative 50%+1 weighted vote by the Metro Vancouver Board at every reading, including adoption, in order to proceed. Adoption of this RGS amendment, as well as the three other requested amendments associated with OCP Bylaw No. 2955, and the RCS would happen at the same Board meeting. This could occur in October and Council could adopt the OCP thereafter.

If not all four of the proposed RGS amendments are approved by the Metro Vancouver Board, a new RCS would need to be submitted. Depending on the nature of the resulting changes to the proposed OCP, an additional municipal public hearing process may be required. This would impact the timing of the OCP’s final adoption.
Communications

Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 2955 is the result of a series of public input opportunities including a design charrette, a survey and feedback form, 8 public input sessions, four town hall meetings and hundreds of email and written submissions. A Public Hearing on Bylaw No. 2955 was held on April 22, 2014.

The RGS amendment requested in this report involves review by relevant Metro committees and Metro Board initiation of a notification and comment period to affected local governments. The requested regional land use change for the Mill and Timber site is considered to be a Type 3 minor amendment to the RGS which does not require a regional public hearing.

Budgetary Impact

The OCP Update process has been funded through the Development Services operating budget which has now been spent.

Council Strategic Plan Objectives

The 2012 OCP update process is consistent with the goals of Planning for the Future and Engaging the Community highlighted within the 2012 Port Moody Council Strategic Plan.

Sustainability Implications

When completed, the updated OCP will provide a renewed vision for the future of areas affected by the Evergreen Line that is transit-oriented, allowing people to drive less and walk, cycle and use transit more.

Policy Implications

The updated Official Community Plan will provide policies to guide the long term future of the City of Port Moody regarding land use.

Alternatives

As directed by Council.

Recommendations

THAT the Metro Vancouver Board be requested to amend the Regional Growth Strategy by changing the regional land use designations for Areas A and B identified in the Murray Street Boulevard in Attachment 1 of this report from Industrial to General Urban and Mixed Employment to General Urban, respectively, and that this report be forwarded to the Metro Vancouver Board as part of this request.
Report/Recommendation to Council
Request for Regional Growth Strategy Amendment – Murray Street Boulevard Area
May 04, 2014

Prepared by: Mary De Paoli, MCIP
Acting General Manager of Development Services

Approved for Submission to Council: Kevin Ramsay
City Manager

Corporate Review
Corporate Services (Human Resources, Information Services, Legislative Services)
Corporate Communications
Financial Services
Community Services (Cultural Services, Facilities, Recreation)
Engineering and Parks Services (Engineering, Parks, Operations)
Fire Rescue
Library
Development Services (Planning, Building, Bylaws & Licencing)
Sustainability
Police

Committee Review List relevant committees

Council Agenda Information
Regular Council Meeting Date: May 13, 2014
Murray Street Boulevard Area - RGS Amendments Request

**AREA A:**
Current RGS Designation: INDUSTRIAL
Proposed RGS Designation: GENERAL URBAN
Area ≈ 0.67 ha

**AREA B:**
Current RGS Designation: MIXED EMPLOYMENT
Proposed RGS Designation: GENERAL URBAN
Area ≈ 3.7 ha
3. Opportunities for the creation of a Cultural Plaza will be pursued on city-owned land around the existing Arts Centre with consideration of a range of uses including residential, retail, performance/cultural centre.

15.5.4 MURRAY STREET BOULEVARD

A new Mixed Employment land use designation has been applied to the south side of Murray Street between Mary Street and Electronic Avenue. This designation includes the development of a combination of uses including light industrial, commercial, office and residential.

In this area:

1. Building forms up to 6 storeys are permitted provided that the first storey consists of employment related non-residential uses. Second storey job space is strongly encouraged where feasible and where such uses are compatible with adjacent residential uses.

2. Above 2 storeys upper floors will be set back from Murray Street to provide opportunities for outdoor spaces and allow a buffer from street level activities.

3. Weather protection along the building face fronting Murray Street is encouraged as are other pedestrian scaled amenities in order to facilitate walking and provide an attractive pedestrian environment.

4. Lot consolidation for new development in the Murray Street Boulevard sub-area is encouraged to reduce the number of driveways off of Murray Street and provide for a more continuous pedestrian environment.

Policy directions in this section apply to the area outlined in the map above.

5. Opportunities for additional N-S pedestrian connections between Murray St and the proposed Moody Central station will be pursued as part of new development in this area.

6. As part of new development, focus will be placed on improving Murray Street so that it is more accessible, safe and attractive for pedestrians and cyclists of all ages and abilities. These improvements include, but are not limited to, designated continuous bike lanes, continuous sidewalks, street furniture, public art, traffic calming measures and additional signalized crossings.

7. For new development, access to the properties on the south side of Murray Street is required through rear laneway access.
GREATER VANCOUVER REGIONAL DISTRICT
REGIONAL GROWTH STRATEGY AMENDMENT BYLAW NO. 1209, 2014

A Bylaw to Amend
Greater Vancouver Regional District Regional Growth Strategy Bylaw No. 1136, 2010.

WHEREAS the Board of the Greater Vancouver Regional District adopted the Greater Vancouver Regional District Regional Growth Strategy Bylaw No. 1136, 2010 on July 29, 2011;

AND WHEREAS the Board wishes to amend the official regional land use designation maps in Metro Vancouver 2040: Shaping our Future, the regional growth strategy;

NOW THEREFORE, the Board of the Greater Vancouver Regional District in open meeting assembled enacts as follows:

1. The Greater Vancouver Regional District Regional Growth Strategy Bylaw No. 1136, 2010 is hereby amended:

   a) By revising the official regional land use designation maps numbered 2, 3, 4, 6, and 12, to record the changes in regional land use designations described in the table below and shown in Schedule A of this Bylaw;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>From DESIGNATION</th>
<th>To DESIGNATION</th>
<th>Affected Land Area (approx.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moody Centre Transit Oriented Development Area and Murray Street Boulevard Area</td>
<td>Mixed Employment</td>
<td>General Urban</td>
<td>7.2 hectares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moody Centre Transit Oriented Development Area and Murray Street Boulevard Area</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>General Urban</td>
<td>1.1 hectares</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   b) By revising the official regional land use designation map number 4 to record the creation of one Frequent Transit Development Area at Moody Centre as shown in Schedule A of this Bylaw.

2. The official citation for this bylaw is “Greater Vancouver Regional District Regional Growth Strategy Amendment Bylaw No. 1209, 2014.” This bylaw may be cited as “Regional Growth Strategy Amendment Bylaw No. 1209, 2014.”
Read a First time this __________ day of __________________, 2014.

Read a Second time this __________ day of __________________, 2014.

Read a Third time this __________ day of __________________, 2014.

Passed and Finally Adopted this __________ day of __________________, 2014.

_____________________________  ______________________________
Chris Plagnol                     Greg Moore
Acting Corporate Officer        Chair

Schedule A - Map of Subject Site
Metro 2040: Shaping Our Future City of Port Moody Amendment Request

City of Port Moody
- Mixed Employment to General Urban
- Industrial to General Urban
- Proposed Frequent Transit Development Area
Mayor and Council

From: Mayor and Council
Subject: FW: Ambelside Park

From: Mayor and Council
Sent: July 15, 2014 9:02 AM
To: Michael Smith
Cc: Mary-Ann Booth; Craig Cameron; Michael Lewis; Bill Soprovich; Trish Panz
Subject: Ambelside Park

Mayor Smith and Council

I am a resident of North Vancouver but I like to walk around Ambelside Park quite often. What has happened to the maintenance and upkeep of this park?

It looks completely neglected with brambles, ivies and weeds taking over the whole area east of the parking lot and around the ponds. I can’t even see where the trees are. This is disgraceful!

Not sure if this is left like this because it is the off leash area or what, but I do not have a dog and can’t believe it has been let go like this. What about tourists who walk over from the RV Park?

This municipality collects a lot of taxpayers money and it sure isn’t going back into parks. The shrubs are completely overgrown around the small park west of Dundarave, too.

North Vancouver, BC
July 15, 2014

Dear North Shore Congress Members:

Further to North Vancouver City Council’s resolution on Monday, July 7, 2014 (attached), I am pleased to enclose a copy of the City’s staff report on affordable housing, and my recent letters to federal Minister Jason Kenney and provincial Minister Rich Coleman requesting increased resources and new partnerships for affordable housing provision.

As you know, affordable housing remains a key concern on the North Shore, and is critical to our community’s social, economic and environmental stability. The City of North Vancouver is committed to providing a diverse housing stock, recognizing stable housing as integral to the overall health and wellbeing of residents. On behalf of City Council, I am writing to request that your respective Council or Board also consider endorsing a resolution to advocate for more active involvement from senior levels of government in providing new and diverse affordable housing options.

Thank you for your consideration of this request, and we look forward to working with you in finding new and innovative ways to address the current and future housing needs of our North Shore community.

Yours sincerely,

Darrell Mussatto
Mayor

Encl.

cc: North Vancouver City Council
15. **Summary of City Initiatives in Affordable Housing – File: 5040-03**

Report: Planner II, Community Development, July 2, 2014

Moved by Councillor Clark, seconded by Councillor Bell that the motion be amend to include “and North Shore Congress” in the third paragraph, after the word “Municipalities”. The motion, as amended, reads as follows:

**PURSUANT** to the report of the Planner II, Community Development, dated July 2, 2014, entitled “Summary of City Initiatives in Affordable Housing”:

**THAT** the provincial and federal governments be requested to become more actively involved in the provision of new affordable housing including partnering with local governments and providing resources directly;

**THAT** a copy of the July 2, 2014 report be forwarded to North Shore municipalities and North Shore Congress, with correspondence requesting consideration of a resolution advocating more active involvement on the part of senior levels of government in providing new affordable housing;

**THAT** staff be directed to explore means of increasing cooperation and coordination between North Shore municipalities on affordable housing policies;

**AND THAT** staff be directed to report to Council with a timeline and recommended consultation strategy for updating the City’s Housing Action Plan following the CityShaping process.

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**
July 14, 2014

Honourable Jason Kenney
Minister Responsible for CMHC
House of Commons
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6

Dear Minister Kenney:

Further to North Vancouver City Council’s resolution on Monday, July 7, 2014 (attached), I am writing to urge that the federal government become more actively involved in the provision of new affordable housing through direct provision of resources and through partnerships with local governments.

The City of North Vancouver’s existing housing policies exceed the requirements of the Local Government Act, and recognize housing as a responsibility critical to the community’s long term stability. The enclosed City Report highlights the social, economic and environmental importance of making a range of housing options available that are affordable to tenants as well as homebuyers. Through our extensive efforts to reduce fees and charges, fast-track affordable housing applications, adopt progressive land use policies, and otherwise support efforts to create and preserve a diverse affordable housing stock, the City has been instrumental in the creation of 300 new below market housing units in our community since 2000.

However, the Metro Vancouver Regional Growth Strategy projects that the City will require approximately 200 market rental units, 300 moderate income rental units and 300 low income affordable rental units over the next ten years to meet anticipated needs. Under current senior government legislation, the City is not adequately resourced to address these long term housing needs, and is dependent on partnerships, support and resources from other levels of government. It is for this reason that we urge the federal government to actively support local governments in meeting the current and ongoing need for adequate levels of affordable housing.

Thank you for your consideration of this important matter, and we look forward to your support to increase the range of affordable housing options in our community.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Darrell Mussatto
Mayor

Encl.

cc: Honourable Rich Coleman, Minister Responsible for Housing
North Shore Congress Membership
North Vancouver City Council
July 14, 2014

Honourable Rich Coleman
Minister Responsible for Housing
PO BOX 9052, STN PROV GOVT
Victoria, BC V8W 9E2

Dear Minister Coleman:

Further to North Vancouver City Council’s resolution on Monday, July 7, 2014 (attached), I am writing to urge that the Province of British Columbia become more actively involved in the provision of new affordable housing through direct provision of resources and through partnerships with local governments.

The City of North Vancouver’s existing housing policies exceed the requirements of the Local Government Act, and recognize housing as a responsibility critical to the community’s long term stability. The enclosed City Report highlights the social, economic and environmental importance of making a range of housing options available that are affordable to tenants as well as homebuyers. Through our extensive efforts to reduce fees and charges, fast-track affordable housing applications, adopt progressive land use policies, and otherwise support efforts to create and preserve a diverse affordable housing stock, the City has been instrumental in the creation of 300 new below market housing units in our community since 2000.

However, the Metro Vancouver Regional Growth Strategy projects that the City will require approximately 200 market rental units, 300 moderate income rental units and 300 low income affordable rental units over the next ten years to meet anticipated needs. Under current senior government legislation, the City is not adequately resourced to address these long term housing needs, and is dependent on partnerships, support and resources from other levels of government. It is for this reason that we urge the Province of BC to actively support local governments in meeting the current and ongoing need for adequate levels of affordable housing.

Thank you for your consideration of this important matter, and we look forward to your support to increase the range of affordable housing option in our community.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Darrell Mussatto
Mayor

Encl.

cc: Honourable Jason Kenney, Minister Responsible for CMHC
North Shore Congress Membership
North Vancouver City Council
To: Mayor Darrell R. Mussatto and Members of Council

From: Michael D. Epp, Planner II

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF CITY INITIATIVES IN AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Date: July 2, 2014

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

RECOMMENDATION:

PURSUANT to the report of the Planner II, dated July 2, 2014, entitled "Summary of City Initiatives in Affordable Housing":

THAT the provincial and federal governments be requested to become more actively involved in the provision of new affordable housing including partnering with local governments and providing resources directly;

THAT a copy of the report be forwarded to North Shore municipalities with correspondence requesting consideration of a resolution advocating more active involvement on the part of senior levels of government in providing new affordable housing;

THAT staff be directed to explore means of increasing cooperation and coordination between North Shore municipalities on affordable housing policies;

AND THAT staff be directed to report to Council with a timeline and recommended consultation strategy for updating the City's Housing Action Plan following the CityShaping process.
ATTACHMENTS:

1. History of Housing Initiatives in the City of North Vancouver, May 2014
2. ‘Summary of Affordable Housing in the City’ Infographic
3. Policy Directions: Housing Affordability and Diversity

PURPOSE:

To provide an overview of the City’s rental and affordable housing policies and initiatives and to present recommended resolutions advocating increased cooperation and coordination between North Shore municipalities and increased participation of senior levels of government in addressing housing affordability.

BACKGROUND:

At the regular meeting of Council held October 7, 2013 it was resolved:

THAT a report of City initiatives in affordable housing be prepared and, subject to receipt by Council, be forwarded to the District of North Vancouver, District of West Vancouver, and to the Provincial MLA’s and Federal MP’s on the North Shore;

The City of North Vancouver has been amongst the most active in the region in adopting measures to support creating new affordable housing and maintaining the existing affordable housing stock. Though policies with respect to affordable housing are a requirement under the Local Government Act, the City’s housing policies go further and recognize housing as a responsibility critical to the community’s long term stability and goal of creating a complete community. The City has embedded strong housing policies in the Official Community Plan, Social Plan and other policy documents.

Despite the City’s significant long-term efforts using the tools available to it, the direct provision of a substantial number of new affordable housing units is beyond the capacity of smaller local governments and significant progress is impossible without additional resources or involvement from senior levels of government and coordination between local governments.
DISCUSSION:

Current Policy Initiatives

The City has identified actions and policies in support of rental and affordable housing, and has worked to provide housing to meet a variety of needs by:

- Negotiating with developers and employing tools such as density bonusing and density transfers to secure new non-market housing units;
- Offering Development Cost Charge relaxations and waivers for rental and non-market housing projects;
- Supporting sensitive infill development in established residential neighbourhoods, including coach houses, secondary suites in duplexes, and small lot development to expand housing options and increase opportunities for home ownership;
- Pursuing partnerships with non-profit housing providers;
- Selling and leasing City lands;
- Maintaining an Affordable Housing Reserve Fund;
- Ensuring the City’s land use planning provides for a diverse future housing stock.

The City’s extensive and longstanding efforts to create and preserve affordable housing options have achieved significant success, resulting in the creation of 300 new below market housing units since 2000. These City efforts and their results are summarized visually in Attachment 2 to this report.

The City of North Vancouver has adopted housing policies in a number of documents and undertaken a series of studies and workshops on housing market conditions, housing stock and housing affordability in the City. These efforts include:

- Social Plan Housing Policies (updated 2000);
- Rental Housing Strategies (2007);
- Housing Affordability Strategies (2006);
- Adaptable Design Guidelines;

Attachment 2 to this report, “Policy Directions: Housing Affordability and Diversity,” reviews current housing conditions and needs in the City of North Vancouver across the housing continuum, highlights key challenges for meeting these needs in the future, and describes the City’s existing housing policies in greater detail.
Senior Levels of Government

Despite these achievements, however, the City is not resourced to adequately address long term housing needs across the housing spectrum. The Metro Vancouver Regional Growth Strategy projects that the City will require approximately 200 market rental units, 300 moderate income rental units and 300 low income affordable rental units over the next ten years to meet anticipated needs. Achieving these targets would require the creation of approximately 60 units of below market housing per year—a rate approximately three times higher than the average number of below market units added annual over the previous two decades. With limited resources, the City's ability to add to the affordable housing stock is dependent on partnerships and support from senior levels of government.

In recognition of the City's dependence on senior levels of government and creative partnerships, the City has long been active in advocating for increased provincial and federal involvement in provision of new affordable housing. Despite these requests, and of the increasing recognition of the importance of safe, secure housing, there has been a significant long term retrenchment on the part of senior levels of government, leaving local governments with increased responsibility without additional resources.

Inter-Municipal Cooperation

The City recognizes that despite its efforts to reduce fees and charges, fast-track affordable housing applications, adopt progressive land use policies, and otherwise support efforts that result in a diverse housing stock, the housing market is ultimately influenced by factors which are beyond the City's control. A regional approach is required to address housing issues.

The City supports neighbouring municipalities in their efforts to promote housing affordability and encourages the District of North Vancouver and the District of West Vancouver to consider a range of measures to support housing affordability on the North Shore. Staff suggest that the District of North Vancouver and the District of West Vancouver be requested to consider a resolution to be forwarded to senior levels of government advocating for increased involvement of senior governments in the direct provision of affordable housing. The District of West Vancouver and the District of North Vancouver may also wish to consider compiling summaries of their efforts to create and maintain a diverse housing stock, in order to emphasize the actions that are being taken on this issue at the municipal level.

NEXT STEPS:

At the regular meeting of Council held June 10th, 2013, Council directed staff to undertake an update to the City's Housing Action Plan after the conclusion of the Official Community Plan review process currently underway. Should Council support the recommendations in this report, staff will report back with a suggested process,
consultation strategy and timeline for an update to the Housing Action Plan. Staff will also continue efforts to build partnerships with non-profit housing providers and advocate for increased resources to address housing challenges.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The recommendations in this report do not have financial implications beyond a commitment of staff resources which can be accommodated within established work plans. The City maintains an Affordable Housing Reserve Fund with a current balance of approximately $2.7 million which is available to contribute to the creation of affordable housing.

INTER-DEPARTMENTAL IMPLICATIONS:

The Civic Projects Team has supported the recommendations in this report.

SUSTAINABILITY COMMENTS:

A key component of a complete community is the availability of a range of housing which is affordable to tenants and homebuyers. Providing a full range of affordability and choice in the City’s housing stock is important socially, as well as economically and environmentally. Adding new affordable units on a continual basis is critical to the City’s social sustainability.

CORPORATE PLAN AND/OR POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

Residential Land Use Objective 5.7.7 in the Official Community Plan supports providing affordable housing, increasing and retaining existing affordable housing, and leasing of City owned property to enable non-profit rental housing.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Michael D. Epp  
Planner II

Attachment

ME:skj
Housing is a key factor to the social and economic sustainability of the City of North Vancouver and to achieving the City's vision of being a healthy, livable and complete community.

As a community with strong working class origins, the City has long been involved in responding to a broad range of issues affecting its residents, including housing affordability. The City works to maintain and improve the existing housing stock, as well as to find opportunities to increase the number of affordable units in the community. Providing a diversity of affordable, accessible, and appropriate housing opportunities ensures that an inclusive range of residents call the City 'home'.

Over the past 70 years, housing policies, practices and initiatives in the City have evolved significantly within the context of the ebb and flow of senior government housing programs and market forces. This document provides a decade by decade snapshot of the City's responses to housing affordability since 1940.

1940s to 1960s

- Booming shipyards and return of war veterans precipitated housing crisis in the City
- Federal Wartime Housing program and sale of vacant lots at reduced value by the City helped construct over 600 small standardized homes in the City
- City properties used to leverage senior government funding to construct non-market rental housing for seniors through partnerships
  - Kwanis Apartments (1950s) - 38 units
  - ANAVETS Apartments (1960s) - 88 units
Proliferation of senior government housing programs facilitated housing boom
- Assisted Home Ownership Program helped lower income households attain homeownership
- Limited Dividend Program, Multiple Unit Residential Building (MURBS) tax shelter, Assisted Rental Program, and Canada Rental Housing Supply Program provided rental housing support for modest income renters, single people, and urban dwellers
- Support for non-profit and co-operative housing

**1970s**

- City Standards of Maintenance Bylaw adopted in 1974: Protect existing housing stock by establishing minimum standards for the maintenance of the physical condition of residential property
- 2 new seniors' housing projects and 2 new family housing projects completed:
  - Grant McNeil Place (1976): 110 units
  - St. Andrew's Place (1976): 15 units
  - Twin Towers (1976): 212 units
- Strata conversion controls adopted in 1978: Penalize loss of rental units, stratification of purpose-built rental units prohibited unless vacancy rate in the City exceeds 3%
Four housing co-ops and two non-market housing projects constructed:
- Creekside Housing Co-op (1985) - 43 units
- Pinewood Place (1985) - 50 units
- Walnut Gardens (1985) - 26 units
- Mosquito Creek Housing Co-op (1986) - 67 units
- Capilano Housing Co-op (1987) - 29 units
- North Shore Housing Co-op (1987) - 38 units

Federal government began funding cuts for non-profit housing in 1984.
Eligibility for Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Program (RRAP) restricted in 1989 to only people of low income or with disabilities.

Social Housing Reserve Fund established in 1989.
Initial contribution of $200,000 from City's general revenue to support implementation of City social housing objectives.

Strengthened City's role in supporting initiatives that enabled affordable and adequate housing for lower income households:
- Small lot sizes permitted (1983)
- Condominium conversion policy (1979)
- Family suites policy (1967)
- Policy to lease City-owned property where appropriate for non-profit housing.

City's first Social Planner hired to respond to diminishing federal housing resources.

Demolition Moratorium
Loss of 38 units in three rental buildings in 1988 prompted Council to utilize its emergency powers to declare a rental housing crisis in the City and issue a Demolition Moratorium on all rental accommodations in multi family zoned areas.
Affordable Housing Action Plan adopted 1990
- Support for affordable housing projects in Official Community Plan (OCP)
- Improved processing times for affordable projects

Strata Conversion Policy benchmark raised and Demolition Notification Policy adopted
- Strata Conversion Policy raised from 3 to 4 percent to meet eligibility for municipal grants under the provincial Rent Supply Program
- Landlords intending to demolish any building with three or more units required to provide minimum 6 months notice prior to eviction

Social Housing Reserve Fund facilitated development of 'Margaret Heights' family project in 1991
- Operated by Entre Nous Femmes Housing Society
- 19 townhouse units with at grade parking
- Nine 2 bedroom units, six 3 bedroom units, and four 4 bedroom units
- On-site child care facility with 25 spaces
- City leased property at 75% of market value
- $2.35 million capital funding from BC Housing
- $16,000 from the City's Social Housing Reserve Fund
- City staff provided support for inclusion of on-site child care facility and later upgrades to the outdoor play area in 1995

1990s

BC Government's 1992 Commission on Housing Options enhanced role of province and local government
- Municipalities required to include strategies on affordable housing in OCP
- New planning powers given to local government, including inclusionary zoning, negotiated density bonuses and transfer of density rights

In 1993, the federal government canceled all support for new non-profit and co-op housing
Budget for national social housing portfolio capped at $2 billion annually; management and ongoing subsidies for social housing devolved to provinces
Secondary suites in single family dwellings legalized in 1993. Secondary suites recognized to provide important source of affordable rental housing in the City, as well as supplementary income for homeowners.

- Moratorium on Enforcement against Illegal Suites in February 1990
- Secondary Suites Working Committee convened in 1991

Residential unit sizes reduced in response to growing affordability challenges and changing demographics in City.

- Smaller minimum unit sizes permitted to comply with new federal and provincial standards (1990)
- 20 percent of units in larger multi-family projects required to be less than 750 square feet
- Unit per hectare residential density control eliminated in 1992 Official Community Plan to facilitate smaller, more affordable units

1990s

- Multiple Unit Building (MUB) Policy in 1995
  Support creation and legalization of additional rental units in unused or underused areas of existing apartment buildings

Rental Premises Standards of Maintenance Bylaw adopted 1998
Ensure owners of rental accommodation required to maintain their property to an acceptable level of livability and life safety standards for tenants
Strategies to Support Seniors Housing endorsed 1994
- Promote housing designs that enable aging in place
- Strategies developed through partnerships with outside agencies

Sites Suitable for Seniors Housing adopted 1995
- Partnership with seniors organizations to determine criteria for location of seniors housing
- Central Lonsdale and Lower Lonsdale deemed ideal location for seniors housing due to proximity to shops and services, good transit service, and smaller residential units that are easier to maintain and more affordable

Adaptable Design Policy adopted 1998
Residential units accessible to a wider range of persons through the consideration of adaptations that could be easily and inexpensively incorporated to facilitate independent living and support aging in place
- Revised in 2003 and 2013
- 25 percent of all applicable units currently are required to meet Adaptable Design Level 2, with specified floor area exclusions permitted

Social Housing Reserve Fund renamed Affordable Housing Reserve Fund (1995)
Broadened use of the Fund to respond to senior government housing programs shifting away from housing core need households to mixed income projects

Affordable Housing Policies adopted 1996 and Affordable Housing Task Force established 1997-1998
- City reconfirmed a facilitative and supportive role in responding to housing needs of residents
- Task Force presented recommendations to protect and enhance affordable housing in the City

Social Plan adopted 1998
- Framework to focus social planning programs and initiatives in the City
- Recommendations from the Affordable Housing Task Force incorporated into the Social Plan in recognition of the importance of accessible and appropriate housing in fostering a healthy and complete community
Quayside Village Co-Housing Project (1996) supported by City
- First urban co-housing project in Metro Vancouver
- Density increased from 1.2 Floor Space Ratio (FSR) to 1.6 FSR, with density bonus for affordable rental
- Agreements between City and Quayside Village designated two townhouses and two apartments ‘20 percent below market’ and one apartment ‘affordable family rental unit’ with rent set at core need income rates
  - Reuse of building materials, incorporation of grey water system and energy efficiency

Density bonus and density transfer facilitated development of Summerhill Residences (1999)
- 107 units of supportive rental housing for seniors, with 1 unit dedicated to respite care
- Density increased from 2.6 FSR to 5.27 FSR, with density bonus and exclusion for rental housing and supportive amenities and a density transfer from neighbouring site
- Relaxation of parking requirements gave developer savings of over $1.7 million
- All units designed to Adaptable Design Level 3
- Residents integrated into community through events, programming and opportunities for socializing

1990s

Royal Canadian Legion Branch #125 redeveloped in 1999 with City density bonusing
- Five floors of non-profit housing in the 15 storey high rise, for a total of 33 one bedroom units.
- Density increased from 2.6 FSR to 4.57 FSR, with bonus provided for affordable rental
- Capital costs ($4.14 million) provided by BC Housing under HOMES BC program; 35-year Operating Agreement with BC Housing
  - Original development required strata units to be sold or resold at 85 percent below market value; rescinded in 2004 after development went into receivership
  - All units built to then current Adaptable Design Level 2

- Ad hoc task force of service providers, health region and municipal social planning staff secured $80,611 of federal Supporting Communities Partnership Initiative (SCPI) funding.

- City provided shelter location in City-owned building and forgave lease revenue of $25,000 during operation.

_2000s_

**HOMES BC funding cut in 2002**

- HOMES BC funding ended
- Homelessness Housing Action Team (HHAT) formed in 2007
- Focus on THA, social housing
- HOMES BC funding for EAH
- Affordable Housing Initiative
- Affordable Housing Initiative established in 2007

- Up-front capital contributions, rather than ongoing subsidies
- Requirement for provincial matching of federal investment funds and for units to be provided at prices at or below market value
- First phase, BC government received $88.7 million to fund Independent Living BC Program, supportive housing for frail seniors and people with disabilities.
- Additional $41.7 million received 2004, which went towards Provincial Homelessness Initiative to provide supportive housing for homeless and people with mental illness and addictions.
2000-2001 Rental Housing Study

- City investigated ways to maintain and encourage affordability in the existing rental stock
- Study found purpose-built rental housing provided approximately 60 percent of the City's rental accommodations, and that rents tended to be more affordable due to age of the buildings and limited amenities

2001 - First purpose-built rental building constructed in the City since 1970s

2000s

- Affordable Housing Workshop in 2004
  Explored approaches to affordability in homeownership, as well as the City's role in facilitating diverse housing options

- Housing Affordability Strategies developed in 2006
  Developed with guidance from Affordable Housing Action Forum, which discussed full spectrum of affordable housing, from emergency and homeless shelters to assisted and independent social housing programs, to rental assistance and affordable homeownership
North Shore Adult Shelter and Transition Housing Facility opened in 2005

- City lobbied senior governments for sufficient capital and operating funding to make temporary shelter a permanent facility
- In November 2001, Council authorized $1.053 million to purchase the site of the permanent facility, provided a 50 percent discount lease, forgave approximately $435,000 for utility and site requirements, and waived various development-related City fees
- Total of 25 bed emergency shelter, 15 to 20 dorm style beds available during cold, wet weather season, and 25 transition studios where residents can stay up to 2 years
- Started as an overnight shelter, but became a 24-hour, year-round operation in 2007 with senior government funding

Addition of two second-stage family housing units in 2006

The North Shore Crisis Services Society accessed federal funding to purchase a lower Tonsdale duplex to provide second-stage family housing for those moving beyond transitional housing.

2000s

New housing units for individuals with mental health issues (2007)

- City used funds from Affordable Housing Reserve Fund to jointly purchase existing apartment building with BC Housing and Marineview Housing Society
- ‘Chesterfield House’ provides 16 units of supportive housing for individuals with mental health issues
- Re-zoned in 2008 to permit an additional building to provide 4 new units built to Adaptable Design Level 2 standards
6 units of supportive seniors housing secured in Central Lonsdale (2008)

- Originally rezoned in 2008, and amended in 2009, partnership between the developer and the City led to density bonus and density exclusion for "The Kimpson" to secure six affordable rental units, under City ownership
- All 6 City units are Adaptable Design Level 2, as well as 4 additional units in the development
- City and Metro Vancouver Development Cost Charges were waived, totaling $38,449
- In August 2012, the 6 affordable rent units were leased by the City to Hollyburn Family Services Society for operation as supportive seniors housing for low income seniors who require social supports to maintain their independence

27 units of below-market seniors housing built in 2007

- Partnership between developer, BC Housing (federal and provincial funds), Kwanis, and City
- "Kwanis St. Andrew's" achieved through density bonusing, density transfer and exclusion of floor area
- City waived approximately $140,000 in fees and development cost charges, as well as reimbursed costs to increase affordability of project
- 26 one-bedroom units and 1 two-bedroom unit, of which 21 units built to Level 2 Adaptable Design and 6 units at Level 3
City adopted Coach House Policy in April 2010
- Unique housing option for residents that adds to housing diversity in City
- Two types: Level A and Level-B

Council approved second mortgage to Vancouver Resource Society in May 2010
Facilitate purchase of existing 28-unit apartment in Central Lonsdale to eventually accommodate persons with disabilities on ground floor and provide non-market rental units

New non-market units secured for persons with disabilities (2011)
- Partnership between the City, Vancouver Resource Society and a developer to provide for a density bonus of 0.5 FSR to achieve five non-market housing units for persons with disabilities
- Each unit is approximately 625 square feet, plus 230 square feet office space

2010s

Non-profit housing group, Housing for Young Adults with Disabilities (HYAD), provided land through rezoning of former school site (2008)
- Partnership between developer, North Vancouver School District and HYAD to create a lot through rezoning for non-profit housing for young adults with disabilities
- 16 dwelling units, including live-in manager support and additional common space built for young adults with disabilities
- All units built to Level 2 Adaptable Design
- Building connected to Lonsdale Energy Corporation
- Parking requirement reduced since most residents do not drive
- HYAD formed by parent group whose objective is to provide semi-independent living for their children to ensure their future security and well-being, allow them to remain in the community, and reduce the future amount of government assistance
• New Army, Navy and Air Force Veterans Society (ANAVETS) apartment building (2011)
  • Partnership between developer and ANAVETS redeveloped site to provide replacement ANAVETS building and market residential building
  • 72 units of seniors housing – 22 studios and 54 one-bedroom units
  • Net loss of 16 below-market rental units, but replaced with newer, larger units
  • 60 new units designed to Adaptable Design Level 2, and 3 units meet Level 3
  • Rents set at no more than 30 percent of total income, secured by Housing Agreement
  • Construction financing provided by BC Housing
  • City excluded floor area of ANAVETS building, which provided developer with more floor area for market residential building
  • City waived Development Cost Charges ($211,000), and Metro Vancouver Development Cost Charges waived as well ($61,382)
  • Parking requirement reduced by half; provision of bike and scooter stalls

2010s

• Federal government continued to divest itself of housing matters
  • 2011 – federal government cut national housing and homelessness investments
  • Overall spending at Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) reduced from $3.1 billion in 2010 to $1.9 billion in 2011
  • Funding for national homelessness plan cut by 11 percent from $124 million to $110 million
  • Federal affordable housing initiative eliminated by 2014
  • Number of subsidized homes expected to decrease by 50,200 by 2014
  • Number of homes renovated under national projects funding expected to be no more than 745 in all of Canada
  • Sharp cuts to housing and homelessness spending happening in spite of CMHC reporting that its net income will more than double from $911 million in 2010 to $2 billion in 2014
Seniors Emergency Housing Unit (2012)
Hollyburn Family Services Society accessed federal and provincial homelessness-related funding to secure a unit in the Vancouver Resource Society apartment building as an emergency unit for seniors at risk of homelessness.

Council approved Accessory Dwelling Units in Duplexes in April 2013.
Supported as an option to increase the availability of affordable rental housing in the City.

2010s

Increase in purpose-built rental units
- Approval of several market rental developments adds to and renews City rental housing stock for the first time since the 1970s.
- City approves density bonuses and permits lower parking requirements for rental housing in order to enable these new projects.

Density bonusing used to renovate an existing rental building and to add two additional storeys.
- Rezoning and density bonus by the City to add 2 storeys of 11 units to older rental building.
- 8 units built to Adaptable Design Level 2 standards.
Gap between cost of housing and household income
The 2011 census revealed that the cost of housing in the City is 10 times greater than average household income.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Average Household Income</th>
<th>Average Housing Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>10x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>5x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>5x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>5x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>4x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>7x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$10x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking forward

- Expiration of operating agreements between non-market housing operators and federal government major concern
  - Subsidy agreements linked to 811 units/beds located in the City will expire between 2017 and 2029
  - Anticipated that loss of federal support will lead to increased numbers of people who need affordable housing.

- Protection and gradual renewal of City's aging rental housing stock
  - A 2012 study conducted by Metro Vancouver estimates that 23 percent of the City's rental housing stock is at moderate or high risk of redevelopment

- Affordable Homeownership
  - The City continues to explore ways of creating more affordable homeownership options for City residents, including reducing the minimum lot size to allow for smaller lots and allowing secondary suites and coach houses on single family lots to serve as mortgage helpers

Continued use of density bonusing to help facilitate affordable housing in the City
A 2013 Historical review of density bonusing in the City revealed the contributions of density bonusing to date:

- Over 172 Units of Non-Market & Special Needs Rental Housing Secured
- Over 116 Units Meeting Level 3 Adaptive Design Guideline
CITY OF NORTH VANCOUVER
AFFORDABLE HOUSING SNAPSHOT

The City is striving to provide housing across the Affordable Housing Continuum

- **Emergency Shelter**
  - Homeless shelters, safe houses

- **Non-Market**
  - Transitional & Supportive Housing
    - Housing plus support for people with special needs
  - Social Housing
    - Subsidized rental housing

- **Market**
  - Market Rental Housing
    - Rental housing at market prices (e.g., secondary suites & coach houses)
  - Lower Cost Home Ownership
    - Small lots/units, multi-family units

...so how is the City doing?

1. Over the past 10 years, housing values have risen dramatically without corresponding increases in household income resulting in a greater affordability gap

![Graph showing affordability gap]

2. More households in the City are paying a larger portion of their incomes on shelter

- **Median monthly shelter costs:**
  - Owned Dwellings: $1,209
  - Rented Dwellings: $1,017

3. Few new rental buildings, and more strata developments is changing the housing composition in the City

![Graph showing dwelling units]

Source: Statistics Canada, Census 1981 - 2011

43.4% of City renters spend 30% or more of their total household income on shelter compared to 26.9% of homeowners
Since the 1970s, the City's use of its limited tools has led to...

1,061 non-market units

Year of construction

5 housing developments facilitated by the Affordable Housing Reserve Fund

Of the 1,061 non-market units, 78 units were secured through density bonusing

7225 Purpose-built rental units built prior to 1980

0 Purpose-built rental units between 1980 and 2000

239 New purpose-built rental units built since 2000

343 units of market rental housing secured through density bonusing

aided by density bonusing, reduced development cost charges, and changes in factors of land use development

But...

23% of the City's purpose-built rental stock is at risk of redevelopment, according to Metro Vancouver
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Executive Summary

Rapid and pronounced shifts in the types of housing in the City, the steady rise in home ownership rates, changing demographics, dramatic increases in housing prices, stagnant incomes and the aging rental housing stock have combined to create new and challenging housing conditions in the City of North Vancouver. This document presents a vision of equitable and sustainable housing options for all residents of North Vancouver. To achieve this vision, the City has adopted housing policies in numerous planning documents, used its zoning powers and regulatory tools, leveraged City-owned lands and assets, and pursued public education, consultation and collaboration. While these efforts have resulted over time in 1,046 non-market housing units, new approaches and concerted effort are essential to meeting the housing needs of the community. This report presents current housing trends, strategies and implementation measures to support the City's housing vision, including changes to policies and regulations, many of which are currently under consideration or which may be incorporated in the review of the Official Community Plan currently underway.
Introduction
The CityShaping process, which began in 2010, is engaging the community in conversations around the critical issues for the City’s future. Through this engagement, affordable housing has emerged as the number one concern of participants—providing timely incentive to refocus the City’s many efforts to ensure safe, affordable, appropriate housing in meeting the fundamental needs of all its residents.

This document compiles the City’s knowledge of its current housing conditions, including emerging trends and challenges for the future and includes a summary of the policies the City has adopted to encourage affordable housing. As the City continues its review of the Official Community Plan through CityShaping and in the course of reviewing other regulations, a number of new policies and initiatives are being considered. These possible future directions are also outlined in this report.

Housing Vision
We envision an equitable and sustainable approach to housing all residents of the City of North Vancouver, who have a right to feel secure in their community and to have safe housing which is appropriate for their life circumstances and affordable for their income level.

Community Housing and Demographic Profile
Between 1986 and 2010, the City has been able to accommodate considerable new development and has become one of the most diverse communities in Metro Vancouver. Homeownership has grown considerably, particularly in Lower Lonsdale and Central Lonsdale. City neighbourhoods have also seen considerable change as strata-titled apartments and town houses are becoming widespread.

Household Characteristics
The City’s household characteristics are changing, resulting in changing housing trends and needs in the community. Policies should recognize these emerging trends while respecting the strong policy foundations that have helped create affordable housing over the past several decades. The section below examines recent changes and trends in household size, incomes, and age structure that will direct housing needs in the coming decades.

Shrinking Households
One person households are now the most common household type.

Household sizes have declined from an average of 2.7 people per household in 1996 to 2.1 people per household in 2011. The traditional household and family composition is transitioning to reflect an increase in both non-family households (single persons or two or more persons who share a dwelling) and lone-parent households across the region. These trends are pronounced in the City of North Vancouver where one person households are

---

1 Statistics Canada, 2011 Census.
2 Ibid.
the largest household type (Figure 1) and the number of lone parent families increased by 23 percent from 1996 – 2011.

Figure 1 Household Size, 2011

Aging Community
As the percentage of older residents continues to increase, the types of housing needed in the community are likely to change.

The City’s population is aging. By 2021 an estimated 18.5 percent of North Vancouver’s population is projected to be above the age of 65, up from 11.8 percent in 2001. The City of North Vancouver is home to fewer youth and more middle-aged adults than Metro Vancouver as a whole: age groups over 45 all increased or remained stable since 2001. Other age groups, such as children under the age of 10 and adults aged 25 to 44, have declined in both relative and absolute terms. These structural changes will impact the housing market and may increase the demand for housing which is close to medical services, smaller in size, and accessible or adaptable for aging in place.

Household Income and Households in Core Housing Need
Though wages and incomes have increased modestly, skyrocketing costs of living are putting households in more precarious situations.

Throughout the 22 Metro Vancouver municipalities in 2006, the median annual household income was $55,231. The City’s median household income is more modest at $49,486, and is significantly lower than in other North Shore municipalities (see Figure 2). With lower earning power, the City’s households are more vulnerable to changes such as the

---

3 Ibid.
recent rise in cost of living (as measured by the Consumer Price Index), which has increased by 15 percent since 2002. Other trends and statistics impacting household incomes:

- Income inequality in North Vancouver is comparatively high;
- 38 percent of renter households (3,770 households) had incomes under $30,000 in 2006, and 25 percent (2,435 households) had incomes under $20,000, making adequate, affordable housing difficult to attain;
- Owner households have much higher median incomes than renter households—$61,740 compared to $38,180, but 19 percent of owner households (2,150 households) had incomes below $30,000.\(^6\)

Figure 2  Median Household Income of Metro Vancouver’s Municipalities (2006)

Source: Statistics Canada, Census Community Profiles, 2006

\(^7\) ibid.
The proportion of households living in unacceptable accommodation and spending at least half of household income on shelter costs (INALH households), is higher in the City than other North Shore municipalities. In 2006, the City had 1,740 INALH households (Table 1), representing nine percent of the housing stock compared to five percent in the District of North Vancouver, seven percent in West Vancouver and seven percent in the Vancouver Census Metropolitan Area (Metro Vancouver). Both the percentage of INALH households and low income households in the City have remained relatively constant from 1991 to 2006. The limited fluctuation in the number of INALH households in the City between Census years suggests this population move infrequently and, due to limited options, remain in inadequate housing.

Table 1: Households in Core Housing Need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1,805</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,615</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Canada Census

Population Growth and Demand for Housing

From 2006 to 2011 the City's population grew 6.7 percent, an average of 1.3 percent per year, with a similar increase in the number of dwelling units (6.8 percent). The Metro Vancouver Regional Growth Strategy estimates the City's population will grow by a further 12,000 people by 2031, to a total population of at least 62,000 people in 2031 from 48,200 in 2011.

The number of new housing units needed to accommodate this population increase is dependent on the residential land uses designated in the forthcoming update to the Official Community Plan, since the overall housing composition impacts the expected persons per unit. If future growth is accommodated in a range of housing types, including apartments and secondary suites, up to 7,000 new dwelling units, or approximately 315 new housing units per year are required to meet the anticipated growth of 12,000 new residents.

---

8 Metro Vancouver (2010). Housing Data Book.
9 Statistics Canada, 2011 Census
10 Metro Vancouver Regional Growth Strategy
Metro Vancouver estimates that the City needs to build an additional 200 market rental units, 300 moderate income rental units and 300 low income affordable rental units over the next 10 years\textsuperscript{11}. Metro Vancouver's projections are based on region-wide calculations of the proportion of renter households to population per dwelling unit figures. The actual demand for rental households is likely to be higher in the City of North Vancouver as a result of the City's high proportion of rental households and the lower than average people per dwelling unit figures. To meet these minimum 10 year targets, the City needs to add at least 60 units of below market rental housing per year. This strong demand for non-market units is evidenced by the 379 applicants on the BC Housing wait list for units on the North Shore as of March 31, 2010 (130 families, 77 people with disabilities, 115 seniors).

**Housing Market Trends**

In 1981, the cost of housing was approximately seven times the average household income. In 2006, the cost of housing was 10 times greater than the average household income (Figure 3). The growing difference between income and housing prices has put many City residents in the position of having insufficient income to secure quality, affordable housing. Understanding the needs and challenges of households across the income spectrum and across the housing continuum (Figure 4), will better enable the City to target its policies, energy and investments in addressing these needs, from housing those in the direst need, to lowering the cost of home ownership.

![Figure 3: Increasing Gap between Housing Prices and Household Incomes, 1986 - 2010](image)

Source: Statistics Canada, 1986-2006 Census

\textsuperscript{11} Metro Vancouver Regional Growth Strategy, Table A.4
Figure 4 Affordable Housing Continuum

The Lack of Affordability of Home Ownership

At present real estate values, few households can afford to both live and work in the City. Between 2000 and August 2010 the average selling price increased substantially\(^ {12}\):

- A single detached house in the City increased by 176 percent;
- A 750 sq. ft. one bedroom apartments under two years old increased by 251 percent;
- A 750 sq. ft. one bedroom apartment 10 to 15 years old increased by 183 percent;
- A 1,200 sq. ft. townhouse increased by 171 percent.

This increase in property values is likely excluding many current residents from entering the housing market in the City of North Vancouver. Annual salaries required to afford the average dwelling in the City exceeded the average salary for British Columbians in 2010 of $43,276\(^ {13}\). Tables 2 and 3 below shows the household income required to afford housing in the City, and the gaps between the starting salaries of various professions and the amounts needed to support mortgage payments. Nurses and teachers cannot afford to purchase older apartments in the City without spending more than 32 percent of their monthly income on housing.

Table 2 Residential Selling Prices and Expected Monthly Payments, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average Selling Price</th>
<th>Est. Mortgage Payment(^1)</th>
<th>Household Income Required(^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detached house</td>
<td>$927,736</td>
<td>$4,971</td>
<td>$186,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment under 2 years old (750 sq ft)</td>
<td>$454,543</td>
<td>$2,435</td>
<td>$91,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment 10 to 15 years old (750 sq ft)</td>
<td>$370,749</td>
<td>$1,986</td>
<td>$74,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouse under 2 years old (1,200 sq ft)</td>
<td>$586,380</td>
<td>$3,142</td>
<td>$117,831</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Assumes 20 percent down payment
2. To pay mortgage without spending greater than 30 percent of household income on housing costs

\(^{12}\) MLS (2010).
Table 3: Salary Gaps for Affording Housing Opportunities by Profession, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Annual Salary</th>
<th>32 percent of Monthly Income</th>
<th>Apartments 10 to 15 years old</th>
<th>Apartments &lt; two years old</th>
<th>Townhouses &lt; two years old</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>$41,643</td>
<td>$1,110</td>
<td>$876</td>
<td>$1,325</td>
<td>-$2,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Driver</td>
<td>$34,905</td>
<td>$930</td>
<td>-$1,055</td>
<td>-$1,504</td>
<td>-$2,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse’s Aid</td>
<td>$36,422</td>
<td>$971</td>
<td>-$1,015</td>
<td>-$1,464</td>
<td>-$2,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee Barista</td>
<td>$19,200</td>
<td>$512</td>
<td>-$1,474</td>
<td>-$1,923</td>
<td>-$2,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>$57,388</td>
<td>$1,530</td>
<td>-$456</td>
<td>-$905</td>
<td>-$1,611</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 1) Salaries are starting salaries for the profession; 2) Salaries were generated assuming a 40 hour work week and excluding overtime. Coffee barista salary was calculated using $8.00 per hour (minimum in 2009).

Sources: BC Stats Wage Salary Survey; North Vancouver School District, 2009; Vancouver Island Health Authority, 2008

Challenges for City Renters

Low vacancy rates, increasing rents and few choices are challenging City renters.

Almost half of the City’s residents are renters, most of whom live in the City’s aging purpose-built rental apartments. Nearly half of these renters are paying more than 30 percent of their income on rent (Table 4), placing strain on their budgets. Families, in particular, have found themselves unable to afford housing appropriate to their situation, with some families able to afford only smaller units that do not suit their needs.

Table 4: Rent as a Percentage of Household Income (2006 Census; 2005 Income)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spending 30% or more of household income on rent</th>
<th>Spending 50% or more of household income on rent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Households Percentage</td>
<td>Households Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CNV Renter Households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,830</td>
<td>4,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>2,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: figures include rental households without income, such as students

This strain on households has been exacerbated as rents have steadily increased in the City over the last 10 years (see Figure 5). From 1989 to 2010 the average rent for a bachelor apartment in the City of North Vancouver has increased by $354 or close to 80 percent, double the rate of inflation. Similarly, rents for one-bedroom and two-bedroom units increased by approximately 71 percent and 65 percent between 1989 and 2009, both above the Canadian inflation rate over the same period. In a balanced rental market, rents tend to increase at approximately the same rate as inflation.

14 (Metro Vancouver, 2010)
Housing the Hard to House

The number of sheltered and unsheltered homeless individuals on the North Shore has risen significantly since 2008 (see Figure 6). Encouragingly, the increase appears to be stabilizing and the proportion of homeless individuals on the street (unsheltered) is declining. The estimated 117 homeless individual on the North Shore is likely a low estimate since the numbers are counted over a single 24 hour period and do not include individuals with tenuous housing situations, who may be couch-surfing or staying with friends. The City's INALH households, who are living in inadequate accommodation and spending at least half of household income on shelter costs, are also at risk of homelessness.

Mental illness and addictions are both drivers of homelessness and barriers to achieving more secure housing. In 2008, the North Shore Shelter reported that 32 percent of its clients had mental illness and 23 percent struggled with addictions. Salvation Army estimated that 75 percent of its clients have addictions, 50 percent are homeless and 90 percent of the homeless also have an addiction.
Figure 6 Number of Homeless Persons Counted on the North Shore 2002, 2005, 2008, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Homeless Count</th>
<th>Number Counted on the North Shore</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>44 (24 sheltered / 20 unsheltered)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>85 (58 sheltered / 27 unsheltered)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>127 (60 sheltered / 67 unsheltered)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>122 (67 sheltered / 55 unsheltered)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: GVRD/Metro Vancouver Homeless Count

Housing Stock

Structure Types
Over the last several decades, single-detached houses have lost their prominence in the City, and in 2006 represented the rarest structural type as a result of steady increases in ground-oriented (medium density) and high-rise apartment buildings. In 1981, the City consisted of 30 percent single family dwellings and 70 percent multi-family dwellings (see Figure 7). This four-decade long trend toward more multi-family dwelling units continues with the 2011 Census revealing a 15 percent single family to 85 percent multi-family split in the City. The City of North Vancouver has one of the greatest proportions of apartment dwelling units in the region at 63 percent, second in the region only to New Westminster at 68 percent, while the City of Vancouver mirrors the regional average at 60 percent.

Figure 7 Changing Housing Types, 1981 - 2011

Source: Statistics Canada Census
Despite the City’s successes in diversifying housing options, all forms of housing in the region are becoming increasingly expensive.

Shifts in the Rental Stock 2000 – 2010
Renters make up a much larger portion of households in the City of North Vancouver than in Metro Vancouver as a whole.

For a large proportion of the City’s residents, renting is the most affordable option as the household incomes needed to buy suitable accommodation have ballooned. Despite growing need, much of the existing rental housing stock is at risk and the proportion of rental housing in the City is declining. There are approximately 230 purpose-built rental buildings in the City containing a total of about 6,830 units\(^{15}\). The vast majority of these units were built prior to 1980, and many are now in need of either minor or major repairs (Figure 8) and some are reaching the end of their lifespan. About 196 rental units were lost to demolition between 2001 and 2010 and an estimated 23 percent of all rental units are at risk of being lost to redevelopment in the absence of municipal policies\(^{16}\). As the primary source of rental housing in the City, the maintenance, retention and continual replacement of these aging units are critical to the City’s supply of affordable rental housing.

Figure 8: Number of Market (Purpose-Built) Rental Units, by period of Construction for Purpose-Built Rental Units, 1900 - 2010

![Diagram showing number of rental units by period of construction](image)


The types of rental options in the City have also changed. Increasingly, renters are being accommodated in secondary suites in single-family homes, as well as in strata units that are rented by the owner or investor. In these situations, tenants have less security since owners or

---

\(^{15}\) Metro Vancouver (2012). Rental Housing Inventory and Risk Analysis: City of North Vancouver Profile.

\(^{16}\) Ibid.
investors may decide to sell the property or opt to use the space to house family or for other purposes. There have been significant increases in the number of strata condos, duplexes, quadplex and row houses that are rented, particularly in Lower Lonsdale and Central Lonsdale. Of the total 8,660 strata apartment and row houses in the City, 2,304 or 27 percent are rented.\textsuperscript{17}

Despite the growth in these new types of rental units, the overall rental housing supply has failed to keep pace with the City’s growth and the number of purpose-built rental units is declining. In 1986, renters occupied 63 percent of the City’s housing stock, and in 2011 accounted for just 46 percent. According to CMHC data, the City’s purpose built rental housing decreased from nearly 6,100 units in 1999 to just under 5,900 units by 2009, a loss of 230 units. Approximately 76 percent of the City’s total rental housing stock was built prior to 1980, with relatively few new purpose-built rental apartment buildings in recent years and 40 percent of this older rental stock in need of major repairs. As these units age or undergo redevelopment, the City is losing licensed apartments while gaining other types of rental housing at a modest rate (see Table 5). The small increases in the overall rental housing stock from 2000 to 2010 have contributed to tight market conditions and low vacancy rates.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|}
\hline
City Data & 2000 & 2010 & 10 Year Difference \\
\hline
Licensed & 6,290 & 6,174 & -116 \\
Single Family Dwellings & 1,295 & 851 & -444 \\
Strata Condos & 1,109 & 2,046 & 937 \\
Non-Market & 881 & 1,024 & 143 \\
Duplex, Quadplex and Row House & 254 & 504 & 250 \\
Secondary Suites & 443 & 506 & 63 \\
\hline
\textbf{Totals} & \textbf{10,272} & \textbf{11,105} & \textbf{883} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Rental Housing Trends 2000 - 2010, City of North Vancouver}
\end{table}

* Secondary Suite estimates vary depending upon the source and methodology. The Metro Vancouver Data Book notes that a three source estimate (municipal, BCAA estimate, proxy based on 2006 Census) of 2,530 (including illegal units) is fairly accurate.

Source: 2000 Rental Housing Study, City of North Vancouver, 2010 City of North Vancouver data

Vacancy rates for bachelor, one and two bedroom apartments in the City have been low for over 20 years. With the exception of the period from 1998 to 1999, vacancy rates in the City have

\textsuperscript{17} City of North Vancouver. Housing Affordability and Diversity, 2010: The Past Two Decades.
been below 1.5 percent, much lower than healthy vacancy rates which range between 2.5 percent to 4 percent, and consistently lower than Metro Vancouver averages. This reflects extremely tight rental market conditions (Table 6).

Table 6  Rental Apartment Vacancy Rates, 1989 – 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bachelor</th>
<th>One Bedroom</th>
<th>Two Bedroom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CMHC Rental Market Reports

Current Programs
As a leader in housing affordability, the City has decades of experience in developing policies and taking action to address housing needs across the housing continuum. Existing policies, programs and initiatives are outlined briefly below.

Historical Overview
The City's affordable housing endeavours have evolved over decades of responding to changes in the housing market:

- From the 1940s through the 1960s the City experienced pronounced housing shortages fueled by the need to house returning soldiers and new shipyard workers. The City leveraged senior government funding to develop non-profit housing;

- In the 1970s senior levels of government provided support to build 2,441 purpose-built rental units and non-profit seniors and family housing projects;

- By the 1980s, devolution had left the City with greater responsibility for delivering affordable housing. With diminishing senior government support, the City took a more active role in adopting new policies and selling or leasing land to create non-profit housing;
In the 1990s, the City adopted its first affordable housing action plan and legalized secondary suites;

Most recently throughout the 2000s and 2010s, the City has been using a range of tools, including land transfers and bonusing to facilitate affordable housing.

Policy Foundations: What We Have Done To Date
The City of North Vancouver has a strong history of supporting affordable housing initiatives by planning, adopting supportive policies and using lands and resources. In 1990 the City adopted an Affordable Housing Action Plan which included a prohibition on condominium conversions to preserve rental housing, a temporary demolition moratorium and the introduction of density bonusing for affordable housing. The City built on this through the Social Plan (1998), which established a housing goal to “ensure availability of a range of housing types and tenure throughout the City which addresses a variety of the housing needs”. The Official Community Plan (2002) expanded the City’s housing goal by introducing residential land use objectives which promote equitable, diverse, affordable housing for households across the housing continuum, including specific policies designed to assist low income households and individuals with special housing needs.

The City can influence housing markets by developing sound policies, building solid partnerships and leveraging municipal assets. Through existing policy and practice, the City is committed to:

- Using regulations and influence to actively preserve the existing stock of rental housing;
- Seeking out and facilitating partnerships to create and upgrade affordable housing;
- Stimulating investment in affordable housing by leveraging City resources and providing support.

Housing Policies
The City’s housing policies are contained within a number of interrelated City documents (see Figure 9). Key policy documents include:

- The current Official Community Plan (2002), presently under review, which includes three principle housing goals aimed at ensuring diverse, affordable housing, preserving rental housing, and creating adequate accommodation for low income individuals;
- The Affordable Housing Action Plan (1990) which led to the introduction of a 10 percent density bonus for providing affordable units;
- The Social Plan (updated in 2000) which includes nine housing objectives aimed to “ensure availability of a range of housing types and tenure throughout the City which address a variety of housing needs;”
Affordable Housing Policies (1996) which established a focus on affordable rental housing and includes direction to make City-owned properties available for affordable housing projects;

Adaptable Design Guidelines (1997) to ensure housing better meets the needs of a wider range of residents and allows aging in place to support independent living;

The Multiple Unit Building Additional Suite Development Guidelines (1996) allowed for portions of common areas, in certain instances, to be converted to new housing units through rezoning; in 2007, the City amended the Zoning Bylaw to allow such units without need for rezoning;

Strategies to Support Seniors’ Housing (1994), which seeks to increase the ability of seniors to age in place by supporting design guidelines and reviews;

The North Shore Homelessness Task Force Work Plan 2008 – 2018 seeks to end homelessness on the North Shore through an integrated approach aimed at strengthening a continuum of support services, including mental health, addictions services, health services, food security and employment training.
Zoning and Regulatory Measures
Through regular revisions to the City’s Zoning Bylaw and other regulations, the City has sought to remove barriers to affordability by:

- Reducing unit sizes to comply with CMHC standards (1990);
- Permitting Secondary Suites in Single Family Dwellings (1993) and in Duplexes (2013);
- Reducing parking standards for affordable housing, rental housing, and housing close to existing transit infrastructure;
- Regularly revising the Rental Premises Standards of Maintenance and Prevention of Nuisances Bylaw to ensure rental housing is safe and in good repair;
- Maintaining a Strata Conversion Control policy to reduce loss of rental housing by requiring that the vacancy rate be at or above four percent for 12 consecutive months for the conversion of three or more rental units to strata units.
- Permitting coach houses (accessory dwelling units) on single-family properties (2010);
- Waiving Development Cost Charges for non-profit rental housing and reducing DCCs by 50 percent for market rental housing (2011);
- Eliminating the unit per hectare residential density control in the Official Community Plan (1992);
- Routinely fast-tracking affordable projects;
- Introducing requirements for larger multi-unit residential projects to have 20 percent of units less than 750 square feet;
- Reducing energy costs for tenants by using density bonusing for buildings which reach higher energy efficiency standards;
- Updating the Adaptable Design Guidelines to require 30 percent of units be Level 2 Adaptable.

City Land and Financial Resources
With senior government capital and rent subsidy programs for housing being greatly reduced since the early 1990s, there are few partnership resources available to the City in creating affordable housing options, including non-market rental housing and entry-level ownership housing. To address this funding gap, the City has engaged proactively in leveraging its assets to create new affordable housing, particularly for populations with specific housing needs. These efforts have included:
Establishing the Affordable Housing Reserve Fund in 1989, an essential City tool for creating affordable housing. In 2003 the City committed to transferring funds annually from general revenues to the reserve fund, and the fund currently has an available balance of $2,400,000 in 2013. The Margaret Heights Family Project, the ANAVETs Seniors’ Housing project, Quay View Apartments, North Shore Adult Emergency Shelter and Transition Housing, and Kiwanis St. Andrews Seniors Project were all facilitated with financial contributions from the Affordable Housing Reserve Fund.

- Providing direct support to homelessness initiatives, assisting the Lookout Society and Salvation Army in providing homeless shelters, transitional housing and for outreach aimed at homelessness prevention;

- Providing direct and in-kind support to a range of non-profits to deliver affordable housing.

Public Education, Consultation and Collaboration
The City has been active in engaging the community and stakeholders in discussing and improving housing policy, hosting several major public processes to explore the issue:

- Affordable Housing Taskforce (1999);
- Affordable Housing Action Forum (2006);
- Housing Needs in the City Workshop (2012).

The Social Planning Advisory Committee also meets regularly to discuss and make recommendations on broad social concerns including housing issues.

To reduce homelessness and identify housing barriers, the City contracts two positions as part of the Homelessness Outreach Prevention Program. In partnership with the Salvation Army, the City oversees an outreach worker to assist in helping homeless persons access such resources as: food, clothing, medical, rehabilitation, financial, jobs, and shelter/housing.

Through the Lookout Emergency Aid Society, the City contracts a Community Liaison Worker to represent the North Shore Shelter within the community. The position provides information, resources, and assists in delivering insight and intelligence to the City’s best practices for homelessness prevention, and addressing public and civic concerns.

To address the City’s lack of low-barrier employment, the City is piloting an employment program. Through the North Shore Shelter, the City has contracted an Employment Initiative Worker to develop and employment program or social enterprise for people who are homeless, at-risk of homelessness, and low-income.
The City has remained active in presenting and sharing its approaches to facilitating affordable housing, and working directly and collaboratively with other municipalities and senior levels of government. Through these efforts the City has established itself as a forward-thinking and proactive municipality on housing issues and remains active in housing discussions with senior levels of government on housing affordability, liaising with Provincial officials and making strategic requests as outlined in the Social Plan. These efforts having included requests to senior governments for adequate resources to establish a North Shore youth safe house and for adequate funding to ensure that all emergency shelters, including the North Shore Adult Emergency Shelter, are operated 24/7.

Measuring Successes to Date
Of the City’s current 1,046 non-profit housing units and emergency shelter beds, 258 have been created since 2000, at an average rate of approximately 20 per year. Nearly all of these housing projects were the results of partnership or land negotiations with the City. To meet anticipated needs for non-market rental, the City will need to work diligent to develop new tools and partnerships to increase the number of units created in the future.

The City’s housing policies have helped to stem possible declines in market rental units and resulted in an increase in the total supply of rental housing from 2000 – 2010 (Table 7). Meeting future needs will require a multi-faceted approach to broadening the housing supply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7 Non-Profit Housing Units, 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Shelter/ Transition Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Cooperatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Non-Market Units</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: City of North Vancouver data*

Community Directions
“Affordable housing of all types, including market rentals, is essential to the City’s current and future competitiveness.” -- John Tylee, Director of Policy and Research, Vancouver Economic Development Commission

The CityShaping community engagement process sought input regarding the role of the City and developers in creating affordable and rental housing under the concept of ‘Housing for All’. As participants explored the desired balance between growth, amenities and equitable housing opportunities, the discussion produced suggested priorities for housing.

Housing Policies
The City’s existing policies in the Official Community Plan, Social Plan and Affordable Housing Action Plan (1990) set a strong policy foundation, encouraging housing diversity and
affordability and laying out many specific actions for implementation. The City has been working to achieve these goals. As the City considers updates to its Official Plan Document and other policy documents, the following housing policies and directions may be introduced or strengthened:

Rental Housing Policies

- Direct efforts, in cooperation with other levels of government and non-profit housing organizations, to increase the supply of affordable rental housing units for households with low, low to moderate and moderate and above incomes.
- Explore incentives to encourage the development of purpose-built, market rental housing that could include lower tax rates in exchange for a covenant on title;
- Explore a rental housing bank that can be used to prevent people from being displaced from their homes due to short term income loss issues;
- Strengthen the Official Community Plan’s rental retention policy by adopting a 1:1 replacement ratio for rental units that are lost during redevelopment and using other policies and tools to minimize loss of rental units;

Age-Friendly Housing Policies

- Require apartment buildings to provide amenity facilities for families with children;
- Encourage a proportion of units in multi-family buildings to be large enough to accommodate families;

Market Housing Policies

- Use or leverage City-owned land and assets to create or upgrade affordable housing of all types.
- Explore the potential to create more affordable housing through the development of a greater range of housing types including five to six storey wood frame buildings, mini-suites, lock-off units (rentable suites within apartment units), smaller homes, and smaller lots;

Integrated Planning Policies

- Concentrate affordable housing near services including schools and medical services and in walking distance to the frequent transit network;
- In working to reduce housing costs, consider the full cost of maintaining a household, including transportation;
Using Zoning and Regulations to Further Affordability

The City’s Zoning Bylaw and other regulations offer the greatest potential for increasing housing affordability at the least cost. The City is currently actively considering the following amendments to its regulations:

Reducing Size to Reduce Costs

- Reducing minimum lot sizes and setbacks for duplexes and single family units, increasing the potential for infill development;

- Relaxing regulations on minimum unit sizes to reflect changing norms and allow for greater flexibility;

- Allowing lock-off units in multi-family developments in a greater number of zones in the City (suites within units which can be left as part of the unit or “locked-off” and rented separately);

Greater Flexibility

- Allowing boarders in housing types other than single-family buildings, to reflect the increasing number of non-family households and allow a new potential source of revenue that could assist potential purchasers in financing their homes;

- Pre-zoning selected existing single family lots to duplex, creating new capacity for affordable units by allowing up to four units per lot;

Considering the Full Cost of Housing

- Reductions in parking requirements for rental units and apartment buildings located close to transit;

- Reductions in parking requirements for buildings operating carshare programs or other strategies to reduce vehicle ownership;

Creating New Affordable Housing

- Reviewing the Density Bonusing provisions set out in the Official Community Plan to assess their effectiveness in securing amenities, including affordable and rental housing, for the community and considering adjustments to the policy for inclusion in the Official Community Plan review.
City Land and Financial Resources
Using City land holdings to create new affordable housing units has been suggested in planning documents and policies and has been a consideration on a case-by-case basis. The City may consider enshrining this practice by considering a specific policy to support it in the Official Community Plan. Playing a more active role in the market may also result in the creation of new units—the City may wish to explore purchasing land and buildings, and leasing them out to achieve affordable housing. Granting land leases and forgiving the first several years of rent may also help facilitate new rental housing. In addition to the considerations above, the City is exploring the following strategies:

- Determining which City lands will be set aside for affordable housing projects;
- Determining the percentage of sale value for remaining City lands that will be allocated to the Affordable Housing Reserve Fund;
- Exploring a viable demonstration project on a City-owned, leased or partnership site which provides innovative affordable housing using the City’s current zoning tools, as well as new approaches;
- Pursuing the purchase of existing apartment buildings, applying covenants to secure them as rental housing in perpetuity and reselling the units as market rental housing.
- Piloting tax rate reductions for rental housing in partnership with the Province.

Public Education, Outreach and Advocacy
Expanding outreach, education and advocacy around housing issues is essential to maintaining and strengthening the community and organizational partnerships essential to creating new affordable housing in the current context.

The City is considering:

- Preparing information bulletins which present the City’s array of policy statements, strategies and achievements for distribution on the City webpage and as hand-outs available at City hall to increase public awareness of the actions that the City has undertaken in support of affordable and rental housing;
- Publicizing the City’s interest in innovative housing forms and approaches which seek to create affordability and promote past successes in utilizing tools such as density bonusing;
- Reaching out to apartment building owners regarding the legalization of illegal suites in apartment buildings as a way to add to the purpose-built rental stock;
- Preparing clear, user-friendly information regarding densification (with illustrations of various types of increased density);
Lobbying senior governments for capital programs to increase supportive housing units and shelter capacity in accordance with the Regional Homelessness Plan;

Establishing a working group of rental apartment building owners interested in developing a variety of innovative ways to support retention of their rental buildings;

Supporting and partnering with other municipalities, Metro Vancouver and community initiatives to increase public awareness of housing needs and acceptance of non-market housing.

Monitoring and Evaluation
The City’s Targets, Indicators and Monitoring System (TIMS), developed to track the Community’s progress toward the goals outlined in the Official Community Plan, will be reviewed and may be augmented or altered as part of the Official Community Plan update process. The City will establish housing targets across the housing spectrum and periodically monitor housing affordability, safety and security, and indicators may include the following:

a. Total Rental Dwelling Units by Type
b. Rental Dwelling Units as a Proportion of the Housing Stock
c. Average Cost of Housing by Dwelling Type
d. Average Rents by Housing Type
e. Rental Apartment Vacancy Rates
f. Number of Non-Market and Non-Profit Housing Units
g. Proportion of Non-Market Housing Units in the Regional City Centre
h. Car Ownership by Neighbourhood
i. Adaptable Dwelling Units Constructed by Level Achieved and Building Type
j. Households in Core Housing Need (Census)
k. Proportion of Non-Market and Rental Housing Units within 400 m of Frequent Transit Network
l. Residential Property Complaints Relating to Building Conditions
m. Number of Sheltered and Unsheltered Homeless
n. Number of Emergency Shelter Beds

Next Steps
This document outlines the City’s ongoing and potential actions to meet anticipated housing demands in the City across the housing continuum. Through the CityShaping process, the City is updating its housing goals and objectives. Following the adoption of an updated Official Community Plan, this document will form the basis of a Housing Action Plan aligned to the Official Community Plan and outlining housing objectives and strategies. Many of the City’s current policies listed in this document are aligned with Metro Vancouver’s guidelines for the development of Housing Action Plans and will form a strong foundation for the development of a Housing Action Plan.
Sources


Metro Vancouver (2012). *Metro Vancouver Purpose-Built Rental Housing Inventory and Risk Analysis: Profile for the City of North Vancouver, prepared by Coriolis Consulting Corp.* Burnaby: Metro Vancouver.


City of North Vancouver (2012). *Historical Overview of City Responses to Housing Affordability*.

July 17, 2014

Mayor Smith

and the Council of West Vancouver:

Re.: Permissive Property Tax Exemptions

The “coding error” scandal had several folds. Collingwood’s residential lots, some purchased “in absence of any plans, simply as a sound investment” are no longer tax exempted. However, that lost revenue could not be recovered because technically it was the error of BC Assessments. Of course to obtain any tax exemption a person must first apply for it. The “coding error” could not occur if Collingwood did not apply to exempt their residential lots as if they were school facilities on those lots. No matter how you slice it in ethical terms Collingwood School Society owes the community several hundred thousand dollars in unpaid property taxes for their residential lots. “Good citizenship is one of the four pillars of a Collingwood education”, but to date Collingwood did not respond whether after selling those lots at Wentworth and also at Morven Drive for profit, they paid capital gain taxes … or maybe they cheated again. It is something that Revenue Canada should verify.

Regarding the second part of the scandal i.e. Permissive Property Tax Exemptions, I also have correspondence from BC Assessments, from the Minister of Community, Sport and Cultural Development and ample correspondence from the Ministry of Education. The District was receiving copies of that correspondence. While now, after the clarification from the Provincial Government we know that it is at the discretion of the Mayor and Council, to grant or to reject requests for Permissive Property Tax Exemptions, the current practice of granting these exemptions to any eligible applicant by default kills the purpose of the provision in the Community Charter. In other words from permissive exemptions you have made these exemptions statutory as it was for years due to the “coding error”.

The Inspector of Independent Schools from the Ministry of Education informed me that independent school authorities have significant autonomy; however, the Ministry would consider suspension of grants from the Provincial Government, upon receiving from the District the report of Collingwood’s in compliance with municipal regulations. To date despite Collingwood’s chronic violations and multiple tickets issued, the District has not reported those incidents to the Ministry. On the contrary, the District reported repeatedly no concerns regarding Collingwood’s operation. This is unfair protectionism. This is abuse of the authority the District has.

Following the “coding error” scandal, Nina Leemhuis, the District’s CFO at the time recommended in the Report to the Council as well as verbally during the Council Meeting to not grant Permissive Property Tax Exemptions to private schools. Mayor Smith immediately took initiative advising the Council to grant these exemptions to all applicants and avoid going through long list of speakers. Two rookie (at the time) councillors opposed such an approach stating that in the first place the District must have some policy. Mayor Smith stepped in again explaining that “…today’s decision will establish policy for the next year and so on”… or something to this effect. This was undemocratic. In fact this was dictatorial.
Two years went by. The Rookie Councillors lost their urge for change. Today they seem to be perfectly satisfied with Mayor Smith’s policy of maintaining status quo. The District of WV still does not have any policy regarding Permissive Property Tax Exemptions. This situation must be corrected before the next tax exemption Council Meeting in October.

In 2012 Collingwood’s neighbours overwhelmingly signed the petition to the Council: “I pay property taxes and I demand the same from Collingwood”. We support the conclusion of Ms. Leemhuis’ Report to the Council that in West Vancouver private schools should NOT receive permissive property tax exemptions. Lifestyles of living in West Vancouver simply do not fit any rational criteria for such grants. We have no issues whatsoever with parents who believe that public schools are not good enough for their kids and gladly pay for the alternative. However, we have a major problem that the District subsidizes private schools at our expense. In fact even some parents, who have their kids in private schools, quietly admit that this is not right. We are positive that these parents who pay $25,000 can afford another $97 (twenty seven (27) cents a day) to have their child in private school, while the municipality would have over $250,000 a year for more important projects that would serve the whole community including public schools. It is a matter of principal and the most basic social fairness.

In West Vancouver applications for permissive property tax exemptions should be restricted to organizations that demonstrate their contribution to the community at large and who have the support of the neighbourhood that they operate in. Furthermore, these applications must be considered on a case by case basis. Otherwise permissive exemptions are converted to statutory exemptions contravening the intent of the provision in the Community Charter for permissive exemption. In any event, we expect that Collingwood’s application for these exemptions will be rejected at least until they return to the community taxes for their residential lots that were exempted due to the coding error, which occurred because Collingwood was cheating on their applications. Similarly, we expect that the Ministry of Education should suspend students’ grants until Collingwood pays back the provincial portion of property taxes for their residential lots.

We also expect that the District will report to the Ministry of Education Collingwood’s habitual violations of bylaws, permit and municipal regulations. Subsequently, we expect that the Ministry will uphold the suspension of student’s grants until Collingwood School starts to respect the law of the land and observes the basic rules of living in a civilized community including liability for damages of private properties as well as damage to public facility (tennis courts).

West Vancouver, B.C.

CC: The Ministry of Education – by email
The Ministry of Community, Sport and Cultural Development – by email
Revenue Canada Agency – by fax 1-888-724-4829
From: 
Sent:  July-17-14 8:31 PM  
To:  Mayor and Council  
Subject:  Public Washroom at Sandy Cove Municipal Park

Dear Madam Mayor and Council,

Although I am not currently a resident of West Vancouver, I grew up there, my mother lives there, and I have strong ties to the community.

I live in Vancouver, but I constantly rave to friends about the outstanding beaches in West Vancouver, and I make the effort and take the time to go to those beaches. One of my very favourite beaches is Sandy Cove, which is under the stewardship of the West Vancouver Municipal Government Parks Department.

I went to Sandy Cove early in June of this year, and was a bit frustrated to see the washrooms closed. The signs said that the washrooms were expected to open later in June. "Oh well," I thought "that's a bit late for swimming season."

Imagine my dismay as, time and time again, I came to the beach to see no functioning washrooms, grown men relieving themselves against the beach rocks, and small children being taken into the trees with their parents to do what they had to do. It's not only an inconvenience, it's an embarrassment. As of today, July 17th, there are no functioning washrooms at the park, and yesterday when I talked to the contractors, it sure didn't seem as if they were imminent.

The signs say that the work began on April 7th. From what I understand, ground at sea level is reliably thawed sometime at the end of February. I know nothing can be done to undo the mess that has resulted in this repeatedly delayed work, but I sure hope the municipality will learn from this embarrassing state of affairs, and schedule things a little more aggressively the next time.

Yours,

Vancouver BC
From: Mayor and Council
Subject: FW: MESSAGE FROM THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE: Agricultural Land Commission Act Consultation Sessions
Importance: High

Sent: July-14-14 4:31 PM
To: Info
Subject: MESSAGE FROM THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE: Agricultural Land Commission Act Consultation Sessions
Importance: High

File: 0280-30
Ref: 180335

His Worship Michael Smith
Mayor of West Vancouver
Metro Vancouver Regional District
E-Mail: info@westvancouver.ca

Dear Mayor Smith:

The Ministry of Agriculture is seeking input from industry, local government and other interested groups on potential amendments to the regulation subordinate to the Agricultural Land Commission Act. We want to share some information with you on this process.

We are interested in the perspective of local governments on this matter. Regional districts have been invited to participate in local consultation sessions but are restricted in the size of their delegation. The limit on the size of the delegation is to ensure that all of those groups invited to the consultation sessions have an opportunity to participate. Regional districts may choose to include representatives from member municipalities or local Agricultural Advisory Committees in their delegations.

In addition, as a local government, your organization may submit any written feedback on the potential amendments to the regulation either via your regional district, or directly to the Ministry of Agriculture at ALCA_Feedback@gov.bc.ca. Regional districts have the opportunity to provide any submissions from their member municipalities to Ministry representatives during their consultation session.

A website will go live at http://engage.gov.bc.ca/landreserve on or before July 22, 2014 which will provide background information on the consultation process that is being undertaken, and detailed questions on the potential regulatory amendments, to which you may choose to respond.

Details for your Regional District's session:

Venue: Best Western - 32110 Marshall Road, Abbotsford
Time: August 14, 2014; 9:00 AM-11:30 AM

Sincerely,

Derek Sturko
Deputy Minister
THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF WEST VANCOUVER
BOARD OF VARIANCE HEARING MINUTES
MUNICIPAL HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18, 2014

BOARD MEMBERS: Chairman E. Quan; Members R. Romses, S. Sanguinetti, and A. Bhayani. Absent: Member D. MacDonald.

STAFF: S. Scholes, Manager of Legislative Services; K. Spooner, Supervisor of Inspections, Permits and Inspections Department; and M. Panneton, Recording Clerk.

1. Call to Order

The Hearing was called to order at 5:00 p.m.

2. Introduction

The Recording Clerk introduced the Board Members and staff present and described the Hearing procedure.

3. Confirmation of the Agenda

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the agenda be amended by:

• withdrawing Item 8 regarding Application 14-013 (4788 Meadfeild Road);

AND THAT the agenda be approved as amended.

CARRIED

4. Adoption of the May 14, 2014 Minutes

Chairman Quan referred to the Minutes of the Board of Variance Hearing held on May 14, 2014.

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the May 14, 2014 Board of Variance Hearing minutes be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED
5. **Time Limit of Board of Variance Orders**

Chairman Quan read out the following statement regarding Time Limit of Order Approving a Variance and noted that the time limit applied to each application approved by the Board:

"Pursuant to section 901 of the *Local Government Act*, if a Board of Variance orders that a minor variance be permitted from the requirements of the bylaw, and the Order sets a time limit within which the construction of the building or structure must be completed, and the construction is not completed within that time, the permission of the Board terminates and the bylaw applies. Orders of this Board of Variance that permit a variance specify that: if construction is not substantially started within 6 months of the issuance of the Building Permit, the permission terminates and the Zoning Bylaw applies; AND FURTHER THAT in the event the Owner is delayed or interrupted or prevented from obtaining a Permit by reason of any Act of God, labour unrest (including strike and lockouts), weather conditions or any similar cause reasonably beyond the control of the owner, the time for obtaining a Permit shall be extended for a period equal to the duration of the contingency that occasioned the delay, interruption or prevention, provided that commercial or financial consideration of the Owner shall not be viewed as a cause beyond the control of the Owner."

6. **Application 14-011 (1181 Esplanade Avenue)**

The Recording Clerk confirmed the following requested variance:

a) 3.028 m to Front Yard Setback.

K. Spooner (Supervisor of Inspections) provided permit history of the subject property.

Written submissions received:
- No written submissions were received.

C. Morisseau (Owner, 1181 Esplanade Avenue) described the variance application for a proposed deck and responded to queries of the Board.

Chairman Quan queried whether there was anyone in the gallery who wished to address the Board regarding this application and there was no response.

Members of the Board considered:
- All of the submissions
- Whether the application was for a minor variance that did not
- result in inappropriate development of the site
- adversely affect the natural environment
- substantially affect the use and enjoyment of adjacent land
- vary permitted uses and densities under the applicable bylaw; or
- defeat the intent of the bylaw; and

- Whether compliance with the bylaw would cause the applicant undue hardship.

Having read the statutory Notice of Hearing for the subject application and the application dated May 9, 2014 including the applicant’s letter, plans and all other related documents, and having inspected the subject site, and having heard the submission of C. Morriseau (Owner, 1181 Esplanade Avenue):

It was Moved and Seconded:

THE BOARD finds that undue hardship would be caused to the Applicant by compliance with the Zoning Bylaw and orders that Application 14-011 regarding a proposed deck at 1181 Esplanade Avenue with a variance of:
- 3.028 m to Front Yard Setback
BE ALLOWED pursuant to the plans dated April 25, 2014, submitted with the application; AND THE BOARD FURTHER ORDERS THAT if construction is not substantially started within six months of the issuance of the Building Permit, the permission terminates and the Zoning Bylaw applies; AND FURTHER THAT in the event the Owner is delayed or interrupted or prevented from obtaining a Permit by reason of any Act of God, labour unrest (including strike and lockouts), weather conditions or any similar cause reasonably beyond the control of the owner, the time for obtaining a Permit shall be extended for a period equal to the duration of the contingency that occasioned the delay, interruption or prevention, provided that commercial or financial consideration of the Owner shall not be viewed as a cause beyond the control of the Owner.

CARRIED

7. Application 14-012 (6872 Copper Cove Road)

The Recording Clerk confirmed the following requested variances:
- a) 2.83 m to Combined Side Yard Setback
- b) 4.22 m to Front Yard Setback
- c) 0.71 m to Minimum Side Yard Setback
- d) 0.93 m to Highest Building Face Envelope
- e) 11% to Highest Building Face Exemption.
K. Spooner (Supervisor of Inspections) provided permit history of the subject property.

Written submissions received:
- One written submission dated June 17, 2014
- Two written submissions dated June 18, 2014.

M. Diner (Owner, 6872 Copper Cove Road) described the variance application for a proposed single family addition and responded to queries of the Board.

Chairman Quan queried whether there was anyone in the gallery who wished to address the Board regarding this application.

J. Macmillan (6880 Copper Cove Road) spoke in support of the requested variances.

Chairman Quan queried whether there was anyone else in the gallery who wished to address the Board regarding this application and there was no response.

Members of the Board considered:
- All of the submissions
- Whether the application was for a minor variance that did not
  - result in inappropriate development of the site
  - adversely affect the natural environment
  - substantially affect the use and enjoyment of adjacent land
  - vary permitted uses and densities under the applicable bylaw; or
  - defeat the intent of the bylaw; and
- Whether compliance with the bylaw would cause the applicant undue hardship.

Having read the statutory Notice of Hearing for the subject application and the application dated May 15, 2014 including the applicant’s letter, plans and all other related documents, and having inspected the subject site, and having heard the submission of M. Diner (Owner, 6872 Copper Cove Road) and J. Macmillan (6880 Copper Cove Road):
It was Moved and Seconded:
THE BOARD finds that undue hardship would be caused to the Applicant by compliance with the Zoning Bylaw and orders that Application 14-012 regarding a proposed single family addition at 6872 Copper Cove Road with variances of:
- 2.83 m to Combined Side Yard Setback
- 4.22 m to Front Yard Setback
- 0.71 m to Minimum Side Yard Setback
- 0.93 m to Highest Building Face Envelope
- 11% to Highest Building Face Exemption;
BE ALLOWED pursuant to the plans dated April 29, 2014, submitted with the application; AND THE BOARD FURTHER ORDERS THAT if construction is not substantially started within six months of the issuance of the Building Permit, the permission terminates and the Zoning Bylaw applies; AND FURTHER THAT in the event the Owner is delayed or interrupted or prevented from obtaining a Permit by reason of any Act of God, labour unrest (including strike and lockouts), weather conditions or any similar cause reasonably beyond the control of the owner, the time for obtaining a Permit shall be extended for a period equal to the duration of the contingency that occasioned the delay, interruption or prevention, provided that commercial or financial consideration of the Owner shall not be viewed as a cause beyond the control of the Owner.

CARRIED

8. **Application 14-013 (4788 Meadfeild Road)**

The application was withdrawn.

9. **Application 14-014 (578 Barnham Place)**

The Recording Clerk confirmed the following requested variances:
- a) 1.27 m to Combined Side Yard Setback
- b) 0.30 m to Minimum Side Yard Setback.

K. Spooner (Supervisor of Inspections) provided permit history of the subject property.

Written submissions received:
- Three written submissions dated April 25, 2014
- One written submission dated June 6, 2014.

O. Lejeune (Stewart Howard Architects Inc., representing the owner of 578 Barnham Place) described the variance application for a proposed addition and responded to queries of the Board.
Chairman Quan queried whether there was anyone in the gallery who wished to address the Board regarding this application and there was no response.

Members of the Board considered:

- All of the submissions
- Whether the application was for a minor variance that did not
  - result in inappropriate development of the site
  - adversely affect the natural environment
  - substantially affect the use and enjoyment of adjacent land
  - vary permitted uses and densities under the applicable bylaw; or
  - defeat the intent of the bylaw; and
- Whether compliance with the bylaw would cause the applicant undue hardship.

Having read the statutory Notice of Hearing for the subject application and the application dated May 22, 2014 including the applicant's letter, plans and all other related documents, and having inspected the subject site, and having heard the submission of O. Lejeune (Stewart Howard Architects Inc., representing the owner of 578 Barnham Place):

It was Moved and Seconded:

THE BOARD finds that undue hardship would be caused to the Applicant by compliance with the Zoning Bylaw and orders that Application 14-014 regarding a proposed addition at 578 Barnham Place with variances of:

- 1.27 m to Combined Side Yard Setback
- 0.30 m to Minimum Side Yard Setback

BE ALLOWED pursuant to the plans dated May 2, 2014, submitted with the application; AND THE BOARD FURTHER ORDERS THAT if construction is not substantially started within six months of the issuance of the Building Permit, the permission terminates and the Zoning Bylaw applies; AND FURTHER THAT in the event the Owner is delayed or interrupted or prevented from obtaining a Permit by reason of any Act of God, labour unrest (including strike and lockouts), weather conditions or any similar cause reasonably beyond the control of the owner, the time for obtaining a Permit shall be extended for a period equal to the duration of the contingency that occasioned the delay, interruption or prevention, provided that commercial or financial consideration of the Owner shall not be viewed as a cause beyond the control of the Owner.

CARRIED
10. **Application 14-015 (3357 Marine Drive)**

The Recording Clerk confirmed the following requested variances:

a) 2.66 m to Combined Side Yard Setback (Accessory Building)
b) 1.28 m to Minimum Side Yard Setback (Accessory Building)
c) 0.44 m to Rear Yard Setback (Accessory Building)
d) 1.52 m to Accessory Building Height (Accessory Building)
e) 2.66 m to Combined Side Yard Setback (Porch)
f) 0.76 m to Minimum Side Yard Setback (Porch).

K. Spooner (Supervisor of Inspections) provided permit history of the subject property.

Written submissions received:
- One submission dated June 13, 2014
- One submission dated June 16, 2014.

M. Hashemi (Owner, 3357 Marine Drive) described the variance application for an accessory building and a proposed porch alteration and responded to queries of the Board.

Chairman Quan queried whether there was anyone in the gallery who wished to address the Board regarding this application and there was no response.

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the requested variances for an accessory building be considered separately from the requested variances for a proposed porch alteration.

**CARRIED**

Members of the Board considered:

- All of the submissions
- Whether the application was for a minor variance that did not
  - result in inappropriate development of the site
  - adversely affect the natural environment
  - substantially affect the use and enjoyment of adjacent land
  - vary permitted uses and densities under the applicable bylaw; or
  - defeat the intent of the bylaw; and
- Whether compliance with the bylaw would cause the applicant undue hardship.
Having read the statutory Notice of Hearing for the subject application and the application dated May 23, 2014 including the applicant’s letter, plans and all other related documents, and having inspected the subject site, and having heard the submission of M. Hashemi (Owner, 3357 Marine Drive):

It was Moved and Seconded:

THE BOARD finds that undue hardship would not be caused to the Applicant by compliance with the Zoning Bylaw and orders that Application 14-015 regarding an accessory building at 3357 Marine Drive with variances of:
- 2.66 m to Combined Side Yard Setback
- 1.28 m to Minimum Side Yard Setback
- 0.44 m to Rear Yard Setback
- 1.52 m to Accessory Building Height

BE NOT ALLOWED pursuant to the plans dated May 16, 2014, submitted with the application

CARRIED

It was Moved and Seconded:

THE BOARD finds that undue hardship would be caused to the Applicant by compliance with the Zoning Bylaw and orders that Application 14-015 regarding a proposed porch alteration at 3357 Marine Drive with variances of:
- 2.66 m to Combined Side Yard Setback (Porch)
- 0.76 m to Minimum Side Yard Setback (Porch)

BE ALLOWED pursuant to the plans dated May 16, 2014, submitted with the application; AND THE BOARD FURTHER ORDERS THAT if construction is not substantially started within six months of the issuance of the Building Permit, the permission terminates and the Zoning Bylaw applies; AND FURTHER THAT in the event the Owner is delayed or interrupted or prevented from obtaining a Permit by reason of any Act of God, labour unrest (including strike and lockouts), weather conditions or any similar cause reasonably beyond the control of the owner, the time for obtaining a Permit shall be extended for a period equal to the duration of the contingency that occasioned the delay, interruption or prevention, provided that commercial or financial consideration of the Owner shall not be viewed as a cause beyond the control of the Owner.

CARRIED
11. Receipt of Written and Oral Submissions

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT all written and oral submissions regarding the following Board of Variance Applications:

- Application 14-011 (1181 Esplanade Avenue)
- Application 14-012 (6872 Copper Cove Road)
- Application 14-014 (578 Barnham Place)
- Application 14-015 (3357 Marine Drive)

up to and including June 18, 2014 be received.

CARRIED

12. Public Question Period

I. Dixon (3355 Radcliffe Avenue) commented relative to the disposition of Board of Variance applications for 3356 Radcliffe Avenue, conveyed concerns from Radcliffe Avenue residents relative to variances that change the character of the street, and difficulty reading building plans, and informed that it would be helpful to have a 3D rendering of proposed variances for residents to examine.

E. Quan (Chairman) responded relative to the disposition of Board of Variance applications for 3356 Radcliffe Avenue.

13. Next Hearing

The Recording Clerk confirmed that the next Hearing of the Board of Variance is scheduled for July 16, 2014 at 5:00 p.m.

14. Adjournment

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the June 18, 2014 Board of Variance Hearing be adjourned.

CARRIED

The Board of Variance Hearing adjourned at 6:04 p.m.

Certified Correct:

E. Quan, Chairman

S. Scholes, Secretary
WEST VANCOUVER MEMORIAL LIBRARY BOARD

MINUTES
For the meeting of
June 18, 2014
Welsh Hall East

Present: K. Farquharson [Chair], A. Bahadoorsingh, M.J. Campbell, D. Carter, E. Fiss, G. Jopson, M. Lewis, J. MacCallum, D. Ryan

Regrets: J. McKenna

Staff: J. Benedict, D. Hutchison Koep, L. Breen, L. Henderson

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 7:02 p.m.

2. Public Comments

There were no members of the public in attendance.

3. Approval of the Consent Agenda

It was duly moved and seconded:

THAT the Consent Agenda be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

4. Approval of Agenda

The Chair requested the addition of b) Key Dates under item 11. New Business.

It was duly moved and seconded:
THAT the Agenda be approved as amended.

CARRIED

5. Adoption of Minutes

It was duly moved and seconded:

THAT the Minutes of the Library Board meeting held May 21, 2014 be adopted.

CARRIED

6. Business Arising from Minutes

None

7. Director of Library Services

a) Welcome to the Library Video

The Welcome to the Library video was previewed by the Trustees. The commentary will be translated into several languages including French, Mandarin, Farsi, Tagalog, and Korean. The video will be on the Library website as well the NewtoBC website. This project was funded by the ULSP grant from the province.

b) 2013 Annual Report

The Library’s 2013 Annual Report will be presented to Council on July 7. The Trustees are welcome to attend the meeting as a show of support for the Library.

8. Liaison Reports

a) Council Update

M. Lewis reminded the Trustees of the upcoming Canada Day Celebrations. He also updated the Board on the following:

- Council has created a Finance Committee comprised of the Mayor, Councillors Lewis and Booth and three community members.
- The Whyte Lake area has officially been designated as Whyte Lake Park.
• The Public Safety Building design is being reviewed to ensure it will suit the needs of the community.

The Chair thanked Councillor Lewis for his report.

b) Foundation

G. Jopson reported the Foundation’s donor appreciation event on June 13 was a success with approximately 70 in attendance. Senior staff provided the guests with a tour of the areas where their donations had been used to fund enhancements to the Library, e.g. Room 14, the Lower Level and the Automated Materials Handling machine.

G. Jopson reminded the Trustees that the Foundation AGM is on Thursday, June 26.

The Chair thanked G. Jopson for his report.

9. Committee Reports

a) Finance

A. Bahadoorsingh advised the Board that the Finance Committee reviewed the 2013 Statement of Financial Information (SOFI) which must be submitted to the province annually by June 30. The SOFI includes the Library’s financial information for the calendar year including the Financial Statements and Balance Sheet.

J. Benedict advised the Trustees of the Budget Approval Process memo included in their e-package that presents a proposed approval process and timeline for the 2015 budget submission process. The goals of the proposal are to provide more time for the Foundation to consider the Library’s request and to engage the full Board in the prioritization of major capital projects.

The Board members considered two options for the process of making the Library’s request to the Foundation. The Trustees agreed to convene a meeting on August 20, the day after the Infrastructure and Finance Committee meetings, to approve the submission of the request. Since the special meeting will have one agenda item and quorum will need to be assured, the Trustees agreed to permit participation by phone.

Councillor Lewis excused himself at 8:03 p. m.

10. Correspondence
a) Letter to TJ Schmaltz, Director of Human Resources and Payroll

The Chair sent a letter on behalf of the Trustees congratulating TJ Schmaltz on his new position with Impark Canada. She also expressed the Board’s appreciation of his support during his time with the District.

11. New Business

a) CLA

D. Ryan attended the Canadian Library Association Conference on May 28 and reported it to be an enjoyable experience. She recapped a number of the sessions she participated in which were particularly interesting. She also noted that there were many international librarians in attendance.

The Chair thanked D. Ryan for her report.

b) Key Dates

The Chair reminded the Trustees of the following key meeting dates:

- June 26  Foundation AGM
- July 2   Infrastructure with John Wong, District Manager, Facilities & Assets
- August 19 Finance Committee – 5:00 p.m.
- August 19 Infrastructure 6:00 p.m. – Full Board in attendance
- August 20 Library Board Special Meeting – 6:00 p.m.

1. Date of Next Meeting

Wednesday, July 16, 2014, Welsh Hall East

2. Adjournment

It was duly moved and seconded:

THAT the meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED

The meeting was adjourned at 8:29 p.m.

All documents distributed at the meeting are available for perusal upon request.
July 9, 2014

Municipal Clerk
District of West Vancouver
750 -17th Street
West Vancouver, BC V7V 3T3

Dear Sir/Madam:

Re: Caring for the Air, Metro Vancouver’s 2014 Report on Regional Air Quality

In support of the goals of Metro Vancouver’s Integrated Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Management Plan, “to protect public health and the environment, improve visual air quality and minimize the region’s contribution to climate change”, Metro Vancouver publishes Caring for the Air, an annual report about air quality and climate change activities being undertaken in Metro Vancouver.

Caring for the Air is a plain-language report intended to increase public engagement in and understanding of air quality and climate change issues. The report provides information about the actions and initiatives being carried out by Metro Vancouver and our partners to improve air quality and mitigate the impacts of climate change. The report also contains indicators on progress towards air quality goals, which helps to identify where new actions are needed.

A printed copy of the 2014 edition of Caring for the Air, which we hope people in your community will find interesting, is included in this package. Caring for the Air can also be accessed electronically on the Metro Vancouver website at http://www.metrovancouver.org/air.

If you would like additional copies to make available for interested members of the public, we would be pleased to provide them. For additional copies of the report, and comments about the report or questions about air quality or climate change, please do not hesitate to contact us through AQInfo@metrovancouver.org.

Yours truly,

Roger Quan
Director, Air Quality and Environment

RQ/ies

Attachment: Caring for the Air Report, 2014

9613153
Caring for the Air
Metro Vancouver 2014

WHAT'S INSIDE?
Information on what's being done about our most pressing air quality and climate change issues including:

- Linking Emissions to Exposure
- Transportation
- Sulphur dioxide limits
- Climate change actions
- Trends in emissions and air quality
- The 'state of the air' in 2013
THE LOWER FRASER VALLEY AIRSHED

Metro Vancouver is situated within the Lower Fraser Valley. Air pollution can freely cross our borders both from and into the surrounding areas. These include the Fraser Valley Regional District to the east, Whatcom County in the State of Washington to the south, Vancouver Island to the west and Howe Sound and the Sunshine Coast to the north.

Successfully managing air quality requires collaboration with our neighbours and other levels of government, and participation from businesses, public institutions, non-government organizations, and residents. Many of the articles in this publication reflect this.

WE WOULD LIKE TO ACKNOWLEDGE THE CONTRIBUTIONS MADE TO THIS PUBLICATION BY:

Greg Evans
Pat Shellard
Kay Teschke
HASTE
The students, parents and staff of K. B. Woodward Elementary School

PHOTO CREDITS:

Cover: Shaw Thien
Traffic (p.7): Laurie Bates-Frymel
Electric vehicle (p.8): Eve Hou
Active transportation (p.9): City of Burnaby
Chalk drawing (p.10): Annika Langeloo
K.B. Woodward Active School Travel Champions (p.10): Laurie Bates-Frymel
Heavy duty vehicle (p.11): Enviroteest Canada
Centennial Beach (p.18): Loger Aure
Rain gardens (p.18): Mark Wellman
INQUIRING MINDS NEED TO KNOW

This year’s Caring for the Air describes actions that are being taken to improve air quality and reduce our contribution to climate change. There is also an update on the state of the air in our region.

If you’re keen to stay up-to-date throughout the year, you’ll find regularly updated news and information about our projects on our website at www.metrovancouver.org/air.

WHAT’S NEW ONLINE?

I want to understand why it’s important to care for our air. What do Metro Vancouver’s videos and fact sheets say?

Where can I find Caring for the Air online?

I can visit AirMap.ca to check current air quality at my nearest monitoring station.

I’d like to see what Metro Vancouver is doing in our region to improve air quality and slow climate change.

Air Quality News provides me with information about new programs and projects, updates on air quality advisories and interesting facts from Metro Vancouver’s latest studies.
HOW ARE WE MEASURING UP?

Every five years the types and amounts of air pollutants and greenhouse gases released into the air are assessed. This emission inventory over the period of one year was recently completed for 2010. Here's a closer look at how our everyday activities contribute to the region's emissions of greenhouse gases and air pollutants.

GREENHOUSE GAS (GHG) EMISSION TRENDS
Your carbon footprint is the greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions produced through personal activities like driving and heating your home. In 2010, personal GHG emissions accounted for half of the total for the region. Driving cars accounted for nearly one third of the total of GHG emissions.

In general, people tend to feel accountable for their carbon footprint. In 2010, we drove our cars less than we did in 2005, despite the fact that we owned more vehicles. Several factors such as the price of fuel, road restriction during the Winter Olympic period and better public transportation options may have contributed to the reduction. The downward trend in GHG emissions from vehicles is projected to continue to 2030, mostly because motor vehicle fuel efficiency standards are improving. In contrast, the amount of GHGs released when we heat our homes is projected to increase from 2010 to 2030 due to the growth in our population.
GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS PATTERNS

GHG emissions in our region result from people's activities. So it is not surprising that more emissions occur in the most densely populated areas (see maps below).

When GHG emissions are examined on a per capita basis, we see a different picture. Although municipalities with high population densities had high overall emissions of GHGs, the emissions per person drop. There appears to be a trend where areas with low population density that are generally populated by single family dwellings have some of the highest per capita emissions of GHGs. This is probably influenced by longer commute distances and differences in building stock when compared to more compact communities that are mostly populated by multi-family dwellings.
TRENDS IN SMOG-FORMING POLLUTANTS (SFP)
The key components of smog are small particles (including secondary particulate matter that can form in the atmosphere in the presence of other air pollutants) and ground-level ozone. Nitrogen oxides (NOx), volatile organic compounds (VOC), fine particles (PM2.5), sulphur oxides (SOx) and ammonia (NH3) are major contributors to the formation of ground-level ozone and secondary fine particulate matter, and to the degradation of air quality and visual air quality. To provide a simplified indicator of how much smog we may be causing, we add together the emissions of these principal “smog-forming pollutants”. But how do the smog-forming pollutants get into our air?

For most people, the first images that come to mind when we talk about the major polluters in the region are those of industrial complexes, ships, trains and other large diesel equipment. However in 2010, personal activities such as driving your car to and from work or for pleasure trips, the use of personal products containing VOC (paints, personal care products, household products) and heating our homes accounted for almost half of the smog-forming pollutants emitted in the region.

When we look at how personal smog-forming pollutant emissions may change over the next few years, we see a decreasing trend in emissions from cars. Cleaner fuels have allowed more advanced engine technologies to be used. These advanced technologies that have been introduced through regulations, create substantial reductions in NOx, PM2.5 and VOC emitted by motor vehicles. However, we expect the release of smog-forming pollutants from personal solvent use to increase between 2010 and 2030 because of the predicted increase in population growth.
In Greater Vancouver, more than one fifth of residents live within 100 m of a major roadway.

**NEAR-ROAD MONITORING STUDY**

and Reducing Exposure to Traffic Emissions

Most of the vehicles on our roads today burn gasoline, diesel or natural gas which produces what we call “traffic-related air pollutants” - ultrafine particles, black carbon, nitrogen oxides, carbon monoxide and volatile organic compounds. Metro Vancouver is working with Environment Canada, the University of Toronto and the University of British Columbia on a Near Roadway Air Quality Monitoring Pilot Study, that will take a closer look at air pollution near roads by making measurements at two monitoring stations equipped to measure traffic-related air pollutants specifically. The results from the study will help us better understand people’s exposure to air pollutants as well as plan future near-road monitoring work nationally.

According to local health researchers, people who live close to major roadways and truck routes are more likely to be exposed to harmful traffic-related air pollutants and experience negative health impacts. Children, pregnant women, seniors and people with existing lung and heart conditions are the most vulnerable.

HOW CAN WE REDUCE EXPOSURE TO TRAFFIC-RELATED AIR POLLUTANTS?

**Clean up dirty trucks.** Learn more about “The Future of Heavy Duty Vehicles in Metro Vancouver and Beyond” on page 11.

**Build healthier communities.** Metro Vancouver is currently working with municipalities, health authorities and other partners to develop land use planning and urban design guidelines that will minimize the exposure of residents to traffic-related air pollutants.

**Invest in cleaner modes of travel.** For example, building more sidewalks, bike lanes and electric vehicle charging stations, and continued transit improvements will encourage more people to use low or zero-emission personal transportation options. The following pages look at some of these ideas in more detail.

“The health of 10 million Canadians is potentially being impacted by traffic related air pollution”

- Dr. Greg Evans, Department of Chemical Engineering and Applied Chemistry, University of Toronto.
Electric Vehicles

**AVERAGE TRIP LENGTH** (data from TransLink Trip Diary, 2011)

- 4.7 km (bike)
- 12.6 km (van)
- 1.1 km (person)
- 2.9 km (car)

**ALL CHARGED UP ABOUT ELECTRIC CARS!**

Electric vehicles emit no air pollution and almost no greenhouse gases (GHGs). Since the “Age of the Electric Car” is upon us, it’s time to bust some myths about electric vehicles.

**“NOWHERE TO CHARGE!”**

In 2012 Metro Vancouver, member municipalities, the BC government and dozens of businesses worked together to install publicly accessible charging stations all over the region. In 2013 there were over 235 public charge points available. You can find your nearest charging station using online tools like plugshare.com.

**“NO BETTER FOR THE CLIMATE!”**

Some British Columbians argue that more GHGs are released when an electric vehicle is manufactured than can be saved over its lifetime. Actually, the energy consumed driving a vehicle far outweighs the energy needed to make it. For British Columbians with hydro-generated electricity, the lifetime GHG emissions for manufacturing and using an electric vehicle will be more than five times less than those for a conventional vehicle.

**“BATTERIES ARE COSTLY AND UNRELIABLE!”**

The cost of batteries has been decreasing steadily and studies suggest it will continue to drop by 50%–66% by 2020. Modern batteries also last a long time - the Nissan Leaf and Chevy Volt both come with 8 year battery warranties.

**“USED BATTERY PACKS LITTER THE ENVIRONMENT!”**

At the end of their life, the materials in modern batteries have a high recycling value so batteries are rarely dumped. 95% of the materials in a battery can be recycled and in fact car batteries are the most recycled product in the US.

**“ELECTRIC VEHICLES DISTRACT PEOPLE FROM OTHER SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORTATION CHOICES!”**

Active transportation (see p. 9) and transit are the best options for getting around locally. For longer trips, electric vehicles make a lot of sense.

“Fast, fun and economical” – Pat Shellard always knew he wanted to buy an electric car. In 2011, he took the plunge and became the fourth owner of a Nissan Leaf in the province. Read more online about his family’s experience with a pure electric vehicle two years on.
GETTING AROUND ACTIVELY

When we think of transportation, the first images that often come to mind are planes, trains, and automobiles. Metro Vancouver residents make approximately 6 million trips daily. Vehicle drivers and passengers account for about 73% of those trips, transit about 14% and walking and cycling the remaining 13%.

Walking, running, cycling, skateboarding, rollerblading or wheelchairing etc. are known collectively as active transportation.

Active forms of transportation can get us to and from buses, cars and trains and can also be a complete alternative for short trips. Our use of active transportation is highly influenced by the quality and availability of things like sidewalks, cross-walks, bike lanes and paths, which help determine safety and convenience. It is also easier to get around for work, shopping or other activities by walking or cycling when commercial and residential buildings are mixed so it is important to design our neighbourhoods to encourage active transportation.

If more people used active transportation, we would have less pollution congestion as well as the benefit of improved health by being more physically active. Not to mention active transportation is often fun!

Taxpayers pay about $3.6 billion per year or $1500 per resident for infrastructure for vehicles. In contrast, it costs each resident about $40 per year to support walking and cycling.

Travelling on foot or by bike is a great way to incorporate activity into our daily lives. And regular physical activity is one of the best prescriptions to reduce the risk of developing heart disease, diabetes, certain cancers, and dementia.

— Kay Teschke, School of Population and Public Health, University of British Columbia.
WALK’N AND ROLL’N TO SCHOOL

Good air quality is very important for children. They’re more susceptible to the health effects of air pollution because their lungs are still developing and they breathe in more air per kilogram of their body weight. As parents, we’re understandably concerned about the safety and health of our kids. When people drive children to school and dozens of cars descend on a school at once, the risk of accidents increases and air quality can deteriorate. If more kids walk or bike to school, they’ll keep the air clean, get more exercise and stay healthy.

58% of parents in Canada walked to school when they were kids; 28% of their children do so today.

(Canadian School Travel Planning Intervention Results [2010-12])

Organizations like Hub for Active School Travel (HASTe) work directly with school boards, municipalities, police, public health professionals, parents, educators and students to make active transportation a safer and more convenient way of getting to school. HasteBC.org features resources such as the iSchool Travel calculator which compares the greenhouse gas emissions, gasoline costs and calories burned for different modes of travel.

Active transportation programs have helped increase walking and cycling in many schools across BC. Thank you for walk’n and roll’n to school!

“We’re attempting to push back to reclaim the streets for children” says Principal Angelo Morelli, of K.B. Woodward Elementary School. Read the story of this Surrey school’s experience with HASTe’s School Travel Planning program online.

K.B. Woodward’s Active School Travel Champions

Left to right: Ms. Krystal Dumais (President of the Parent Advisory Council), Dakota and Dustyn (two brothers who cycle to school every day, rain or shine) and Principal Angelo Morelli
THE FUTURE OF HEAVY DUTY VEHICLES in Metro Vancouver and Beyond

In 2012 Metro Vancouver and a number of partners conducted a study to collect information about air emissions from heavy duty vehicles throughout the region. The results of the study confirmed that:

- Newer vehicles are cleaner due to Federal emission control regulations which have become increasingly stringent over time; and

- For every age group, the worst 10% of vehicles emit four to eleven times as much as the typical vehicle – these vehicles are referred to as “gross emitters”.

Based on the findings, Metro Vancouver, the Province of BC and a number of partner organizations are looking at a range of policy options to address the issue. Some of the options being considered include Low Emissions Zones, mandatory phase-out, inspection and maintenance, and fees. Each option will be evaluated on cost and effectiveness at reducing emissions, as well as a host of other criteria.

LOW CARBON TRUCKING

Reducing greenhouse gas emissions means reducing fuel consumption – something trucking companies can find real value in doing. Fuel is one of the most significant operating costs for fleets and reducing fuel use helps the bottom line. It's not surprising, therefore, that most vehicles are already extremely fuel-efficient, but even so, there are some programs in BC that can lead to improvements.

- E3 Fleets: Operated by the Fraser Basin Council, this program assesses and rates trucking fleets for green trucking practices. e3fleet.com

- FT Solutions: A relative newcomer, FT Solutions is a division of the Carbon Offset Aggregation Cooperative (COAC), a registered co-operative which focuses on public and private sector fleets. The services are comprehensive and FT Solutions will, for a fee, evaluate trucking fleets, administer data collection from telematics systems, provide driver awareness training, and recommend equipment. FT Solutions is based in Prince George but works across BC. carbonoffsetcooperative.org

- SmartWay: This Federal program uses fuel data to provide fleet certification based on self-reported emissions levels. SmartWay in Canada
SETTING OBJECTIVES

Metro Vancouver sets outdoor air quality objectives to protect human health and the environment. These objectives set generally accepted limits for each air pollutant in our region. Objectives are reviewed on a periodic basis to support our goal of continuous improvement in air quality. In 2013 we started reviewing the region's sulphur dioxide (SO2) objectives. Throughout the review process, we will be talking to many people and attempting to answer questions such as:

Where do SO2 EMISSIONS come from in our region?
The largest SO2 sources in our region are marine vessels and a petroleum refinery. Refineries in Whatcom County also emit significant SO2.

What are the CURRENT LEVELS of SO2 in our region?
SO2 levels are generally low in our region, but they are elevated near port activities and the refinery.

How will SO2 emissions and levels change in THE FUTURE?
SO2 emissions and levels are expected to decrease over the next few years as new marine vessel emission control regulations come into effect. However, shipping is expected to increase, so we are investigating how these changes may impact air quality.

What levels will protect human HEALTH?
To determine how to protect human health, we are collecting information from many organizations like Health Canada, the World Health Organization and the US Environmental Protection Agency.

How will the ECONOMY be affected?
We will investigate the economic costs and benefits of setting new SO2 objectives. Emission controls can be expensive, but lower emissions means fewer health impacts and lower health care costs.

What levels will protect the ENVIRONMENT?
To ensure the environment is protected, we are considering the possible impacts of SO2 on vegetation and ecosystems.

WHAT LEVELS ARE ACHIEVABLE?
We need to assess whether additional technology, fuel and/or operational changes to control emissions will help to achieve the different options that are being considered for a new SO2 objective.

WHAT DO STAKEHOLDERS THINK?
Options will be discussed with residents, other government agencies, industry and other stakeholders during the process.

Learn more about Metro Vancouver’s air quality objectives:
www.metrovancouver.org/services/air/Documents/AQOFactsheet.pdf

Learn more about sulphur dioxide:
www.metrovancouver.org/services/air/Documents/SO2Factsheet.pdf
AIR QUALITY IN 2013

Air quality objectives define limits on air pollutant levels that protect air quality. Some of these limits were exceeded for fine particulate matter in 2013.

The short-term limit for fine particulate matter was exceeded at five monitoring locations in 2013. The exceedances occurred over one to two days in January (in Langley and West Vancouver), October (in Abbotsford), and November (in Richmond). Local emissions and stagnant conditions probably contributed to these exceedances that we can now detect thanks to new monitoring technology.

In 2013, new technology was introduced to improve measurements of fine particulate matter. The amount of fine particulate matter in air has generally not increased - the new instruments measure particles that the old technology could not. The fine particulate matter chart shows how measurements from the new instruments (red) and old instruments (blue) compare.

REGIONAL TRENDS FOR AIR POLLUTANTS

Regional trends show how air quality has changed over time. They are calculated using data from monitoring stations throughout the network to represent the outdoor air quality we generally experience.

Improvements have been made over the last decade for major air pollutants, including fine particulate matter (top chart), nitrogen dioxide, sulphur dioxide and carbon monoxide (bottom chart). These improvements have been brought about by key historical actions. For example, improved vehicle emission standards and the AirCare program are largely responsible for lower carbon monoxide and nitrogen dioxide levels. Sulphur dioxide levels have improved because of lower sulphur in vehicle fuels, the shutdown of several refineries, and lower emissions from the cement industry.

Peak ground-level ozone levels (not shown) are better now than in the 1980s and early 1990s. Average levels of ground-level ozone are increasing slightly, even though levels of pollutants that form ground-level ozone are lower. This is partly a result of increases in the ozone from outside Canada that comes into our region. Metro Vancouver is currently working with partners to develop a strategy to reduce ground-level ozone.
MONITORING RESULTS

FINE PARTICULATE MATTER (PM2.5) IN 2013

In 2013, fine particulate matter (PM2.5) levels throughout the region were better than the Canadian Ambient Air Quality Standard (see map above). Measurements averaged over the entire year were within Metro Vancouver’s annual objective, although one station in Abbotsford very slightly exceeded the objective. Peak levels, based on the highest 24-hour average, were also worse than the short-term objective (25 µg/m³) on one or two days at stations in West Vancouver, Richmond, Langley and Abbotsford. A combination of factors including emissions from local sources, such as heating, transportation and burning, along with stagnant weather conditions were thought to have caused these exceedances.

GROUND-LEVEL OZONE IN 2013

Ground-level ozone forms when nitrogen oxides and volatile organic compounds react in the air in the presence of sunlight. Ground-level ozone levels were better than Metro Vancouver’s air quality objectives and the Canadian Ambient Air Quality Standard at all monitoring stations in 2013. The map above shows how measurements for 2013 compared to the Canadian Ambient Air Quality Standard.

Canadian Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) are new standards developed by the federal government for fine particulate matter and ground-level ozone.
SULPHUR DIOXIDE IN 2013

Average concentrations of sulphur dioxide for 2013 are shown above. Levels were generally better than Metro Vancouver’s air quality objectives at all stations in 2013 with the exception of one station in North Burnaby. At this station, Metro Vancouver’s 1-hour and 24-hour air quality objectives were both exceeded during stagnant conditions during one evening in January. The largest sources in the region are marine vessels (mainly ocean-going vessels) and the oil refinery in Burnaby. The highest sulphur dioxide levels are observed near these sources, especially in the Burrard Inlet area. Further away from the Burrard Inlet area, sulphur dioxide levels are much lower.

NITROGEN DIOXIDE IN 2013

Nitrogen dioxide concentrations were better than Metro Vancouver’s long-term and short-term air quality objectives throughout 2013. Annual averages are shown on the map. Over 60% of the regional emissions of nitrogen oxides (which includes nitrogen dioxide) come from transportation sources. The highest average nitrogen dioxide concentrations are measured in highly urbanized areas near busy roads.

CARBON MONOXIDE IN 2013

Carbon monoxide levels were well below Metro Vancouver’s air quality objectives at all stations in 2013. The main source of carbon monoxide in our region is motor vehicles. The highest levels are measured near major roadways during peak traffic periods. Lower levels are observed where there is less influence from road traffic.
NETWORK NEWS

MONITORING STATIONS
A new air quality monitoring station was added in Agassiz in 2013, expanding the regional air quality monitoring network, which covers communities in Metro Vancouver and the Fraser Valley with stations from Horseshoe Bay to Hope. Measurements of ground-level ozone, fine particulate matter and nitrogen oxides from Agassiz will provide data for the Air Quality Health Index (AQHI). This station and a second additional station opening in Mission in 2014 will fill a monitoring gap on the north side of the Fraser River to help us understand how pollutants form and move around the region.

New stations are also being added in New Westminster and North Vancouver. New Westminster is located near major transportation routes as well as commercial and industrial activities, all of which can affect air quality. The new station in New Westminster, expected to open in 2014, is close to the centre of Metro Vancouver and will improve information in an area that currently has no monitoring. The new station in North Vancouver will provide baseline data prior to construction of Metro Vancouver's new Lions Gate Secondary Wastewater Treatment Plant and then ongoing air quality monitoring in the neighbourhood nearby.

MAMU
The Metro Vancouver Mobile Air Monitoring Unit (MAMU) will monitor in the Moodyville area of North Vancouver in 2014. Information gathered by MAMU will be used to help answer questions raised by local residents about air quality related to transportation projects and the nearby industries located close to the community. MAMU is a fully equipped mobile station with air quality and weather monitoring instruments similar to those used in the network stations.

VISUAL AIR QUALITY MONITORING
Visual air quality information was available in six locations in 2013. Additional instruments will be installed in Richmond and Pitt Meadows in 2014 to improve reporting of visual air quality. For more information about visual air quality, as well as images from the visual air quality monitoring network, visit www.cleanairbc.ca.

ULTRAFINE PARTICULATE MATTER
Airborne particulate matter (PM) is not a single substance but many, many different kinds of solids and liquids. It is generally classified by size, for example the air pollutants PM10 and PM2.5 are particles that are less than 10 µm and 2.5 µm respectively. Metro Vancouver recently received instruments to measure even smaller particles. These are known as ultrafine particles. For PM10 and PM2.5, we report how much mass of particles (in micrograms) is found in one cubic metre of air. The mass of ultrafine particles is relatively small so a different measurement, the number of particles in one cubic metre of air, will be collected. We will be testing the new monitors in 2014 in the Near Roadway Pilot Study (p.7). This will help us understand how and where to add ultrafine particle monitoring to the air quality monitoring network.

AirMap displays real-time measurements from air quality monitoring stations in the region. Measurements of air quality and weather data are available for the last seven days on AirMap at www.airmap.ca.
WHAT HAPPENS
to air quality complaints?

Have you ever registered a complaint with Metro Vancouver about odour, dust or other air emissions and wondered what happens to it? Well, during normal business hours, complaints are assigned to an Environmental Regulation and Enforcement Officer based on the location of the problem. If you call after hours or on weekends, your complaint will be forwarded to an on-call Officer who will start the complaint follow-up process and, if not resolved by the next business day, will assign it to the regular Officer.

The Officer reviews your complaint to understand the problem and to check whether you have requested a call back. We aim to respond to call-back requests within one business day. If you have not requested a call back, the Officer may still call you to gather more information. Next, the Officer evaluates whether Metro Vancouver has the authority to deal with the complaint. We regulate air emissions from businesses located in Metro Vancouver. If we do not have authority, we refer you to the correct organization. For example, we refer complaints about ship emissions to Port Metro Vancouver and complaints about noise to your municipality.

If Metro Vancouver is the responsible authority for dealing with this issue, the Officer may visit the site to gather more information and assess the seriousness of the situation. If a suspect source can be determined, they will be contacted to inform them of the complaint (without identifying you) and obtain information about their operations. The Officer’s primary objectives are to find the source of the problem and work with the parties involved to resolve the issue. Sometimes we are not able to find the source or there is no simple solution. If the issue is resolved, the complaint will be closed and, if requested by you, the Officer will inform you of the outcome.
CLIMATE MATTERS

UPGRADING NORTH SHORE WASTEWATER TREATMENT
As Metro Vancouver upgrades sewage and drainage networks and facilities, it is designing for sea level rise.

DESIGNING FOR BETTER STORM WATER MANAGEMENT
Local governments are constructing buildings, roads and drainage systems that can respond better to more extreme events like heavy rainfall.

The latest report from the world’s climate scientists confirms that our greenhouse gas emissions are changing the climate in ways that have never been experienced in all of human history. Although the effects are not profound now, they will continue to accelerate in the next few decades. As winters get warmer we will see less snowpack, shortening the ski season. Drier summers will mean strong heat waves and more forest fires. Rising sea levels will mean greater chances of coastal flooding and higher insurance costs.

To protect us, projects are being undertaken now to help us adapt to living in a future with more extreme and less predictable events.

GARDENS AND YARDS THAT REDUCE RISK OF FLOODING
Residents in the region are also doing their part by building rain gardens, planting harder species of plants and making other changes to their own properties to reduce risks from more frequent flooding and other changes due to our changing climate.
CAPTURING 'FUGITIVE EMISSIONS'

How do refrigerants contribute to climate change? Refrigerants are substances that are used in all kinds of refrigeration systems to cool perishable goods to the required temperature. But it's not the cooling that's a problem for climate change, it's the refrigerants themselves.

Most commercial refrigeration systems in Canada and the United States use refrigerants called chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs), hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFCs) and hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs). When they leak out of sealed systems, CFCs and HCFCs can destroy the ozone found in the ozone layer in the upper atmosphere.

Laws were put into place to restrict CFCs and HCFCs. The newest refrigerants, HFCs, are designed to have no negative impact on the ozone layer. But none of these refrigerants are climate friendly – they are greenhouse gases that are thousands of times stronger than carbon dioxide at warming the planet.

CFCs, HCFCs and HFCs can only damage the climate if they escape from refrigeration systems into our air. When this happens, we call them "fugitive emissions". Fugitive emissions happen all too frequently due to a lack of preventative maintenance and a lack of awareness about the harm they cause to the climate. Based on studies done in California and preliminary work in Metro Vancouver, it is estimated that a significant amount of greenhouse gases are leaked every year from commercial refrigeration systems found in businesses of all sizes in our region.

Metro Vancouver is currently working to understand how to limit leakage from commercial refrigeration systems and support programs for safe disposal of refrigerants to avoid negative impacts on our climate.

The ozone layer prevents dangerous levels of ultraviolet rays from the sun reaching the surface of the Earth, leading to adverse health effects.
Mitigating Climate Change

SMART SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT MEANS LOWER GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

CLIMATE ACTION
by Local Governments in Metro Vancouver

Metro Vancouver is doing its part to **tackle climate change** and make our facilities more resilient to a changing climate. But Metro Vancouver is not alone in its mission to reduce its carbon footprint. Many municipalities have electric, hybrid and alternative fuel vehicles in their fleet and are ensuring their buildings and facilities are energy efficient. Some of the biggest successes have come from working together on projects that benefit everybody. Metro Vancouver and its member municipalities have been working with the BC government to improve the availability of electric vehicle charging stations (p.8).

The challenge of reducing emissions related to solid waste disposal has also been approached collaboratively. Metro Vancouver manages the region’s waste on behalf of all of the municipalities and this task has a large carbon footprint. Greenhouse gas emissions from landfills can be reduced, either by diverting organic waste (food scraps and yard waste) away from landfills or by capturing methane gas at the landfills. In 2012, many municipalities expanded their organics collection programs. This reduced greenhouse gas emissions by about 65,000 tonnes. Carbon credits from this project were earned by the municipalities that took action, and went a long way towards balancing their carbon footprints.

More collaboration is in the works. Greenhouse gas reductions from upgrading the Vancouver Landfill gas collection system mean there will be more carbon credits to be shared amongst the local governments in the region.

Attention is also being turned to the protection and restoration of some of the sensitive ecosystems in the region. By looking after our forests and bogs, we can remove carbon dioxide from the atmosphere, and it can also make these important ecosystems more resilient to a changing climate.

Stay tuned!
WHAT CLEAN AIR MEANS TO YOU

We asked people to show us what clean air means to them. The photos on the cover and here are a selection of what people submitted.

COVER
Shaw Thien

LEFT COLUMN - TOP TO BOTTOM
Nicolas Carbajales
Laurie Bates-Frymel
Mike Lan
Bart Frymel

RIGHT COLUMN - TOP TO BOTTOM
Diane Moran
Kellee Maglio
Geoff Moeller
Ania Paweloc
SERVICES AND SOLUTIONS FOR A LIVABLE REGION

If you have any questions or comments about Caring for the Air, please contact us at AO:info@metrovancouver.org
Hon. Mayor Michael Smith & Council,

I am very pleased to see the proposed plans for the moving forward on your precious jewel of the DWV FBG. I fully support the devotion of Ruth Payne and Brent Leigh on these plans. I think it is very wise to proceed with this venture not only to upgrade your beautiful historical building of 1912, but also the potential of revenue generation for the DWV. This is a win – win situation for all concerned. This will bring in art lovers, like myself, from across the region to your beautiful city. Think of the economic spinoffs for local businesses.

Truly, it is time to upgrade your site, and offer more space for exhibitions.

I full support the proposed plans of the Ferry Building Gallery renovation. Michael there are no losers here.

Set up your memberships, and I will become one, and tell everyone I know.

Best regards,

Vancouver, BC
Dear Mayor and Council,

I am fully in support of the renovation, design and expansion of the Ferry Building. It is a vital institution, perfectly situated but it desperately needs to expand. It will be enjoyed in the future by many residents old and young. I know you will think of the greater good. Please don't let a small vocal minority stop this project.

Please think back to April and the SD45 show at the West Vancouver Museum when 900+ people showed up at the opening. Now picture that on the water front.

Yours in paint.

West Vancouver, BC

Sent from iPad
From: [redacted]  
Sent: July-13-14 11:05 AM  
To: MayorandCouncil  
Subject: Ferry Building Gallery Upgrade

I am in favour of the proposed restoration of the Ferry Building and it’s move to higher ground. Historically, it belongs near the pier where the ferries used to arrive.

However, I don’t understand proposing a monumental large building on a unique and natural waterfront. Our natural and unspoiled areas are becoming more difficult to find, and grass is a precious commodity. The sheer volume of the proposed structure will trivialize the Ferry Building. It needs green space around it to emphasize it’s unique position and architecture.

We have the opportunity to save this natural and unique bit of waterfront from contrived vegetation and more buildings. Let’s save it!

West Vancouver, B.C.
From: MayorandCouncill
Sent: July-14-14 1:11 PM
To: Fwd: Vancouver Sun - Ferry Building

FYI.

Begin forwarded message: West Vancouver, BC

From: July 14, 2014 1:06:21 PM PDT
To: Re: Vancouver Sun - Ferry Building
Cc:

Subject: Re: Vancouver Sun - Ferry Building

May I add my congratulations to.

The Mayors numbers do not add up to me either? Ferry Building hours: Tues. to Sun. 11 a.m. to 5 p.m. = 36 hours a week = 1,872 hours a year if open on ALL stat. hols!

Think 60,000 people a year rather inflated! 500 at an exhibit? All at once? Would cause the fire department some concern even IF 500 could even fit into the Ferry Building! And, as you said, 300 events a year? Well, each exhibit is usually in there for more than a couple of weeks.

(I have gone through the F.B. on the odd occasion and RARELY is there anyone else in there.)

The taxpayers already have amenities: The Park, toilets, and cafes. We need more infrastructure first before any of this type of expenditure! THE PARK IS THE FACILITY WE WANT TO ENJOY!

So, if the building is inadequate for what it is being used for, just leave it as an example of our past and use accordingly.

The Mayors comment on misinformation has only himself to blame if that is the case! If, only they were more transparent?

Think some of this should be thrown back at the Mayor at the meeting, WHENEVER THAT IS?

-----Original Message-----
From: [s.22(1)]
Sent: Monday, July 14, 2014 8:36 AM
To: [s.22(1)]
Cc: [s.22(1)]; North Shore News
Subject: Vancouver Sun - Ferry Building

[s.22(1)] - WELL DONE!.

For those who haven't seen it look at the article on P. 2 of the first section of the Sun.

By the way maybe someone can tell me what 300 'events' a year is the Mayor talking about or was he 'misquoted'? One event every 1 1/4 days approx?

Also please note that all the windows on the main floor of the Ferry Building are blanked off except the window on the north side of the east wall which I assume was not blocked as it would provide light to the bottom of the staircase to the upper or office floor,

So they have demonstrated that being on the waterfront is not an attribute to a Gallery but a detriment. It could be placed elsewhere to greater advantage to all. Maybe in the Grosvenor building when that is constructed. At least then there might be some advantage to the Grosvenor building.

[s.22(1)]

-----
No virus found in this message.
Checked by AVG - www.avg.com
Version: 2014.0.4716 / Virus Database: 3986/7848 - Release Date: 07/13/14
I have read with interest the article in today's vancouver sun relating to another proposed expanded Arts Complex on or near our waterfront. I have not previously signed any petition against such development consideration but please take this response as my BIG NO to any such Arts Complex consideration.

I am deeply concerned with councils continued support for any new or renovated Arts complex on or near our waterfront. Your mandate should be to continue to acquire and convert waterfront property to public park land. Under no circumstances should any arts facility be build or expanded to on such public lands. Please stop this madness immediately. I can appreciate preserving the ferry building for it's historical value but under no circumstances should it be renovated beyond it's historical footprint.

Further consideration should also be given to the removal of other inappropriate district buildings on the waterfront. ie silk purse, music building next door and that other newly acquired building on the west side of John Larsen park. Although some of these structures are used, the more appropriate use would be a location OFF the waterfront.

Why should the west vancouver taxpayers continue to fund the restoration of what is a Dilapidated old building (silk purse) of no historical significance that is inappropriately located in a low lying part of our waterfront?

And why we continue to keep that Music Box building is a complete mystery to me. Once again whatever use is being made of the building has nothing to do with the waterfront so such activity should be moved to a more appropriate location.

Why that building on the west side of John Lawsen park was kept is beyond me. It again serves no waterfront purpose. We walked through it once since it was opened.

In summary, as a west vancouver resident, it is certainly not the arts that attracts me to our waterfront. It is the natural beauty of this pristine coastline that should be continuously expanded based on you historical mandate.

What you should be promoting is viable small business opportunities on private land that compliments this waterfront village atmosphere.
July 14, 2014

From

West Vancouver, B.C

To
Office of the Mayor
West Vancouver Council Members

Sirs/Madams:

I am not in favour of this expansion at Ambleside.

The thing that is great about this "high profile site" is that it has some space and wide open views of water, sky, trees across the water at Stanley Park, ships of all sizes coming and going, and there is a boat launch, pier and lovely lawn and parking. What I appreciate, as a taxpayer, is the freed up space. I never expected something big and better once the houses were gone. The lack of public toilets is a problem all over the North Shore and Vancouver and all transit hubs not just at the Ferry Building. Fix it up to protect it from floods and leave it at that. The space is to be treasured.

Sincerely,
Dear Mayor and Council;

We were reading the article in the Vancouver Sun today regarding the ferry building expansion. As long time residents of West Vancouver, and regular users of the waterfront and seawall, we fully support the planned expansion. The addition of amenities along the waterfront walk from Park Royal to Dundarave is very welcome indeed, and an upgraded art gallery space would be wonderful. We are in total disagreement with statements in the Sun attributed to Norma Gibson.

West Vancouver B.C.
Mayor and Council,

I support the renovation of the Ferry building. It badly needs to be enlarged and to have a public washroom. I do not comprehend the endlessly negative people who won't even allow a small art gallery to be enlarged.

We hardly have a view restaurant left in West Van which is nuts considering we are a waterfront city. Hopefully some new plans for the waterfront lots the city has bought will include a view restaurant and a real art gallery.

Thank you for all your work.

W.V.
I have been a West Vancouver resident for 48 years, and on the whole the Council has got things right for most of this time. The proposal to allow dogs on the seawall walk was one major mistake that I recall. This proposal is another one. The area around the ferry building is a lovely space and quite central to the whole Ambleside ambience. I cannot think of how a proposal could be much worse than this one, with a cafe' and toilets, and an enlarged ferry building.

There are toilets at the Ambleside Beach and more facilities at the John Lawson Park. Adding more toilets here and a coffee place is simply wrong. There have to be more suitable alternatives.

I am sure that there will be a lot of West Vancouver residents who will be very upset if this proposal proceeds.
It is time that the spending on these faculties stops. There is limited use of them by the general West Vancouver population, they attract no new people and are instead used by the same people that advocated for them in the first place (a minority). I notice on all of my walks that the art attracting the greatest attention is the ad hoc form where individual artists are allowed to set up their wares on the grass verges. Why not spend money on making the general purpose areas more attractive, and for example; installing fueled BBQs in picnic areas (as it done in all public parks in Australia). Things that are useful to more than a few who have selected themselves to enforce the art "culture" that they see fit - at the expense of all other "cultural" activities. If the Council are going to "steal" money in the budget from infrastructure development and maintence at least spend it to meet the needs of the many not the needs of the few.
Honourable Mr. Todd Stone: Minister of Transportation
Mr. Grant Main: Deputy Minister of Transportation & Infrastructure
Mr. Jordan Sturdy: MLA West Vancouver Sea to Sky
Ms. Nicola Bentley: Constituency Assistant to Mr. Jordan Sturdy
Mr. Michael Smith: Mayor West Vancouver
July 13, 2014

Hello all,
Re: BC RAIL PROPERTIES VS SUNSET LANE RESIDENTS

This is a quick update to be sure that everyone is clear where we stand at this point.

We have now confirmed that each one of the BC Rail Properties Ltd. easements in question, is assessed at only $18,900; as confirmed in writing on the 2014 Property Tax Notice from the District of West Vancouver. This information is available to the general public, and clear as day online.

Keeping in mind that these easements are used as our sole access to our properties, and to get some of our vehicles off the very narrow single lane-way; obviously the demands (exceeding $100,000) of BC Rail Properties Ltd. are completely outrageous! These tiny plots of land are useless to anyone else ~ without a single improvement, or any maintenance by BC Rail in over 50 years. We cannot fathom how they can think this land is worth a penny more than its assessed value.

Thankfully, Mr. Matthew Chapman (an Investigator for Ms. Kim Carter, BC Ombudswoman) has agreed to investigate our complaints against BC Rail Properties Ltd. Our latest deadline now stands at September 30, 2014, but we would all be very relieved to get this dealt with as soon as possible as well.

From the very beginning of this decades long ordeal, we have only ever asked for a fair and reasonable price. Here's hoping BC Rail Properties will accept the official assessment from the District of West Vancouver, and our money will be on its way. And, finally, this complete waste and stress on so many will be over!

Thank you, and we truly appreciate everyone's time and efforts into this life-changing resolution affecting these long time residents.

Sincerely,
Mayor of West Vancouver

Dear Sir

I am sending an e-mail with the intention of making you a small request. First of all, I am a young boy and my favorite sport is cycling. In my cycling curriculum, it is noteworthy to refer that I have covered most of the municipalities of Portugal and some in Spain. As I would like that Canada and West Vancouver was part of my cycling script, I am asking you to send me the pins alluding to your district (e.g., the coat of arms, flag, logo, tours, celebrations, etc.) and, if possible, textile badges, keyrings and other materials related to the attached files, which will also be welcomed and will help to enhance the promotion of the district of West Vancouver. Thank you, now, for your understanding.

Graciously

Yours faithfully,

Penafiel Portugal

* Please do not send tourist information (tourist guides, maps, brochures, catalogs, flyers, pamphlets), because I can see information on the internet.
Junta de Freguesia
Santa Maria Maior
Chaves
AGUEDA
USE BICICLETAS UGAL
PEDALAR DA SAUDE
Rodas de Vinato
To Mr. Smith

I do not live in West Vancouver but I do live on the North Shore and I work in West Vancouver.

I find the statements made by you in the article regarding Chinese signs not only upsetting but quite frankly totally disrespectful for all of those of use who are from European (Caucasian) background. First of all, I thought it was known that it was the European (Caucasians) who had the courage to discover and to build Canada and they were also the majority that fought 2 world wars for the democracy and freedom that it would appear to be forgotten at this stage.

In your mention turning the clock back 50 years and the inference that something is wrong with that thought process perhaps you should remember that most of West Vancouver was developed and built from people from that time many of whom are still alive and living in West Vancouver. Since that thought process made the community a desirable place for immigrants I think you owe your European (Caucasian) population a huge apology.

In terms of calling people who do not agree with Canada's present immigration policy "racist" maybe should look at the actions of some of these immigrants because I find some of their actions racist as well. For example I find it extremely disrespectful when people how know English refuse to speak in in front of European (Caucasian) people, I find it racist when an ethnic group only hires from within their own group, I find it disgraceful when an ethnic group thinks they should get special treatment because of their race (just look at all the demands made to the City of North Vancouver from all the different Iranian groups). I would really like to know what it is called when ethnic groups offer money to politicians in order to get special favours for their group - these actions would never be tolerated from European (Caucasian) but it is OK for immigrants?

Why don't you put your money where you mouth is and have an open forum on immigration, one where you not only have all the people representing the ethnic people but have s. 22(1) for those who do not support immigration. Since you do not agree with the "nanny" or the "higher purpose people" - whatever that means then you will certainly go for this idea since it is allowing all opinions to be expressed! Last time I looked this was a country that allowed freedom of expression and I would like to remind you of that because it is NOT racist to be against immigration. Rather at this point of time it is more out of fear as we see homes getting out of local income price points, jobs going to immigrants that are willing to work for less or only hire within their own ethnic group.

If you are not capable of looking at this subject with an open mind as well as an open waiting hand then perhaps you should step down from your position because you are obviously not interested in representing all people equally.

- a very proud European (Caucasian) North Vancouver, BC
Dear Mayor and Council,

I have recently returned from vacation and am aware of the debate that is ensuing regarding the Chinese bus stop signage in West Vancouver.

My view on this, in common with most people I have spoken to is that the signs in question are counter to the spirit of Canadian inclusiveness. The experience of Canadian immigrants to date, is that in order to integrate and participate in our society fully such that they embrace its opportunities, and influence its future development, is that this is facilitated in large part thorough effective communication in our official language(s).

This latest in a wave of immigration into West Vancouver is of a different nature. These people are not immigrating to escape tyranny, oppression, or the wish for a better future for their children, but rather buy into a lifestyle that cannot be achieved in mainland China at the present time. While this is understandable and nothing wrong with it per-se, the result is affecting the population who are vested into this community long term, and who made it what it is today. We should not feel excluded as we are being made to feel, exemplified by these signs. If we allow this to continue, we are allowing our community to be divided. Other immigrants integrated very effectively but I would argue that this wave has no economic or social incentive to become part of the mainstream of our society, or contribute to it in any meaningful way. West Vancouver is not alone in this, but concerns should not be dismissed as the Mayor did in his recent quote to The Vancouver Sun, namely;

"I believe in personal freedom. If you pay your money you should be able to advertise your sign in any language you want. I'm not a racist. I don't see why anybody would be offended by an advertisement in a different language," he said.
"There's some people who would like to turn the clock back 50 years when all the immigrants to Canada came from Europe. It's a different world."

I hold strong beliefs in personal freedom too and also enjoy experiencing influences of other cultures within this country and beyond. I should be free to understand what commercial offerings are in our marketplace. By these signs being in Mandarin, I have no idea what they are advertising, but clearly the underlying message is "non Chinese speakers are unwelcome". Is that not counter to the creation of an inclusive Canadian society? Its not a question of turning the clock back 50 years or being racist; the Germans, Dutch, Italians, Swedish, and recently Iranians all made sucessful efforts to integrate. We have a culture, society, country and municipality
we are proud of. Communication in a common language is central to its preservation and our children's future, of all ethnic groups.

Best Regards
s. 22(1)
The Manager,
Legislative Services/Municipal Clerk
District of West Vancouver Municipal Hall
750, 17th Street, West Vancouver, BC

Re: Proposed Development Permit No. 13-067: Park Royal Mall North.

Dear Sirs:

I reside at Park Royal Towers, adjacent to Park Royal North. Our residents have been quite adversely affected by the Mall's recent development. We do not have any confidence now about the ability or will of the parties involved to consider the basic needs of our 400+ families "neighbourhood" – not to be confused with the “Neighbourhood” the Mall is now promoting.

Here's the pattern:

1. The development resulted in the discontinuation of the 239 "Park Royal" bus service to the north Mall for months. When this started, we were forced off the bus at the Lions Gate Bridge: no drop off even at the south Mall turnaround.

2. The development, apparently with the Council's approval, resulted in emergency vehicles being unable to reach Park Royal Towers (PRT) from the west without driving the full depth of the Mall parking lot, and almost all the way back out again to make a hairpin turn at an uncontrolled 3-way intersection over an embankment, into an oncoming lane. Emergency vehicles leaving the Towers must navigate the same turn and meander through the Mall parking in order to proceed east on Marine Drive to the hospital. The development will not address issues caused in their last redevelopment. However, they ARE planning to add truck access from Marine Drive at that very location. This will apparently be through a pedestrian crossing right into an uncontrolled 4-way intersection, joining to the aforementioned 3-way uncontrolled intersection, in less than a car length? This was stated by the Vice-President of “Community Partnerships and Development”. The plan could not possibly be any more ironic.

3. The development resulted in the removal of two overpasses, once specifically designed for pedestrian traffic to the south mall and the Vancouver/eastbound bus stop. I am in agreement with the fencing that prohibits the jaywalking which was rampant in the block. When the developer mentioned that your famous "poll" indicated the overpass was hardly used, everyone present from PRT were very dubious that such a poll even existed. I myself counted nine people using the overpass in less than 15 mins: four came for the bus, the others for the Village. That doesn't include the people who also jaywalked.
4. A slap in the face following point 3: the development/Council placed the crosswalk closest to PRT on the east side of the new intersection. The east Mall already has two pedestrian-controlled crossings! All tenants in PRT now have to "walk the box" to get back to our bus stop.

5. The development/Council took months to establish the promised traffic sensors in that intersection, requiring us to wait through pointless light changes.

6. I was assured by a call to City Hall that no west-bound entrances to Park Royal Towers would be removed, when in fact one was removed. We now have one.

New Proposal Notes:

This new proposal includes an off-ramp running down the far west edge of the new rooftop - which curls down to the only wheelchair ramp coming off our sidewalk. I use "ramp" advisedly: it is a rough blob of tarmac. This sidewalk is made impassible for wheelchairs and walkers by inclusion of lamp standards and overgrowth, forcing the tenants to walk in traffic. This and the planned truck access will result in more dangerous and awkward movement for vehicles and pedestrians who are forced to travel across Mall properties to access municipal areas and services.

I feel that the pattern of this developer and the Council displays complete disregard for the residents of Park Royal Towers, from hit-and-miss wheelchair access and people tripping over chunks of concrete left on Marine Drive sidewalks to emergency vehicle access.

You must address the issues of safety and access of Park Royal Towers residents to municipal areas and services. All 400+ families of us.

Sincerely,
Truck license plate is here at 6.30 am!! Pic attached

----- Original Message -----

From: Sarah Almas  
To: Nora Gambioli; MayorandCouncil; Michael Smith  
Cc: Bill Soprovich; Paul Reece  
Sent: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 5:36 PM  
Subject: RE: Collingwood noise exemption

Good evening

Thank you for your email. Construction noise is permitted during the following hours:

7:30am- 5:30pm Monday- Friday  
8:00am- 5:00pm Saturday  

No Construction Noise Sundays or Holidays

While our Bylaw Officers are unable to attend every day due to our responsibility to balance our presence throughout the District, we are monitoring Collingwood for compliance regularly. Any contraventions can be reported to our Bylaw Services front counter line at 604-925-7152. Our Bylaw Officers work 8am to 8pm, 7 days a week and we currently have an officer starting at 7am for construction standards patrols.

You may reach our voicemail after 4:30pm, however, please leave a message included a brief description of the contravention, the location, your name and contact information. Bylaw Officers check messages regularly and will ensure a call for service is created for response.

For additional information, an officer is scheduled to attend Collingwood this evening to monitor for compliance with the construction noise regulations.

Thank you,

Sarah Almas  
Manager, Bylaw and Licensing Services | District of West Vancouver  
d: 604-925-7153 | westvancouver.ca

This email and any files transmitted with it are considered confidential and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are intended. If you are not the intended recipient or the person responsible for delivering the email to the intended recipient, be advised that you have received this email in error and that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete all copies of this email and attachment(s). Thank you.
Subject: Re: Collingwood noise exemption  
Importance: High  

Thank you, what is now allowed time to make a noise? Workers are coming before 6 am and still there si work performed and NOISE after 5.15 pm  

What is the best number to call By Law Office to supervise this?  

I just do hope this "Mayor" will be FIRED by citizens very soon!  

Mr. MAYOR COME AND ENJOY THE DAY AT MY BACKYARD!!! TODAY AND ON THE WEEKEND!!!  

thank you  

regards

----- Original Message -----  
From: Nora Gambioli  
To: [Redacted]  
Sent: Wednesday, July 09, 2014 12:52 PM  
Subject: Collingwood noise exemption  
Hello  

This is to thank you for your recent correspondence to Mayor & Council. As you may be aware, the proposed noise exemption bylaw was turned down by Council on Monday.

Nora Gambioli  
Councillor, District of West Vancouver  
604-653-8823  
Please contact me 9am-3pm, M, W, F
It is 6.30am and there is already a noise from construction activity I suggest you will get someone here to witness it each day!!

----- Original Message ----- 

From: Sarah Almas  
To: Nora Gambioli; MayorandCouncil; Michael Smith  
Cc: Bill Soprovich; Paul Reece  
Sent: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 5:36 PM  
Subject: RE: Collingwood noise exemption  

Good evening  

Thank you for your email. Construction noise is permitted during the following hours:

7:30am- 5:30pm Monday- Friday  
8:00am- 5:00pm Saturday  
No Construction Noise Sundays or Holidays  

While our Bylaw Officers are unable to attend every day due to our responsibility to balance our presence throughout the District, we are monitoring Collingwood for compliance regularly. Any contraventions can be reported to our Bylaw Services front counter line at 604-925-7152. Our Bylaw Officers work 8am to 8pm, 7 days a week and we currently have an officer starting at 7am for construction standards patrols.

You may reach our voicemail after 4:30pm, however, please leave a message included a brief description of the contravention, the location, your name and contact information. Bylaw Officers check messages regularly and will ensure a call for service is created for response.

For additional information, an officer is scheduled to attend Collingwood this evening to monitor for compliance with the construction noise regulations.

Thank you,  
Sarah

Sarah Almas  
Manager, Bylaw and Licensing Services | District of West Vancouver  
d: 604-925-7153 | westvancouver.ca  

This email and any files transmitted with it are considered confidential and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are intended. If you are not the intended recipient or the person responsible for delivering the email to the intended recipient, be advised that you have received this email in error and that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete all copies of this email and attachment(s). Thank you.
Subject: Re: Collingwood noise exemption
Importance: High

Thank you, what is now allowed time to make a noise? Workers are coming before 6 am and still there si work performed and NOISE after 5.15 pm

What is the best number to call By Law Office to supervise this?

I just do hope this "Mayor" will be FIRED by citizens very soon!

Mr. MAYOR COME AND ENJOY THE DAY AT MY BACKYARD!!! TODAY AND ON THE WEEKEND!!!

thank you

regards

s. 22(1)

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Nora Gambioli
To: s. 22(1)
Sent: Wednesday, July 09, 2014 12:52 PM
Subject: Collingwood noise exemption

Hello  s. 22(1)
This is to thank you for your recent correspondence to Mayor & Council.
As you may be aware, the proposed noise exemption bylaw was turned down by Council on Monday.

Nora Gambioli
Councillor, District of West Vancouver
604-653-8823
Please contact me 9am-3pm, M, W, F
Thursday, July 17, 2014

Mayor Michael Smith and Council
City of West Vancouver
750 – 17th Street
West Vancouver, BC
V7V 3T3

RE: Invitation to the 2014 A&W Cruisin’ to End MS

Dear Mayor Michael Smith and Council,

On Thursday, August 21, 2014, more than 800 A&W restaurants across the country will participate in Cruisin’ to End MS in support of the 100,000 Canadians with multiple sclerosis, as well as their families and loved ones. As part of Cruisin’ to End MS, one dollar from every Teen Burger® sold will be donated to the Multiple Sclerosis Society of Canada to help fund vital MS research, government advocacy, financial support and wellness programs that empower people impacted by the disease.

Please drop by your local A&W at Park Royal South to eat a Teen Burger® on August 21 and help us raise funds for people affected by MS and promote awareness of the disease.

Gather in a fun and festive atmosphere celebrating our community’s effort to help end MS. The A&W Great Root Bear, MS Society volunteers and staff and people living with MS will be onsite to show appreciation of your support. Invitations to media will also be issued.

To better organize your visit, please let us know what time you will be arriving. You can contact us at 604-602-3208. If you can’t join us at the location listed above, please visit www.aw.ca/awhome.nsf/location for other A&W stores near you.

We appreciate your support in making this year’s event a success. Please share this information by publishing it in your constituency newsletter, posting it on your website and by encouraging your constituents to visit us at www.cruisintoendms.ca.

Thank you in advance for helping us raise awareness about MS and Cruisin’ to End MS. You are contributing to our country’s efforts to end this disease.

Yours sincerely,

Stephanie Mosher
Corporate Relations Specialist
Multiple Sclerosis Society of Canada – BC & Yukon Division
p: 604-602-3208
e: stephanie.mosher@mssociety.ca
From: Ian Haras
Sent: July-16-14 5:24 PM
To: Mayor and Council; Anne Mooi; Andrew Banks
Cc: Horseshoe Bay Park -- Park Maintenance -- Garbage

Dear s. 22(1)

Thank you for your email and your comments regarding the garbage in Horseshoe Bay. I have been asked to respond to you on behalf of the Parks Department.

The photo you attached was one of our in ground garbage cans located at the foot of the pier. Typically people travelling from various islands use this garbage can as a convenient drop off location for their personal garbage. It is our expectation that people take their garbage home for curb side pickup. This does not always happen and during the busy summer months, garbage is frequently left in large bags adjacent to the garbage can.

We have been meeting with the HSB Business Association to discuss strategies regarding garbage and have just implemented an afternoon garbage shift that will work Thursday to Monday to attend to this high use park, to improve service.

Thanks again for your email and please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Regards,
Ian Haras, BCSLA, CSLA
Manager of Parks Operations | District of West Vancouver
604-925-7143 | westvancouver.ca
From: 
Sent: July-02-14 8:52 AM 
To: MayorandCouncil 
Subject: Horseshoe Bay Park -- Park Maintenance -- Garbage

Your Worship,

For all the hoopla about the beauty of West Vancouver, etc., one constant remains ever present: The Parks Department appears incapable of keeping up with the production of garbage and the dispersal of garbage around and about the garbage cans at Horseshoe Bay Park. For whatever reason (or corporate “rationalizing”, if you like) the Parks Dept. remains negligent when it comes to maintaining the park in a presentable condition. This is the general condition of Horseshoe Bay Park during and following weekends and during and following statutory holidays whether it is Winter, Spring, Summer, or Autumn. It is a corporate culture problem, i.e., it is endemic to the Parks Dept. It hasn’t changed in years, and it matters not one wit whether it is a Doug Leavers in charge of the Dept. or an Andrew Banks in charge of the Dept. It doesn’t seem to matter if it’s Anne Mooi at the head of the Dept. or Kevin Pike - each one is incompetent in his or her own way when it comes to maintaining the park.

We see in the picture below (taken early this morning) three ravens who have arrived to partake of the feast provided by garbage left unattended by Parks Dept. staff. Earlier it was rats and skunks. Seagulls and crows were there until the ravens arrived. It was the same yesterday morning, only instead of just one garbage can with garbage laying around it, it was this garbage receptacle plus four other garbage cans in the same condition as this one. What’s the cause? Well, Horseshoe Bay Park is a regional destination park. The Parks Dept. is well aware of this status. Horseshoe Bay despite its distance from the central core is an attractive weekend outing for many residents of the Lower Mainland. And the residents of this part of West Vancouver embrace that status – it benefits the local businesses and keeps them viable which in turn makes the community viable. But it comes with a cost. The cost is the problem of garbage and refuse containment and removal which task is the responsibility of the WV Parks Dept. But the Parks Dept. has a bias, and that bias sees the Dept. neglect the upkeep of the park during the high usage periods, and that negligence gives rise to the issue of unsightly displays which detract from the park’s ambience and give WV a poor reputation for cleanliness of its parks. As I mention above, this is nothing new – it was as endemic under Kevin Pike as it is today under Anne Mooi. The Department’s negligence is ingrained, but hopefully not indelibly so.

So, why have I elected to write to you today? Well, because after many years’ of effort to find a resolution by speaking with staff in the past, I have determined that perhaps bringing the matter to the attention of our elected representatives a better outcome might be obtained. What do think? Is it worth the candle? Perhaps, you and your colleagues on Council can give it the old college try. Because despite all of my efforts and jawboning in the past, the Parks Department remains reprobate in this area. Have a go at it, and see if you can’t do better – it might just get some result, if only for a while. But then something is better than nothing at all, isn’t it?

Respectfully yours,

/s/

West Vancouver, BC