



Memo

February 10, 2015

File:

TO: Mayor Richard Walton and Council

FROM: Councillor Lisa Muri

SUBJECT: Pace of Development Discussions

Recommendations:

That Council

- a) defer further consideration of new development applications no later than May 31, 2015, in order to allow appropriate time for staff to create a geographic development phasing strategy for current and future rezoning, traffic and capital infrastructure projects, taking into consideration DP applications;
- b) begin a review of the OCP, its implementations, visions and principles; and further
- c) Staff reviews the development application process to include a preliminary process for council to consider individual projects earlier on.

Discussion:

During the last term of Council, development and the pace of development arising from the implementation of the OCP was discussed by Council a number of times. As we experienced traffic disruption and congestion on Highway 1 and on roads throughout the District, Council directed Staff to attempt to determine the causes and identify steps that could be taken to improve the situation. During the last election, many residents linked our transportation problems to the pace of development on the North Shore and called upon candidates to slow development down in the District until solutions to our transportation problems could be addressed.

In response to the traffic issues on Highway 1, Staff has been working with the Province to determine the causes and reach an agreement on steps to improve the Second Narrows bridgehead. In response to the traffic issues within the District, the Streets and Traffic Bylaw has been amended to give staff more control over disruptions caused by construction and assembled a small team to better manage and co-ordinate traffic disruption caused by development and construction within the road right of way. Both

the bridgehead improvements proposed by MoTI and the transit improvements proposed by TransLink (subject to referendum) will offer some relief but there is no certainty with respect to if and when these improvements will be made. Council recently passed a resolution recommended by Councillor MacKay Dunn to examine this on a North Shore wide basis.

In response to concerns expressed over the pace and impact of development, Council and Staff have commenced a series of discussions in order to better understand what is occurring; arrive at some conclusion based on the information that is available; and agree on steps that can be taken to reduce any negative impact on our community. We have received one presentation in early January by Mr. Bydwell, an overview of the OCP and a series of slides illustrating where we are to date. Two more presentations are scheduled in February and March to look at Traffic Issues, and Construction Management. Advancing any further rezoning applications could negatively impact any ability to manage those outcomes in a thoughtful, informed and responsible way. Approving current rezoning applications without a plan will create a collision of projects and further exacerbate our current traffic situation. Example is Bosa coming forward in June for a DP for 362 Condos on 27th and Mt. Highway, and under the current timeline Polygon coming forward in March with a rezoning application for 321 units directly across the street.

Currently, under the existing development timeline, there are 788 units that will be coming forward to Council before June of this year for Development Permits. As well, there are 498 units being considered for rezoning before May. Council does have the ability to approve or reject rezoning applications, but DP's are required by the Developer to begin construction and Council has very limited ability to reject them, therefore, a significant amount of development will commence in the coming months. Many of these applications will be happening in areas that have significant projects occurring, such as the replacement of the Keith Rd. Bridge and the addition of a further 310 units at Seylenn. As well, Larco will be submitting their DP application for the first 2 phases totaling 228 units for consideration in Lower Capilano in the Fall and Metro is about to commence work on their 9 month water main replacement in Upper Capilano. The DP application for the Grouse Inn has still not been submitted. Larco and Grouse Inn will have a total of 740 units coming forward. When a phased development plan is considered, it is imperative to consider all work in one given area so as not to overlap projects, create development gridlock, limiting the livability to our residents and the movement of goods for our businesses.

- Since the adoption of the OCP, 392 units have been constructed and occupied, 2739 units have been approved for construction. And applications for a further 2150 units will likely be submitted for consideration by Council in the future for a total of 4889 units.

- Because of the age of the District single family housing stock a significant number of houses (520) are being replaced or renovated, many with secondary suites, as well as the ability to add Coach Houses
- The OCP defines a rate of development at 500 per year, the problem with this number is it does not define what 500 is. Is it rezoning applications for 500 units per year, or 500 DP's per year? We need to define how we are going to use this number. Currently there are 788 units up for DP approval before the end of June.

We need to create a robust monitoring and implementation plan, for Council to provide early direction on development applications. In addition we need a phased development plan for Lynn Valley, Capilano, Lower Lynn and Maplewood centres, protection of older rental units to allow for the continued existence of affordability. Are the services and business contemplated within the sustainable vision of the OCP becoming a reality? If so, are we able to reduce our dependence on the car, and if not, where do we need to rethink our direction and the creation of sound construction traffic and infrastructure management plans?

This memorandum is intended to solicit Council support for a moratorium on consideration of new multi-family developments until Council's discussions regarding the pace of development and discussion of the traffic implications are concluded. This delay would also allow Staff to prepare a geographical phasing plan for development, traffic improvements and infrastructure to come forward. Under the current list, a majority of projects are small, so the assumption is that they can turn around in 4 to 6 weeks on average. Their impact and those single family rebuilds create a significant impact, as well as the large multi-year project. The implications of these multiple projects being approved on an overlapping basis, in my opinion, will cause construction and traffic gridlock as our geography across the District is challenging and ingress and egress points are limited.

To assist Council in our discussion of my recommended resolution, I am providing the following examples of the information and issues that I feel need to be considered before we continue down the development trail.

1. In addition to the information provided on District development applications, we need:
 - a) Geographic phasing strategy to manage development and infrastructure projects
 - b) A comprehensive list of the significant utility projects (DNV, Metro, Fortis, Telus, Shaw etc.) contemplated in the next ten years including timelines
 - c) A comprehensive list of the significant transportation and transit projects (DNV, TransLink, Province, etc.) contemplated in the next ten years

- d) A list of known significant non-residential private and public projects planned for in the next ten years (waterfront industry, recreation facilities, Metro facilities such as the Sewage Treatment plant etc.)
 - e) An indication of the projects and development activity that may occur in the City of North Vancouver, District of West Vancouver, First Nation Reserves and Port lands
 - f) Clear information on traffic movement (people and goods) during peak and non-peak times
 - g) More information on the extent of and impact of single family replacements and renovation on local neighbourhoods
 - h) A financial analysis of the impact of community amenities contributed through development on future expansions, maintenance and replacement costs to the District
 - i) Review of preliminary applications before they advance
 - j) Definition of 500 unit count per year
 - k) Review of single family permits and impact, including massing and local neighborhood impact
 - l) Review of the OCP Implementation Committee and their term of reference
2. A better system on how we measure progress, activity and impact of the implementation of the OCP. Are we in ensuring that projects that are being considered and then constructed are consistent with the vision, principles and standards contained in the OCP and related Plans? One way of doing this is reviewing the projects approved and/or constructed to date.
3. Discussion of the Staff observations provided January 20 to determine what, if any, action should be taken with respect to them.
4. What options exist with respect to the possible phasing of development and/or significant projects, perhaps focusing at the neighbourhood level?

I provide the above examples not because I wish to stop development but rather because I fear that all the anticipated activity will overwhelm us, resulting in more negative community impacts than positive benefit if we do not properly manage it. I sincerely hope Council will consider supporting the resolution.



Councillor Lisa Muri