

**Subject: [Fwd: Re: Omitted OCP process - Seniors Development 100 Block W. Queens/29th]**

**Date:** Wed, 23 Jun 2004 14:44:28 -0700

**From:** Brian Platts <bplatts@shaw.ca>

**To:** Corrie Kost <kost@triumf.ca>

---

**Subject: RE: Omitted OCP process - Seniors Development 100 Block W. Queens/29th**

**Date:** Wed, 23 Jun 2004 10:54:58 -0700

**From:** James Ridge <James\_Ridge@dnv.org>

**To:** Elizabeth James <cagebc@yahoo.com>, Ernie Crist <ernie\_crist@dnv.org>, "DeJong, Allan" <allan.dejong@ubc.ca>, Senior Management Committee <managecomm@dnv.org>, Nathalie Valdes <Nathalie\_Valdes@dnv.org>, Mark Bostwick <Mark\_Bostwick@dnv.org>

**CC:** fonvca@fonvca.org, Agnes Hilsen <Agnes\_Hilsen@dnv.org>, Mayor and Council - DNV <Council@dnv.org>

Ms. James,

This application has been in process since spring of 2003 when the proponents submitted a preliminary application. The proponents hosted a public meeting on April 21, 2003 with residents in an effort to obtain early input and address concerns. The formal application was submitted on Sept. 18, 2003 and the required public information meeting was held on January 28, 2004. Residents within 950 meters of the site were invited. The concerns were noted and adjustments made. After the April 19, 2004 consideration by Council it was referred back to the applicant to address outstanding issues. Two facilitated workshops were held; one on May 12, 2004 and one on May 19, 2004. A final summary report from the facilitator was completed on May 28, 2004, and more adjustments made. Now it is the subject of a public hearing which started last night, the fifth opportunity for public input.

In short, even before a public hearing there have been four public input sessions on this development, one of which occurred even before the formal application was submitted.

I don't think it follows that because consensus has not been reached, the process is therefore flawed. While consensus is certainly desirable it is not always obtainable. This is when Council must weigh the concerns of the public and the needs of the community for seniors facilities, and make a decision (a difficult task).

James Ridge  
CAO

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

**From:** Elizabeth James [mailto:cagebc@yahoo.com]

**Sent:** Tuesday, June 22, 2004 10:53 AM

**To:** Ernie Crist; DeJong, Allan; Senior Management Committee; James Ridge; Nathalie Valdes; Mark Bostwick

**Cc:** fonvca@fonvca.org; Agnes Hilsen; Cagebc@yahoo.com; Mayor and Council - DNV

**Subject:** RE: Omitted OCP process - Seniors Development 100 Block W. Queens/29th

22 June 2004

Dear Clr. Crist:

During the course of a public hearing which formed part of last night's meeting of North Vancouver City Council, a councillor made the following comment: **"It should be well known by now that it is the responsibility of property owners - and their developers and architects - to consult with their neighbours at the beginning of the process, not six months later. This was not done in this case, the neighbours oppose this development, they are well-organized and reasonable - so I will not be supporting the application."** City Council made a unanimous decision to reject.

The next application was approved because the reverse was true. And so it went throughout the evening.

From the information provided by Mr. DeJong, it would appear that the District hasn't yet come to grips with applying a democratic process to development applications.....even when the developer is the municipality itself. Once again, as with the Edgemont Liquor store application and the Lynn Valley Centre re-development, the District is faced with trying to close the barn door after the horse is long gone.

Mr. Ridge has been faced with an enormous task, in his efforts to raise the District operation from its place at the bottom of the heap nationally. Hopefully, with the upcoming additions to senior staff, he soon will be able to conduct

a complete review of zoning by-laws, as they mesh with guidelines in the various OCP's and the changes likely to be imposed by upcoming redevelopments throughout the community. Taxpayers are tired of being caught behind the 8-ball.

Whether such a review will be in time to assist Mr. deJong and his neighbours remains to be seen but, for the sake of all, it is to be hoped that Mr. Ridge can initiate and mediate a meeting between staff and the Queens Road neighbourhood, so that an outcome can be designed that will benefit all.

Sincerely,

Liz James

**Ernie Crist** <[ernie\\_crist@dnv.org](mailto:ernie_crist@dnv.org)> wrote:

Dear Mr. Dejong:

Your concerns will be taken into consideration if and when this item goes to public hearing and subsequently goes back to Council for debate and a final decision. The problem with this as with so many other projects is that the District failed to protect and use its Heritage Fund which among others was supposed to be used for land assemblies, to rezone such appropriate parcels of land and sell it to developers under conditions including design guidelines which would enhance the community and protect residents such as yourself. It falls under the concept of modern and comprehensive community planning. As such it is taught in all but third class institutions of learning in town planning.

In the District this too was the plan except it was never done. The idea fell victim to mediocrity, plain political opportunism and the proverbial "I'm all right Jack philosophy". Instead, the Heritage Fund was misused more or less while the chaotic process such as we are now witnessing has continued with predictable results.

Any and all efforts on my part as well as other Councillors such as Pat Munroe for instance who shared this philosophy met with total apathy. It was total and included not only the general public and elected representatives but also those organizations who now clamor for badly needed housing for seniors. The upshot of all this is that now our design and development options are correspondingly limited.

The real issue is this? ...Do we stop this development because it is not perfect even though it is badly needed or do we proceed with it and by so doing punish people like yourself who have invested in their neighborhood in good faith? It has come to this, as mentioned, because of total lack of political leadership supplemented by total public apathy. Unfortunately, the public went even further. They not only stood idly by when this happened but failed even to reelect those Councillors who defended and understood the importance of such matters including the Heritage Fund as a tool for comprehensive community planning.

Notwithstanding the above, I will give the most serious consideration to your concerns.

Yours truly,

Ernie Crist

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

From: DeJong, Allan [<mailto:allan.dejong@ubc.ca>]

Sent: June 21, 2004 4:26 PM

To: Ernie Crist

Cc: 'fonvca@fonvca.org'; Agnes Hilsen

Subject: Omitted OCP process - Seniors Development 100 Block W.

Queens/29th

Dear Councilor Crist,

I seek your support and therefore write to you in regard to an OCP process issue that is of substantial concern to my neighbours and me and to, no doubt, the numerous Community Associations in the District of North Vancouver. I am a resident that lives on the North side of Queens and I write in regard to the proposed seniors development at the 100 block W. Queens/29th. Let me first say that I support the creation of seniors housing across the street, but only in a thoughtfully designed, medium-density facility.

The District of North Vancouver did not consult with adjacent neighbours to develop guidelines that would steer the design & development of any buildings proposed on 100 W. Queens/29th -as required by the North Lonsdale/Delbrook OCP (see below). The guidelines currently proposed were crafted by District Staff after the development was in an advanced design phase. Clearly, the guidelines should have been created before any developers began planning the building/site. The guidelines support the proposed development. In essence, the current development initiative has formed the guidelines; not the local community as specified by the OCP.

As an aside, if the building were more thoughtfully designed there would be far less community resistance to this proposed development. Sadly this is not the case. The proposed building is a monstrous wall that extends along Queens in excess of 100 ft and reaches up over 40 ft in height. The development blocks views of properties to the North and North East; introduces an excessive density into what is primarily a single family, residential neighbourhood; makes a cheap attempt at mirroring the qualities of the heritage homes on Queens, and if allowed to proceed will mar our neighbourhood for many decades to come.

I seek your support. Please honour our OCP -specifically the section that requires prior community involvement in guideline development. Reject the current development so that guidelines can be objectively developed, jointly between the District and the local residents. Quality, medium density seniors housing can be developed that enhances the neighbourhood; not detracts from it.

I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Allan de Jong  
144 West Queens Road

North Lonsdale - Delbrook Official Community Plan

Section 5.1.3.3

Develop further guidelines for redevelopment of the block bounded by W. Queens Road/Chesterfield Ave./W.29th St./rear of Lonsdale properties in consultation with:

the owners of the properties in this block;  
owners of properties on surrounding blocks i.e. 100 block (north) W. Queens, 200 block W. Queens, adjacent commercial uses and the Somerset Green residential complex on the south side of West 29th.

These guidelines will provide the overall format of redevelopment and will respond to the community's needs for:

view preservation and external appearance, particularly from W. Queens Road;  
gradation of densities and heights from east to west (higher towards Lonsdale, lower towards Chesterfield);  
site consolidation with the intervening lane;  
minimum site size for redevelopment.

