

# Meeting Notes

## Grandview Heights NCP #4 Citizen's Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting

### August 30, 2012

---

File: 6520-20 (GH NCP #4)  
Date: August 30, 2012  
Time: 5:45 p.m.  
Location: Surrey City Hall,  
Planning Room 1

#### In Attendance:

##### CAC Members:

Hugh Carter  
Eric Chen  
Rene Desrosiers  
Anthony Hepworth  
Avtar Johl  
Brad Lambert  
Aman Sandhu  
Bernie Scholz

##### Community Association Rep.'s

Cindy Lighthead

##### City Staff:

Remi Dube  
Stephen Godwin  
Don Luymes  
Doug Merry  
Mira Petrovic  
Fay Keng Wong

##### Regrets:

Arnold Fenrick  
Bhargav Parghi  
Norm Porter  
Mike Proskow  
Delmar Robertson  
Prit Pal Sandhu

##### Consultants:

John Steil  
Marc Bonner

*The following is a summary of the discussions that occurred at the meeting:*

#### 1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS (Don Luymes, All)

- Don Luymes welcomed everyone in attendance and introductions were made around the table.
- An updated Agenda and updated November 24, 2011 CAC Meeting Notes, as well as a copy of the Draft Preferred Land Use Option and accompanying table, were distributed to the CAC members.

#### 2. CAC MEMBERSHIP (Don Luymes)

##### a. Nadine Adams

- Nadine Adams has asked if she can step off the committee (with Rene Desrosiers as her permanent replacement) but sit in on CAC meetings as an observer.
- The CAC had no objections.

##### b. Vena Sandhu

- Vena Sandhu has requested that her husband, Aman Sandhu, replace her on the CAC.
- The CAC was fine with this.

#### 3. NOVEMBER 24, 2011 CAC MEETING NOTES (Fay Wong)

- Since the last CAC Meeting Notes (from November 24, 2011) were sent out, a couple of CAC members requested changes to the Meeting Notes. One change is under Section 2.b., Questions & Comments from the CAC, in the 9<sup>th</sup> bullet. Brad Lambert added a phrase to the

first sentence of this bullet. The second change is the addition of the last bullet under Section 2.c., Question & Comments from the CAC, by Rene.

- The CAC was okay with the changes to the Meeting Notes.

#### 4. UPDATES

##### a. Preferred Land Use Option (John Steil, Don Luymes)

- John Steil provided an update on the Draft Preferred Land Use Option. The draft plan has been fine tuned. The differences between the fifth and sixth drafts are subtle changes and include the following:
  - The road that intersected the northern ends of 180 St and 182 St and that joined those two streets now connects the northern ends of 181 St and 182 St instead.
  - A green strip Riparian Area has been added along the west side of 184 St, between 24 Ave and 23 Ave.
  - After looking at the topography of the area, the School District requested to place the school on flatter land. Hence, the Wildlife Corridor/Greenway has been angled and shifted slightly to the east.
  - The block north of 24 Ave, between 179 St and 180 St, has increased in density from 15 upa to 30 upa.
  - The north-south road (177 St) has been straightened so that it is not so curvy.
  - A red-coded (Class A) creek, located in the northern tip of the NCP area, was missed on the last draft and is now shown.
- Don met with the agent for the Science of the Soul property, who requested that the townhouse designation be changed to single family because that seems more achievable for them and their property is also adjacent to single family along Hwy 15. This makes sense and the City will support this change to the draft land use plan.

##### Questions & Comments from the CAC

- Tony Hepworth commented that the streets on his land result in the development being broken up into small parcels. Are the local street layouts negotiable? John Steil responded that the principle of 100 m x 200 m blocks has always been in the plan and will provide flexibility in the form of the access. Tony further commented that it seems that the resulting development sites would be too small for townhouse development. Don added that some of this can be worked out at the development application stage. What we want to avoid are very large blocks, and this depends on assembly and project design.
- Hugh Carter commented that he has a 10 acre piece abutting 179 St and there is a stormwater pond, wildlife corridor, and residential transitional on his property. Hugh does not like the location of the wildlife corridor on his property. John responded that for the effectiveness of wildlife corridors, the width needs to be sufficient, and that connecting natural areas with continuous corridors is important.
- Hugh asked if the wildlife corridor could shift so there could be more development on the west. Don responded that density on the west was what was originally shown as an option, but, at the request of Qualico (Hugh's company), it was changed to what is now shown – Medium Density Residential (15 upa) west of the Wildlife Corridor, and Residential Transition east of the Wildlife Corridor. Residential transition east of the wildlife corridor works well with adjacent rural Redwood Park estate homes. The alternative to this would be a more substantial buffer.
- Hugh further commented that Qualico's main issue is that they want to densify as much as possible. Don responded that the issues of the residents of the Redwood Park area must also

be considered. Cindy Lightheart commented that the main concern of Redwood Park residents is retaining the wildlife corridor. Keep the wildlife corridor as healthy as possible because it benefits the environment (keeps the air clean). The wider it remains, the healthier it is. Leave it as it is now. The area is the way it is because of the wildlife corridor. Avtar Johl commented that the density should be kept to the west as much as possible.

- Hugh asked what the dimensions of their developable land will be. John responded that it may be better to change the shape of the pond to allow better access to the development parcel. Don commented that Paul Rollo's report will also be looked at to see if there is anything that can be done through a green space levy.
- Bernie Scholz asked what a "green street" is. Is it for pedestrians, bikes, etc.? Mira Petrovic commented that a green road could have pavement, curb, meandering sidewalk to protect trees, etc. John added that there are various existing examples of green streets, such as Crown Street in Vancouver which has a narrow, meandering pavement with swales, etc.
- Avtar asked if the example in Grandview Heights NCP #2 is wide enough for 2-way traffic. Don responded yes.
- Eric Chen commented that too much of his property is designated greenspace and road. Don responded that roads are necessary in order to access the homes that will be developed.
- Eric further commented his concern over the park designation on his property. Don responded that if the City determines that a park is needed and decides to purchase land for park, it purchases it at fair market value equivalent to neighbouring, adjacent uses. The property owner can choose to not sell to the City. Park space is not a loss because the City buys it at market value.

#### **b. Status of the Transportation Study (John Steil)**

- John provided an update on the transportation study. The City has looked at the existing traffic model on a sub-area basis and the transportation model (modelling results) should be done by the end of October. We have to make sure that all the intersections work in the plan. The modelling results will not affect the land use plan, but may impact the road classifications, costs, number of traffic signals, etc. Mira noted that there will not be any new arterial roads beyond those already shown in the plan. There will be collector roads but they will not make a difference in the land use designation, only on the road width to support parking, bike lanes, etc., which may affect statutory right of ways.
- A CAC member asked what is the classification of 24 Ave? Mira responded that it is an arterial. In the future, there may be up to 6 lanes required for this road.
- Cindy asked if there would be any potential for a park and ride facility in the plan area. Don responded that in the future there will be bus stops on 24 Avenue, but there is no plan for a park and ride here. Mira commented that the form of transit depends on TransLink. Don added that 24 Ave is on TransLink's future transit network and transit there will increase as ridership/population increases. A lot of the north-south streets will make it easier for people to walk to the bus. The neighbourhood plan would allow for bus routes if this was deemed feasible in the future.
- Cindy commented that, in the draft plan, looking at these streets with the thoroughfare and small blocks, is there a way to make them look different, such as like cul-de-sacs? Don responded that the philosophy of planning in general is to develop an interconnected street grid system, which builds good neighbourhoods. Cul-de-sacs only work in very low densities. Cul-de-sacs do not work with higher densities because it pinches traffic onto only a few collector roads, creating congestion. Mira commented that an interconnected street grid allows people to walk shorter distances to transit and increases safety by creating an open, rather than gated, community.

### c. Engineering Infrastructure Costs (Remi Dube)

- Remi Dube provided an update on the Engineering infrastructure costs. The City has been working on the engineering costs, has received preliminary costs from Stantec, reviewed them and sent them back to Stantec, and Stantec is now refining them based on the City's input and the servicing concepts drawn from the latest road network. Stantec has also given some data to Rollo. Considering contingency allowances, the Engineering infrastructure costs do not differ much between Draft Preferred Land Use Option #5 (on which they were based) and #6. Remi does not have numbers tonight because they are still draft.

#### Questions & Comments from the CAC

- Avtar asked if the Engineering infrastructure costs will be broken down into on-site and off-site costs. Remi responded yes, we are just dealing with DCC costs, looking at trunks, ponds, etc. It will be a functional design as opposed to a concept design. Calculation of on-site costs is the responsibility of the landowners.
- Hugh commented that the concern seems to be the timing of the plan. Is there a way to start some of the servicing work now? Remi responded no, Engineering's work plan for this year is done. There are other higher priority areas and areas that need upgrades. There are also limited staff resources available. John added that Stage 1 has to be approved by Council first. Servicing costs are usually done during Stage 2. Avtar commented that he does not think the servicing will hold up the process because servicing will be addressed during Stage 2.
- Avtar commented that while the first one to develop will have to pay for the servicing, the developers who come in later will likely bring the traffic problem that will require a traffic signal. Mira responded that individual traffic impact studies are done with each application.
- Cindy asked what is going to happen in terms of drainage for the Redwood Park estates? Remi responded that NCPs generally result in a better drainage situation (water is taken away with the installation of drainage systems in the NCP areas) for areas such as the Redwood Park estates. Servicing will not be brought in unless residents opt in/pay for it.
- Hugh asked if anything came up from the engineering infrastructure costs study that was not anticipated. Marc responded, no, but mentioned that there may be some refinements required on the exact routing of the trunk sewers along the northern boundary of the NCP. However, this is all more detail than would normally be done at Stage 1.
- Avtar asked if it is really the off-site costs that are adding to the costs? Remi responded that the costs of the detention ponds are significant, since ponds need to be located on sloping lands. Off-site costs of extending the sanitary sewer trunk are significant, though not as significant as the drainage infrastructure costs. Don commented that there are a lot of "fingers" of creeks so a lot of smaller ponds are needed, which are expensive. Remi added that none of these works are in the City's current 10-year plan. When an NCP goes to Council, a decision has to be made whether the trunk services should be included in the 10 year plan. The City balances the need to keep DCC rates competitive across the City with the need to open up new NCP areas in making these decisions.
- Avtar asked if normally DCC items are added once the plan is complete. Remi responded that the Anniedale-Tynehead NCP is an example of where an area-specific DCC rate structure was implemented, with DCC rates that are higher than in the rest of the City, to cover the cost of infrastructure in this NCP.
- Avtar commented that most of the NCPs have been added to the 10-year plan, except Anniedale-Tynehead and a few others? Remi responded yes. Don commented that in this NCP, we are looking further into the costing information at Stage 1, than is normally done for other NCPs. One of the reasons why the land use plan was delayed is that Paul Rollo's work in assessing the viability of the green levy is contingent on what the developers would have to pay. We sent the preliminary costs to Rollo Associates to answer if this neighbourhood can

afford to pay beyond the typical park amount. If it cannot, we need to inform Council on that. Rollo Associates will need a couple more weeks to complete their report.

## **5. NEXT STEPS (Don Luymes)**

- The City will receive the Rollo report in mid-September and the results may require some adjustments to the draft plan. Assuming that it does not, then the draft plan will be very close to being done.
- The next CAC meeting will be at the end of September or early October. The draft plan presented at that meeting will be the Preferred Plan accompanied with Rollo's report on how the green space levy will be applied on a per acre or per unit basis (or some other variation).
- Assuming there are no major adjustments, a report may go to Council in late October or early November showing Council the Preferred Plan and to get authorization to take the Preferred Plan to a Public Open House later in November (the final public meeting). In the mean time, transportation and costing will be worked on. It is anticipated that the finalized Stage 1 plan will go to Council early in the New Year (2013).
- Development applications can typically be received at the end of Stage 1 but are not approved until the end of Stage 2.

## **6. ITEMS FROM CAC**

- Tony asked if Rollo is making estimates on land value in this area? Don responded yes, Rollo has talked to the City's realty division to establish reasonable market valuations.
- Don noted that Mike Proskow sent him an e-mail to note that Mike's major concern is the potential for cut-through traffic running through Country Woods Estates via 28A Ave from NCP #4 and to avoid this from happening. This street was recently "traffic calmed" and is not intended as a means to avoid congestion at the traffic light at 32 Ave and Highway 1.
- Rene Desrosiers suggested that CAC meeting material always be sent to the CAC before the meeting.

## **7. ADJOURN**

- City staff will determine a date for the next CAC meeting and will notify the CAC.
- The meeting adjourned at 7:38 pm.