

# Meeting Notes

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

### November 24, 2011

---

File: 6520-20 (GH NCP #4)  
Date: November 24, 2011  
Time: 5:40 p.m.  
Location: Surrey City Hall,  
Planning Room 1

#### In Attendance:

##### CAC Members:

Marlon Carlson  
Hugh Carter  
Eric Chen  
Rene Desrosiers  
Anthony Hepworth  
Avtar Johl  
Brad Lambert  
Prit Pal Sandhu  
Vena Sandhu

##### Community Association Rep.'s

Cindy Lightheart  
Mike Proskow

##### City Staff:

Stephen Godwin  
Ileana Kosa  
Don Luymes  
Doug Merry  
Bhargav Parghi  
Mira Petrovic  
Fay Keng Wong

##### Regrets:

Nadine Adams  
Arnold Fenrick  
Norm Porter  
Delmar Robertson  
Bernie Scholz

##### Consultants:

John Steil

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

#### 1. INTRODUCTION

##### a. Welcome

- Don Luymes welcomed everyone in attendance.
- Don announced that the Public Open House for Grandview Heights NCP #5A (Orchard Grove) will be held on the evening of Tuesday, November 29<sup>th</sup>. Stage 2 of NCP #5A will be presented at the open house.

##### b. CAC Member Changes

- The Owner's Group would like to change its representatives from Chuck Brook and Paul Fenske to Hugh Carter (a property owner in NCP #4 and General Manager, Land Development of Qualico/Foxridge Homes) and Bernie Scholz (a property owner in NCP #4 and of Adam-Chris Development). Bernie was not able to attend tonight so Marlon Carlson (a local resident and investor in the area for a number of years) will be filling in for Bernie today.
- Nadine Adams also cannot attend, so Rene will be her alternate.
- Introductions were made around the table.

##### c. October 11, 2011 CAC Meeting Notes

- John Steil noted the changes that were made to the October 11, 2011 CAC Meeting Notes since they were last e-mailed to the CAC. These changes were from CAC comments.
- The Meeting Notes were accepted as amended.

## 2. PREFERRED OPTION

### a. Summary of Feedback

- A copy of the comments received from CAC members regarding the Draft Preferred Option presented at the October 11<sup>th</sup> CAC meeting was e-mailed to the CAC last week.
- Eric Chen briefly spoke of the comments he submitted, stating that the location of the road on 178 St, between 20 Ave and 24 Ave, along his property line, should be moved so that it is equally portioned between his property and the property adjacent to his.
- Rene added that the re-alignment needs to be continuous and shifted to the East so that property lines are equal part for road allowances.

### b. Revised Plan Update

- John presented the revisions that have been made to the Draft Preferred Option since the last CAC meeting.
- John and the City have consulted the Surrey School District to fine-tune the plan.
- The southeast portion of the NCP has not changed much.
- South of 24 Ave, the north-south corridor has been narrowed and lot lines have been shifted so that roads align. Lower density townhouse (about 15 upa) along Hwy 15 now continues south to 20 Ave.
- The detention pond located between 177 St, 27 Ave, 178 St, and 26 Ave has been moved to the wildlife hub, but we need an outlet for the stormwater runoff from this new location in the hub to the creek to the west. The pond at the southeast corner of 24 Ave and 178 St has been shifted to the east a bit to allow 178 St south of 24 Ave to align with 178 St north of 24 Ave, resulting in the pond overlapping a bit into the adjacent corridor. A drainage basin for each pond must have a catchment of at least 20 ha in size.
- Since it was determined that the size of the school area on 26 Ave can be reduced, the eastern half of 26 Ave (the major east-west road north of 24 Ave) has been shifted down, which will increase the size of the wildlife hub and compensate for the portion of the hub that was removed as a result of the developable area on its west widening into the hub. On the expanded southern portion of the hub, there is also a new multi-purpose pathway/greenway that connects to the nearby creek on the east and another multi-purpose pathway/greenway.

### Questions & Comments from the CAC

- Mike Proskow asked about the dual use of wildlife hubs. Stephen Godwin responded that there are a lot of times when water features like a detention pond can be a benefit in terms of creating a synergy with the wildlife hub. It also depends on where we allow access for people to go through. Having a pond in the wildlife hub may have an effect, but it is not necessarily negative as the removal of a few trees would allow for a water feature to be put in, which local wildlife may benefit as much, if not more, from.
- Mike asked if topography and depth will impact the pond. Stephen commented that the pond can be reoriented.
- Hugh asked if the standard slope ratio for a pond is 7:1 or 4:1. The ratio can impact the size of the pond and the planting around the pond. John and Ileana Kosa responded that each pond was examined and all have been sized according to standard. John added that every time we have changed the road pattern, the pond size has changed. Don noted that designs of what the ponds could look like may be brought to a future CAC meeting for the CAC to see.
- Avtar Johl asked if these new types of pond will affect DCC rates and about cost sharing. Doug Merry responded that if it is attached to a park, there may be an opportunity for cost sharing. John noted that the areas of the pond had to meet the high water level requirement.

- John added that there will probably be some language in the plan for minimum developable areas.
- Tony Hepworth commented that the road on Avtar's properties should be adjusted or it will be awkward for Tony to get access and he would have to buy a little portion from Avtar's properties to get access.
- Tony asked if the small "bulge" of the wildlife hub on his property could be rounded out so that it would allow him 1.5 acres more of higher-density townhouse.
- Avtar commented that he cannot proceed with his plans to develop in Grandview Heights NCP #4 if the plan remains as is. He added that less than 1/3 of his land is developable.
- Brad Lambert commented that there should not be too much concern about potentially losing a developer who was once interested in developing in the area because there are other developers in the area, including the offshore developer EMAAR. Brad's clients are permanent residents and developers in Richmond. We do not know who is going to develop until the plan is done.
- Eric asked why the road widths are 20 m. John responded that there are a number of factors that determine road widths, such as rights-of-way for servicing, on-street parking, street character, and what will happen in the future. Mira responded that the 20 m width is not all road. Boulevard and pedestrian space (e.g. sidewalks, trees, grassy area, lamp standards, on-street parking, etc.) takes about half the road width. The area for moving vehicles is only about 6 m. While Surrey's annual population rate increases by 3.3%, the annual number of vehicles in the city increases by 4.6%. The biggest issue new areas have now is parking. If every home has 2 adults and maybe illegal suites and all go out of the area to work, the typical 2 car garage will not be adequate for a home whose occupants have a total of e.g. 4 cars. A street is designed to make it interesting for people to walk, which means smaller block sizes. Don added that as yard space becomes smaller with more units, there is more responsibility on the public realm to provide for this deficit.
- Hugh commented that the proposed commercial seems a bit disconnected. Don responded that the commercial area will be grocery store anchored and have a high street character and urban design quality. It was not placed in the corner of Hwy 15 and 24 Ave because the desire was to make it a neighbourhood commercial centre not highway oriented commercial.

### **c. Land Use Implementation**

- Don spoke on land use implementation. There are different kinds of greenspace and each type is acquired differently. City staff has identified the different types, allocated a number to each, and differentiated developable and more difficult to develop land. These greenspaces include the school site, stormwater ponds, wildlife hub, railway right-of-way, multi-use pathways, and other areas. There will be a City staff meeting involving realty, parks, and planning departments to discuss strategies to implement the green space.
- The cost and how it can be equitably distributed is being considered. Currently, there are about 42 acres of designated wildlife corridor. Using the figure \$1 million an acre, about \$42 million will be needed to acquire these 42 acres. The cost would be distributed throughout the neighbourhood through a levy of about \$102,000 per developable acre. (Using per acre tends to favour higher density development.) On a per unit basis, this translates into about \$10,000 per unit. City staff is trying to figure out how much funds the City has to pay for the various types of green space.

### **Questions & Comments from the CAC**

- Eric commented that it seems like it would be favourable for his property to base the green space levy on per unit rather than on per acre.

- Hugh asked what are the various costs per type of unit (single family, townhouse, apartment, etc.) and what are the cumulative effects. John responded that we need to finalize the land use plan (Stage 1) before we can determine costing.
- Rene commented that the cost of properties and feasibility of development is pushing the cost of units, that the green space levy should be based on per unit not per acre, and that there is no value left on low density areas after DCCs, levies, etc. are counted.

### **3. PROCESS/TIMING/STEPS**

- Don noted that traffic analysis has to be done in more detail, but a lot of the components in the updated draft land use option are really settled.
- At a future CAC meeting, Don will have the CAC look at the implementation issue.

#### **Questions & Comments from the CAC**

- Mike commented that the number of cars, growth of number of cars, and their ability to negotiate should be considered as well as the traffic impact study.

### **4. NEXT MEETING**

- Another CAC meeting will be scheduled for early 2012. In the mean time, City staff and consultant will work on the numbers.
- The draft Preferred Option will be revised and City staff will ask Council to allow staff to take the revised plan to a Public Open House in Spring 2012.
- CAC members will be advised of the next CAC meeting date.

### **5. ITEMS FROM CAC**

- Cindy Lighthouse asked how a park and ride and future transit will be worked into this plan. Where will residents park if they drive to the bus stop and park their car on the surrounding streets before taking transit? John responded that there will not be a park and ride facility in the NCP and that the only current forecast for transit is for 24 Ave for 2012. Don responded that people will go to a centralized park and ride to travel long distances, not go to a nearby commercial centre. Also, a minimum population is needed before you can get a park and ride. Mira added that 800 m is equal to a 10 minute walk, which is walkable for those walking to a bus stop.

### **6. ADJOURN**

- The meeting adjourned at 7:35 pm.