

Meeting Notes

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

November 1, 2012

File: 6520-20 (GH NCP #4)
Date: November 1, 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
Delmar Robertson
Prit Pal Sandhu
Bernie Scholz

Community Association Rep.'s

Cindy Lighthouse

City Staff:

Rémi Dubé
Stephen Godwin
Ileana Kosa
Don Luymes
Doug Merry
Bhargav Parghi
Fay Keng Wong

Regrets:

Arnold Fenrick
Norm Porter
Mike Proskow
Aman 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)

- Don welcomed everyone in attendance and provided a brief overview of the agenda.

2. AUGUST 30, 2012 CAC MEETING NOTES (Fay Wong)

- The August 30, 2012 CAC Meeting Notes have not changed since they were last sent out to the CAC in September. Hugh Carter had sent an e-mail to the CAC to elaborate further on the comments he made at the CAC meeting, but no changes were made to the Meeting Notes.
- There were no requests for changes to the Meeting Notes so they will be posted on the CAC website as is.

3. UPDATES

a. Discussions with the Redwood Park Property Owners Association and Property Owners in the NCP Area (Don Luymes)

- Don recently met with the Redwood Park Neighbourhood Association. Residents of Redwood Park are concerned about what traffic might be like in the area near 180 St, whether or not sidewalks are necessary, and people using 20 Ave as an alternative to 24 Ave (which is already impacting the neighbourhood with high speed rat-running). At the meeting, the possibility of a

roundabout at 20 Ave and 180 St was discussed. Don has talked to the Engineering Department about this and the idea has been received positively. Whether or not we put it in the plan now or after is being sorted out.

- Also discussed at the meeting with the Redwood Park Neighbourhood Association were the edges of the greenspace corridor, which is now being shown with a half road against 179 St to result in a better buffer.
- Another item that was discussed at the meeting was whether the stormwater pond at 24 Ave and 178 St could be relocated to the southwest corner of 180 St and 24 Ave, where it currently is shown as Single Family Transitional. Single Family Transitional may not be suitable on 24 Ave. The stormwater pond for this area would be 1.2 ha in size, which is smaller than previously shown. However, the stormwater from this pond has to find a way to the most westerly creek. If the pond is relocated, it would result in some catchment areas smaller than the minimum 20 ha required by the City.

Questions & Comments from the CAC

- Hugh Carter asked about baseflow. Ileana Kosa responded that if the stormwater goes to the second creek, it is more difficult and would change the catchment area for all the ponds (biological issues and the size of the catchment that results). We do not want a pond catchment size that is too small for DCC funding.

b. Adjustments – Preferred Land Use Option (John Steil)

- John provided an update on the adjustments that have been made to the draft Preferred Land Use Option since the last CAC meeting.
- The wildlife corridor has been shifted.
- The stormwater pond has been adjusted as Don just spoke about.
- The area along the east side of 176 St, between 30 Ave and just south of 28A Ave (in the triangle area), are now shown as Detached Residential / Medium Density Flex.
- Pump station has been moved further west across 176th.
- The statistics for the draft Preferred Land Use Option have been changed to include the adjustments.

c. Engineering Infrastructure Costs (Rémi Dubé)

- Rémi provided an update on the engineering infrastructure costs for the NCP. A copy of his presentation will be e-mailed to the CAC.
- Stantec has been working on finalizing some of the cost estimates.
- Water servicing. It is projected that on-site costs will be \$14 million, off-site costs \$9.5 million, and estimated DCC revenues \$8 million, resulting in a shortfall of \$15.5 million. Pressure reducing valves are needed as you go into the lower zones. As you move down the hill, you want to reduce the pressure. Water is being fed from the pump station at 24 Ave and 184 St. There is a lot of upgrading on the area to the west. These figures are conservative.
- Sanitary Servicing. It is projected that on-site costs will be \$3.9 million, off-site costs \$9.5 million, pump station \$12 million, and estimated DCC revenues \$10.8 million, resulting in a shortfall of \$14.6 million. The sanitary costs shown include the pump station that will take it to the Grandview interceptor. Ileana noted that interim solutions are not DCC rebateable. The pump station is more expensive (\$17-18 million) plus the force main.
- Drainage. It is projected that construction costs will be \$40.5 million and estimated DCC revenues \$40 million, resulting in a shortfall of \$500,000. These figures are very sensitive to

the cost of moving dirt (actual construction) and the detailed design of the ponds. An ISMP has been done for this area.

- **Transportation.** It is projected that, for roads, on-site costs will be \$32.5 million, off-site costs \$27.5 million, and estimated DCC revenues \$18 million, resulting in a shortfall of \$42 million. The problem with transportation is that there are roads through the neighbourhood that handle a lot of traffic from outside so we know that some of the funding has to come from outside. For on-site costs, arterial roads account for about \$10 million, collector roads another \$10 million, intersection roads about \$3 million, and the rest is for contingency. For off-site costs, almost \$20 million is for upgrades to 184 St (which has to be upgraded from 16 Ave to 24 Ave) and the remainder for off-site intersection improvements.
- **Financing.** The overall cost overrun is approximately equivalent to DCC revenue. Once the land use is finalized, we will have a better idea of the revenue.
- **The Engineering Department** will keep working with Stantec.
- **Assumptions.** Preliminary cost estimates for on-site and off-site works are based on 2012 tenders and the most cost effective design (i.e. no throw away infrastructure). Contingency/engineering ranging from 25% to 40% depending on infrastructure included in estimates. Revenues are based on the Grandview Heights NCP #4 area only, assuming 4000 units that are each 2000 sq. ft on average. This will be refined with the land use plan. No revenue has been assumed for areas outside Grandview Heights NCP #4. No cost recovery/financing options have been reviewed. DCC reimbursement assumes infrastructure will be included in the City's 10 year Servicing plan.

Questions & Comments from the CAC

- Hugh Carter asked where the pump station is. Don responded just off of Hwy 15 (a few hundred meters away).
- Brad Lambert asked for clarification on interim infrastructure. Rémi described options such as development works agreements.
- Avtar Johl commented that the projected figures shown in the presentation are really helpful because it gives an indication of the challenges of this NCP.
- Tony Hepworth asked how different are these figures compared to other NCPs. Don responded that the Anniedale-Tynehead NCP would be the most similar. Rémi commented that the land use for the Anniedale-Tynehead NCP was different, so its infrastructure costs are about double the infrastructure costs of Grandview Heights NCP #4. The Anniedale-Tynehead NCP was based on an area-specific DCC.
- Tony asked what type of contingency is there. Rémi responded over 40%.
- Avtar asked if the CAC can have the detailed figures at some point. Rémi responded that the CAC will be sent a copy of the presentation, but the spreadsheet that Stantec has sent the Engineering Department is very complex and may not be understandable without the context.

d. Draft Report – Green Space Implementation (Don Luymes)

- Don provided an update on the proposed greenspace levy. A copy of his presentation will be e-mailed to the CAC, but it is not quite ready for the website, yet.
- The NCP is a little lean on neighbourhood parks/greenspace.
- The City has received a greenspace levy analysis report from Rollo. We had asked them to look at the proposed greenspace levy in the context of the NCP.
- \$42.9 million (the total amount generated by the levy) was calculated by subtracting 5% from \$45.15 million (assuming 42 acres at \$1.075 million per acre).
- The number of housing units (shown as 4,020) could be changed.

- Household size of 3.0 people per single family unit is based on the average number of people per single family unit in South Surrey, but will be adjusted to 3.6. Secondary suites will be allowed and will change the number of people per unit.
- The report outlined 5 different levy calculation methods/options: levy per net developable acre, levy per dwelling unit, levy per buildable floor area, levy per population, and levy with set amounts by housing type. Rollo assessed each of these methods, thought the “per buildable floor area” and “per population” methods were the most equitable between land uses, and recommended the “per population” method because its equity between various land uses is the same approach as used for DCCs, and its link between amenity (greenspace) and number of future residents.

Questions & Comments from the CAC

- Tony commented that assuming the household size is 2.1 people per apartment means that RM-45 units would not work for developers. If it is RM-30 and the DCC is too high, it might, instead, result in maybe 18 units. Use the “per population” method to a cap and then fall to the “by housing type” method.
- Brad asked what is wrong with the “per buildable” method. Don responded that the “per buildable” method may result in a levy shortfall if smaller units are built.
- Tony commented that the land value for single family is more than for multi-family. Don responded that existing landowners, who have equity, may be in a different situation compared to people who are purchasing land now. Low density may not generate enough DCC’s to fund the green space levy.
- Tony asked for clarification on the figures for the preliminary assessment of levy impact. Don responded that single family would be half the percentage of levy as apartment development. All the prices are based on South Surrey numbers. Nobody really knows who will be occupying these areas.

4. NEXT STEPS

- City staff will send the draft greenspace levy analysis report back to Rollo with final changes.
- Parks DCC revenue and purchase is one thing that we do not have yet. On the edge of many wildlife corridors, there are watercourses. Technically, if there is a path or trail along a watercourse, it is not a wildlife corridor, but a park. So that is the type of work that we have to do.

5. ITEMS FROM CAC

- Tony asked when the 10 year plans get updated. Rémi responded every couple of years.
- John advised the CAC that if they have any other questions, to let him or City staff know.
- Don commented that the next CAC meeting will take place after the shirtsleeve session.

6. ADJOURN

- The meeting adjourned at 7:24 pm.