

Meeting Notes

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

October 11, 2011

File: 6520-20 (GH NCP #4)
Date: October 11, 2011
Time: 5:40 p.m.
Location: Pondside Cafe

In Attendance:

CAC Members:

Eric Chen
Rene Desrosiers
Anthony Hepworth
Avtar Johl
Brad Lambert
Delmar Robertson
Prit Pal Sandhu
Vena Sandhu

Community Association Rep.'s

Cindy Lighthouse
Mike Proskow

City Staff:

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

Regrets:

Nadine Adams
Chuck Brook
Arnold Fenrick
Paul Fenske
Bhargav Parghi
Norm Porter

Consultants:

Marc Bonner
John Steil

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

1. INTRODUCTION

- Nadine Adams was unable to attend this meeting so Rene Desrosiers is serving as her alternate.
- The CAC did not have any changes for the April 19, 2011 CAC Meeting Notes other than noting John's attendance at that meeting.

2. OPEN HOUSE UPDATE

- Fay Wong provided a summary of the results from the May 3, 2011 Public Open House.
- 133 adults, 1 youth, and 8 children attended. There was also a youth consultation component to the Open House.
- 147 completed feedback forms, representing comments from 104 properties. Of these, 50 comment sheets representing 53 properties are within Grandview Heights NCP #4 or within 1 km of its boundary. This summary is of the comments received from these 50 comment sheets.
- To view the results from the feedback forms, refer to the "October 11, 2011 – May 3, 2011 Open House results Summary Presentation" link on the CAC website at <http://www.surrey.ca/plans-strategies/6361.aspx>.
- The CAC did not have any comments or questions.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL UPDATE

- John Steil and Stephen Godwin provided an update on the watercourse issue.
- Watercourse Assessment Studies were done on several creeks in the Spring of 2011 to determine the limits and classifications of the Fisheries watercourses. These were presented to the Engineering ERC to accept proposed changes to the City of Surrey COSMOS Fisheries

Watercourse Layer. The ERC requested that some Class C watercourse on Tony's and Avtar's property be further assessed during the drier summer weather to verify that in fact they did not pick up ground water and were surface drainage feature only. Phoenix Environmental went out to take a look and presented their findings at the September 21st Engineering Environmental Review Committee, which were approved by ERC. Nothing on COSMOS was changed because the watercourses had already been noted as Class C, so their presence was simply confirmed.

4. PREFERRED OPTION

- John presented the draft preferred land use plan option and distributed a copy to each CAC member.
- Option B was preferred most based on feedback from the Public Open House from a variety of perspectives. Input was also received from City staff, Stantec's Engineering staff, the School District, the CAC, and more.
- Servicing issue as it affects the plan is mostly related to storm drainage. The preferred land use plan option shown is draft and will still have some changes.
- Worked through the road network in more detail. The first cut has been adjusted, moved around, and then made sure it is more equitable throughout the area.
- Tried to make sure that the plan dealt with the implementation issues.
- Greenway width – feedback received was the wider the better. It is generally about 70 m wide and was moved around so it was consistent with property lines where possible.
- Feedback from the School District who wanted a more rectangular site. It was shifted a bit so that there would be more continuity relative to the riparian area and wildlife hub. This plan needs to be reviewed by the School District as we can likely make the site slightly smaller.
- A stormwater pond was added to the northwest triangular portion of the NCP and also south of 24 Ave (east of proposed 178 St). The other ponds are the same as before. Pond location was also determined by the City's size requirement. A drainage basin must be at least 20 ha in order for it to be accepted as a public drainage system.
- The riparian areas are generally the same.
- Parks are located throughout the NCP.
- There is a commercial area north of 24 Ave between proposed 177 St and 178 St. There is also a smaller commercial site located south of 24 Ave, east of proposed 182 St.
- Density distribution generally follows the previous Option B.
- Interconnectedness – tried to maximize access to Hwy 15.
- Should the area to the south of the NCP ever be interested in connecting with the area, there is opportunity for them to connect in terms of access and servicing.

Questions & Comments from the CAC

- Tony Hepworth estimates that 30-40% of his and Avtar's land appears undevelopable due to the amount of land designated for riparian area/wildlife hub/detention pond.
 - John responded that other people in the community wanted a lot more land for green than this and has since shrunk it and tried to make it more equitable among the area's property owners. Alternatives have been explored (e.g. CO2 credits, some kind of levy so everybody contributes to the acquisition of these lands, etc.). There are two issues: the area and the location. The environmental study called for more area than this. We have thought about breaking it up a bit but the whole notion of a wildlife hub is that it is an adequately sized area that wildlife will use.
- Mike Proskow asked how much has the wildlife hub been reduced?
 - Don Luymes responded about 1/3.

- Mike asked what is the financial protocol that might make this feasible?
 - Don commented that in another NCP, a special DCC was created where the funds go in a coffer to purchase land for parks. Land is to be purchased at appraised value and funded through levies. An implementation scheme is to be developed for Phase 1 of the NCP.
 - Avtar Johl commented that Langley has a greenway amenity charge where if one were to develop, the area would receive enough funds. An area of this size would not receive enough funds to compensate the developers. Money would come from future development. If the city looked at it as a fund rather than a specific area fund (where the City would advance money from this fund, it may work. The City needs to prepay.
 - Doug Merry added that the City does have a park acquisition fund that is used to purchase sites for parks. When the Realty department purchases parks, they pay based on an appraisal of the property. Appraisals are based on the designation of the land as if it was zoned equivalent to the adjacent, non-parkland use.
- Brad Lambert asked if your property is partly designated as Park, would the lender lend you money.
 - Avtar commented that he thinks the bank would ask you for a pro forma (on a development basis), but it may be different if you are buying raw land.
- Delmar Robertson commented that much of his property and Vena's property are proposed for corridors/buffer and that they will have to wait until development happens around them before they can benefit.
 - Don commented that if their land was designated something else, they would still have to wait until developers bring servicing in.
- Brad asked what would happen if owners will not sell their properties for lower than they want and hinder potential developers from coming in and bringing in servicing.
 - Don commented that no one can force anyone to change their zoning. John commented that we are not establishing a scheme to allow some to develop and others to not. This is a very complicated neighbourhood because of the number of owners and the shapes of the parcels. Don added that a consolidation plan can be developed so that some properties are not orphaned (undevelopable).
- Avtar commented that this area may not be viable to develop.
- Mike asked how many controlled intersections will there be along 176 St.
 - Mira Petrovic commented most likely every 400 m but they will be determined as traffic volume warrants traffic signals.
- Cindy Lighthouse commented that at last Monday's Council meeting, Council had mentioned that the wildlife corridor/hub is better used as a larger corridor/hub rather than breaking it up and that it should be used as urban greenspace and preservation area rather than a commuter route. There is a lot of wildlife there, which Council was concerned about.
- Eric Chen asked if it is possible to reduce the road grid of the Single Detached Housing and what is the road width?
 - John commented that local roads will be the standard 20 m, which includes boulevards, parking, etc. Don added that the roads and lanes are needed to get cars to the door/garage.
- Cindy commented that a lot of the new development will affect Redwood Park estates in terms of drainage.
 - Don commented that about 90% of the development is downhill from Redwood Park Estates. We want to make sure that the opportunity is there so that it is possible to connect to servicing and transportation for future generations should they want it in the future.
- Cindy commented that the current residents concern is what is happening now but they do realize that things change over future generations.

5. SERVICING

- Marc Bonner, an Engineer from Stantec, provided an update on servicing. A copy of the 3 servicing maps that was presented was distributed to each CAC member.
- **Water Distribution:** This area will be serviced by the Grandview Heights Reservoir using gravity flow and pumped flow. Dashed lines shown on the plan in the roadways represent water mains. Heavier lines represent the difference between pressure zones. There are three pressure zones – north (low pressure), central (intermediate pressure) and south (high pressure). Water will be supplied to the central and north zones by a gravity pipe from the reservoir. The City requires that the mains in the central zone should feed those in the north zone. A total of four pressure reducing valves are currently shown to allow flow to pass from the central pressure zone to the north pressure zone. The pressure reducing valves are placed to allow looping of the flow so that the flow is distributed as evenly as possible. Another pipe that will be higher in pressure, will service south or high pressure zone (south area of the Neighbourhood). Mains are shown in front of lots, on the streets all the way around to provide for fire hydrants. Stantec will meet with the City to review and discuss the number of pressure reducing valves will be needed. Marc is also waiting for all the land use to get finalized before determining their final location.
- **Sanitary Sewer:** There will be a trunk gravity main and a pump station (exact location to be confirmed). Since the land generally slopes to the northeast throughout the Neighbourhood, all sanitary flows are generally going in a northeast direction, which is largely why we have a large trunk main along the northern boundary. One of the constraints for the route of the trunk main that we are dealing with is creek crossings. At each creek crossing the pipe must pass under the creek, which is lower than the ground on either side of the creek. This results in the depth of the ground over the trunk main reaching up to 8 m – 9 m in some places. The City's Design Criteria calls for a maximum sewer depth of 3.5 m, but the City is prepared to accept depths of 4-4.5 m, or 5 m/5.5 m at most, hence the curving of the trunk main in some places. Earlier work showed that the trunk main can be extended south to service Redwood Estates. However, the sewer will be deep in some locations, deeper than called for in the City's design criteria.
- **Stormwater:** All the proposed detention ponds are 20 ha or more except for one that is 7.4 ha. Minimum water depth of 1.5 m was achieved. Side slopes within ponds are 5 horizontal to 1 vertical or 5H:1V. In general, the ponds will not fit into the areas that have been allotted for the ponds using slopes that are flatter than 5H:1V. It is recognized that the City prefers flatter slopes. However, due to the somewhat steep nature of the ground throughout the Neighbourhood, it can be expected that flattening the slopes of the ponds will significantly increase the area a pond occupies. For those ponds located on lots, it is likely that the pond would no longer fit on the lot on which it is currently shown. The City is looking for something flatter (7 to 1).

Questions & Comments from the CAC

- Cindy asked if the proposed servicing would enable Redwood Park estates to tie into it if they wanted to in the future.
 - Don responded yes, we just need to size the pipe enough to accommodate it.
- Tony asked if the pond can be moved to the wildlife hub.
 - John responded that we can see if we can put the pond in the hub. Don added that the pond has to be balanced with the creek.
- Avtar asked if the City allows interim detention ponds.
 - Ileana responded that interim onsite detention will be allowed only after the lands for the community detention pond have been secured.

6. NEXT STEPS/NEXT MEETING

- Next CAC meeting is November 24, 2011 at Surrey City Hall's Planning & Development Department in Planning Room 1.
- The School District has not seen the draft preferred land use plan option yet, and Marc still has to do a bit more work on the servicing component. We will take the feedback from this meeting (and that we will receive over the next two weeks) and bring a revised draft preferred land use plan option to the November 24th CAC meeting.
- Note that the draft preferred land use plan option handout that was distributed to the CAC members today should not be distributed to others as it could be taken out of context by those who have not been part of the ongoing discussion.
- City staff would also like to get input from the City's advisory committees such as the Agricultural Advisory Committee, Environmental Advisory Committee, Heritage Advisory Commission, and Engineering Environmental Review Committee. This will take place before the Public Open House.
- Once the preferred land use plan option has been finalized, a report will go to Council for their approval to present it to the public at a Public Open House. After we received feedback from the Open House and incorporate any further revisions, it will go to Council again for Stage 1 approval.
- Currently, it is anticipated that the Public Open House will be held in January or February, with a report to Council around March.
- **The CAC is to provide John and Don with any additional comments by October 25th.** John will revise the plan for the November 24th CAC meeting.

7. ITEMS FROM CAC MEMBERS

- Nadine Adams had met with the City prior to the CAC meeting to express her neighbourhood's concern that they see their neighbourhood somewhat deteriorating due to the increasing number of homes that are owned by absentee landlords, unknown tenants, and the level of uncertainty. They feel that the longer the plan takes to complete, the longer these problems will exist.
- Rene Desrosiers added that there is a constant traffic of unknown people in the neighbourhood and the longer this happens, the more dangerous the neighbourhood could be.
- Another CAC member commented that there are grow-ops.

8. ADJOURN

- The meeting adjourned at 7:30 pm.