

MEETING NOTES
HOUSING PIC MEETING
JULY 9TH 2001
2 PM

- Kathy suggests discussing:
 - 4.0 draft edits
 - specific sites
 - other comments

- NOTES RE; DRAFT:

- RE: Narrative
- Add Waterfront reference
- Review narrative to highlight importance of east-west traffic concerns AND
- Northlands - significance, impact on community etc.

- Re: 4.3.5-approval process for new development projects....
- Emphasize the importance of traffic/transportation
- Agreement that Northlands is qualitatively different (scale, impact, scope) than other sites still under consideration
- Charlene to work on 2-pronged approach
 - 1. Must in general terms emphasize the relationship between any development and traffic impact, especially east-west movement within Seymour (this is apart from the bridgehead, which is a given in any scenario)
 - 2. In particular, in table dealing with specific sites, emphasize the need for traffic impact studies and other "subject to" conditions on a site by site basis. This is particularly important for Northlands

- Re: 4.4.2: Statement is: "consult with Tsleil Waututh neighbours on development and planning issues."
- Keep this statement but also add another (and re-number)
- I.e. 4.4.3 "Monitor and consider the impacts of development and growth in neighbouring communities."

- **NOTES RE: SPECIFIC SITES**

- NORTHLANDS:
- In general need to balance 'control' objective with phasing and managing development
- Key wording in recommendations will be development "subject to"... **AND "in keeping with the growth parameters established by the plan..."**
- See considerations and variables on phasing table and from Growth PIC and add these points:
 - Comprehensive plan
 - Economic viability
 - Study of impact on east-west Seymour traffic
 - Impact on schools and other community services
 - Go slow
 - Start small
 - Start south
 - Initial phase small scale -- range? Up to maximum?
 - Seek amenities from development, including:
 - Seniors supportive care
 - Community centre/hall/shared space

- MOUNT SEYMOUR PARKWAY NORTH & SOUTH
- Was there resolution of whether north or south ought to be prioritized?
- Committee does not support specifying seniors housing in specific locations; rather, variety in housing forms (subject to

usual site condition considerations) will provide choice and options, which may be suitable for seniors. It is recognized that the topography, access to services, commercial, transit etc., do make the Parkgate area particularly suitable for seniors as a neighbourhood location.

- RIVERSIDE TERRACE (GRAVEL PIT)
- Recognize that the community needs supportive housing (e.g. congregate care) and that this is a suitable site
- Could this happen while Northlands was underway? Could depend on need and opportunity, but would likely not fit into growth and phasing parameters.

FROM KATHY TURNER 4-0

Housing and Schools Input Committee Meeting - July 9, 2001

Present: Helena Galas, Jim Porter, Kathy Turner
NV District Planning Department - Charlene Grant

The following are additions to the notes taken after Charlene had left the meeting.

1. Seymour Estates statement -

We support the concept of rental apartments in a rebuilt Seymour > Estates. We are concerned, however, that the existing proposal as we > understand it, (an increase of 125 units or 110% growth) would have a > strong impact on traffic and community facilities within Seymour. In our > opinion it is imperative that these issues be addressed whether this > area remains in the Seymour Local Plan or becomes part of the Maplewood > Plan.

2. South and North Seymour Parkway -

We decided not to prioritize separately but support that whichever area has achieved a District/private partnership and has the support of the local community should have priority.

We decided to keep the recommended # units for North Parkway at 108 units.

3. Roche Point East -

From discussion concerning the need to protect this area, and as expressed in the addendum, we support limiting the development in this area to no more than 4 single family homes formed around a cul de sac and no further extension of the Roche Point Drive beyond this point.

4. Meeting with Growth Committee -

We agreed that we would attend a meeting with the Growth Input Committee to discuss mainly:

- site areas where our recommended # of units vary
- development areas where the phasing parameters would present difficulties (Northlands, supportive housing, etc.)

Any comments? Kathy

SITE RECOMMENDATIONS: Growth Committee & Housing Committee

DRAFT

| SITE | PHASING | UNITS | | TYPE | | Key Variables/ Conditions | | Other |
|---------|-------------|--------|-----------|--|---|--|--|---|
| | | Growth | Housing | Growth | Housing | Growth | Housing | |
| MSP (N) | 2017 - 2021 | 35-70? | Up to 108 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider variety of forms: duplex, triplex, fourplex Character r vs. "Levo" rows of H Possibly seniors, possibly more affordable | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 or 4 small 2 story apt buildings take advantage of proximity to golf course; trail linkages etc. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trade study Environmental re: creek crossing Shared driveway/acc Requiring DNV partnership Community support All or nothing per block? Buffer housing from MSP | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not age-specific; suitable for any age wanting this choice Access via Apex, garage or turf centre Underground parking Community support not consistent Consider traffic/safety, parking and noise issues | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Phasing: homes in west blocks are older (Housing) Order relative to MSP (S) depends on partnership, feasibility and community support |
| MSP (S) | 2017 - 2021 | 35 | 25 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focus on seniors Character r should be "green" Buffered from MSP and surrounding | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One small 2 story 3 storeys underground park blend in with surrounding buildings | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community support DNV partnership \$ feasibility buffer | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> not age-specific; any age wanting small park close to amenities and transportation Not access off MSP buffer to MSP mitigate noise impact on TH to south | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Growth sees North before South Housing sees order dependent on partnership, community support and DNV partnership Wanted to resolve immediate neighbour's pressure for higher building provide more light and green space with overall desire to avoid higher buildings/density |

Handwritten notes:
 10000 m² with 10000 m² of green space
 10000 m² with 10000 m² of green space
 10000 m² with 10000 m² of green space

Handwritten notes:
 10000 m² with 10000 m² of green space
 10000 m² with 10000 m² of green space
 10000 m² with 10000 m² of green space

Handwritten notes:
 10000 m² with 10000 m² of green space
 10000 m² with 10000 m² of green space
 10000 m² with 10000 m² of green space

Handwritten notes:
 10000 m² with 10000 m² of green space
 10000 m² with 10000 m² of green space
 10000 m² with 10000 m² of green space

Handwritten notes:
 10000 m² with 10000 m² of green space
 10000 m² with 10000 m² of green space
 10000 m² with 10000 m² of green space

Handwritten notes:
 10000 m² with 10000 m² of green space
 10000 m² with 10000 m² of green space
 10000 m² with 10000 m² of green space

Handwritten notes:
 10000 m² with 10000 m² of green space
 10000 m² with 10000 m² of green space
 10000 m² with 10000 m² of green space

Handwritten notes:
 10000 m² with 10000 m² of green space
 10000 m² with 10000 m² of green space
 10000 m² with 10000 m² of green space

Handwritten notes:
 10000 m² with 10000 m² of green space
 10000 m² with 10000 m² of green space
 10000 m² with 10000 m² of green space

Handwritten note in box:
 No high rises

Handwritten note:
 Green - not a family

Handwritten note:
 PB "cur"

Handwritten notes:
 - lay of road site - car access
 - get examples eg Buller Park
 - not boxes in app F
 - not boxes in app F

Handwritten notes:
 - see F up to
 100 too high
 green park

SITE RECOMMENDATIONS: Growth Committee & Housing Committee

DRAFT

| SITE | PHASING | UNITS | | TYPE Form & Character | | Key Variables/ Conditions | | Other |
|---------------------|----------------------|--------|-------------|---|--|--|--|---|
| | | Growth | Housing | Growth | Housing | Growth | Housing | |
| Anne Macdonald (MF) | 2022 - 2026 | 52 | 40 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Growth | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing Size and quality to blend in with SF homes built here Not more than 3 storeys | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Growth Environmental/creek protection Partnership with private owners to achieve environmental goals | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing Environmental assessment and protection of Creek Stay within low density | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appealing to leave in natural state Greater than 3 storeys would be intrusive given trees, parks and golf course setting Look into effect of golf course of creek (run-off, etc) Could MF become SF? |
| Riverside | 2022-2026 and beyond | 125 | 80 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Growth Possible congregates but not market seniors Not MF | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing Possible seniors care facility Possible mix SF and low density MF, including TH and duplexes Predominant SF | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Growth Environmental impact/protection Access to public Impacts Achieve green space, PRO, walking paths Consider designating as "future study" Demand/need for care facilities | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing Environmental assessment and protection: geotechnical considerations (banks) Ranked last since least compromised by former uses Access from Riverside | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> possible PRO? Achieve greenways |
| Roche Point East | Beyond 2026 | 24 | 4? (or 24?) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Growth SF only around cul-de-sac with no extension of road | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing SF only | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Growth Environmental assessment/protection No road extension | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing No road extension Retain greenways at end of cul-de-sac | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Future study ("hold" for future) Designate Roche Point West as Natural Parkland Consider land use designations of "PRW" or "future something" as a holding designation for Mystery, Roche Point west, possibly Riverside and Roche East |
| Other Areas | | | | | | | | |

George
Wemyss Road
PRW
PRW

←
Heavenly

future study

been