

Charlene Grant

From: Charlene Grant
Sent: Thursday, June 21, 2001 11:31 AM
To: 'cam turner'
Subject: RE: Housing and Schools SLP

Hi Kathy,

I have gone over your notes. As well, David Cook has forwarded some observations, which I gather the committee had solicited from him. I have some questions and comments.

1. How are you (and therefore, am I) treating the additional comments appended to the group's site analysis? Do they form a part of the committee recommendations for the site? Or, do they represent 'minority' observations not to be included in the committee conclusions?
2. A couple of particular points on Northlands: on what do you base the road connection suggestions? (I'll review them with the traffic dept) and On what do you base the estimate of \$18 million needing to be recovered in the development of Northlands?
3. Here is a brief summary of the comments of the Growth PIC on a site by site basis. I think it would be interesting for your members to see where they are consistent and where they differ. (in general, they are quite consistent)

NORTHLANDS

- your comments regarding impact and District control are very consistent with the Growth PICs thinking.
- the Growth PIC, referring to the "Phasing Table," groups the phasing of Northlands development more closely together, i.e. eliminates the gaps between phases. However, they also want to push the start of development out further into the future (i.e. end of Phase 2: approx 10 years) in order to account for the anticipated and earlier development on Tsleil-Waututh lands and Maplewood area.
- perhaps this should be discussed further. The argument could be made that this phasing undermines the "control" objective.

SEYMOUR PARKWAY SOUTH

- the Growth PIC also reduced the estimated units from 70 to 35
- focus on achieving seniors housing
- additional comments included incorporating character into the design and ensuring a buffer from the Parkway
- note also the variables identified through the phasing exercise, i.e. differing community points of view, financial feasibility of lower vs. higher density forms and the need for partnership since the DNV owns interspersed lots
- see north side happening before south side

SEYMOUR PARKWAY NORTH

- Growth recommends lower number of units
- seniors possible
- possibly more affordable housing
- raised issue of all or nothing in a block (i.e. so as not to have one house left standing among a new form)
- try to achieve character vs. "lego" looking rows of townhouses
- buffer from Parkway -- (perhaps orient to the north with walkways along course, etc)
- shared drive/lane access
- note also variables identified through phasing exercise: community difference of opinion; partnership (DNV ownership); traffic study required; creek crossing to consider

ANNE MACDONALD WAY - MULTI FAMILY SITE

- Growth PIC favours later phasing - i.e. Phase IV - 2017 to 2021
- consistent with variables identified in phasing exercise: environmental issues to protect creek; also partnership opportunities with private owners to achieve environmental goals

ROCHE POINT EAST

- Growth PIC phases this far into the future beyond 2021
- they do however, support straight single family development

RIVERSIDE TERRACE - "GRAVEL PIT"

- Growth PIC supports congregate care, but not straight seniors housing or multi-family, since it is too isolated
- discussion around coming up with a designation along the lines of "further study" with a recommended future use for care
- although they also phase this into the distant future e.g. 2017-2021 or beyond, there was also discussion that if it was strongly desired/supported by the community and IF the key variables about development on Tsleil-Waututh and Maplewood did not come to pass, the development could happen sooner.

Overall, it appears your analysis and that of the growth group is generally consistent. There is some to-ing and fro-ing re

the sequence of development, but this too is quite consistent. Both groups agree that Northlands should be "first" and some of the more environmentally impacted areas "last" -- eg. Riverside and Roche Point. We should discuss more explicitly the timing of the phases and how trying to account for Tsleil Waututh and Maplewood pushes the commencement of any development into the future.

4. As to how to proceed from here, I will attempt to incorporate your observations and recommendations into the draft chapter we have already reviewed. I think we may then need a meeting to more fully discuss implications. It occurs to me as well, that we might want to consider asking the Growth PIC to be part of the discussion so we have as complete and integrated as possible an approach to housing (your emphasis) and phasing (growth PIC emphasis) which have slightly different emphasis but inevitable over-lap. Shall I forward your analysis and recommendations to the growth PIC? I think this would be useful.

Some thoughts for now. I'll work away at this and get a copy back to you. Thanks for all your input,

Charlene
990-2415
grantc@dnv.org

Charlene
990-2415
grantc@dnv.org

-----Original Message-----

From: cam turner [mailto:cam_turner@telus.net]
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2001 7:46 AM
To: Charlene Grant
Subject: Housing and Schools SLP

Hi Charlene - Have included the notes on our site visitations as well as further comments made by the committee members after they read the notes. They would like to know what are you intending to do with this information. Everyone is willing to attend another meeting if necessary. Could we have the the revised draft and then decide if we need to meet as a group again?

This is the statement we would like to add concerning the waterfront in the *Housing and Schools* document.

To be added to the end of the third paragraph under Housing and Schools 4.0:

"...existing neighbourhoods. Inherent in these goals is the recognition of the community's commitment to protect environmentally sensitive areas and to establish a Seymour waterfront that is clean, natural, and accessible."

Are you still able to see the light at the end of the SLP tunnel?
Looking forward to hearing from you, Kathy

SLP HOUSING AND SCHOOLS

SITE VISITATIONS

June 4, 2001

Jim Porter, Helena Galas, Brent Mayall, and Kathy Turner visited 6 possible development sites in the Seymour area on June 4, 2001. Later that week, June 8, Jim Porter, Diane Silverwood and Kathy Turner met to discuss the environmental impacts of development in these same areas. With the SLP vision statement as the guide, the group worked at applying the Housing Committee's suggested land usage criteria, recognizing that the growth policy will be influenced by what is happening on the Tsleil-Waututh lands and Maplewood. Discussion re. land usage, priority ranking (1 indicating first priority for development, #6 being last among the 6 sites visited to be considered for changes), and size of development (based on District definitions of low, medium, and high density), resulted in the following observations:

a. Northlands

Recommendations:

of units - 300 units *profit @ public approval*

priority listing - # 1 or #2 (see Seymour Parkway South, North)

Northlands is the largest undeveloped land in the District. It is relatively flat and easily serviced and central to most activities in Seymour. It is important that the District has influence over how this land can meet the community needs, and for this reason it has been listed as priority #1 over properties that have buildings on them already. If the District must act soon to incorporate this area into the Seymour Plan, then Northlands should be considered the first area for phased development in Seymour.

This land provides an excellent opportunity for the community to plan a comprehensive land use package providing for the development of single family homes of varying size, some multi family structures, and a Seniors Retirement and Care Facility* on the east (Strathaven) side. A community park could be established here providing playing fields, possibly a competitive track and a live Outdoor theatre. Interconnecting pathways should extend from Blueridge to Parkgate. Land should be set aside and reserved for future needs.

Access to this area could be from both an extension of Northlands Road, and from Strathaven with a connecting road to the north running from Hyannis to Mount Seymour road.

**Green PIC consultant*
clear up costs - hard to estimate
transportation
need to address
DNU mission east-west

but growth PIC possible draw out to credit plan...
This would be a great investment

JIM developed for many years

having water

Constraints:

McCartney Creek must be protected and its corridor should be expanded. There is soil contamination from Northlands' former role as the Blair Rifle Range and the cost would be in the millions for a clean-up. CMHC has incurred costs of approximately \$18 million which must be repaid making this land expensive. As a completely new and large neighbourhood, there should be open and frequent public discussion in establishing the overall plan for this area.

* see
* Phasing
table
various

b . Seymour Parkway

i) Seymour Parkway South – 3600 Block south

Recommendations:

of units – 20-25 units ? *6 months to address 70 units to 35*

priority listing # 1 or #2, (see Northlands)

One 3 storey small multi-family building with underground parking, appropriate for seniors and all ages who opt for a smaller apartment, near shopping and public transportation. This would blend in with other buildings in the same area. A road would be necessary to the south of existing houses to avoid using the Parkway as the entry and exit point. This land is used for residential now and at least 2 of the owners are offering their houses for sale. Put some sort of buffer along the Parkway to combat the noise, as was done in the next block to the west.

*Gravel & C
concrete
- sound
- charcoal
- buffer
WSP*

Constraints:

There is limited space here and the challenge would be to have a design that would put the focus of the building more to the south, and not on the Parkway, to avoid its noise and pollution. At the same time if an access road is built on the southside, this could force the building to be closer to the Parkway. The neighbouring townhouses to the south are quite close and would be impacted by any changes in this area. The community at large has expressed adversity to high rise buildings although this has been suggested by the neighbours to the south; the concern being that several small apartment buildings would block more light than one tall building.

* see Phas
table
variables
- 1 - comm
disagree
- 8 fears:
- parking
inquiries

ii) Seymour Parkway North – 3200, 3300, 3400 blocks

Recommendations:

of units – 108 units

see growth PIC

priority listing - # 2 or # 3 (see Northlands)

3 or 4 small 2 storey apartment buildings for all ages that would have access onto Apex, Gaspe or the entrance to the turf center off the Parkway. Underground parking would alleviate the space constraints, and if the entrance road to the buildings paralleled the Parkway, running on the south side rather than behind the buildings, the noise problem could be somewhat abated. The new buildings could take advantage of the proximity to the golf course, and the trails could be further developed. It is within walking distance to Parkgate Mall and convenient to public transportation. Houses west of the 3500 block are generally older and some are teardowns. As for many residents whose homes face onto the Parkway, there are hazards for family and animals living so close to such a heavily traveled road as the Parkway, and it is awkward and sometimes dangerous to exit their driveway onto the Parkway. There are difficulties finding parking for guests near their homes.

See Growth PIC
- lower #
- security possible
- affordable
- all on 1 block?
- character
- MSP barrier
- ucccc

Although the homes are generally newer in the 3500 block north, eventually this area could be considered for commercial use as the Parkgate Mall expands.

Wm +

Constraints:

While residents of the 3200 and 3300 blocks are very supportive of these ideas, not all residents in the 3400 block have agreed with these suggestions. The Parkway is noisy and polluted by traffic so it is unwise to house more people here without taking definite measures to protect the residents in such an environment, with building designs that would direct living space to the north and the provision of effective noise deterrents.

** See Phasing Table*
- community
- parking
- traffic study
- creek crossing

c. Anne MacDonald Way *MF*

Recommendations:

of units – 40 multi family units (We are unsure of the exact acreage; however, any development should stay within the definition of low density)

Growth PIC might do this later w/ phase 10 = 2017 207

priority listing - #4

Multi-family units should be of a size and quality that would blend in with the built single family homes to be constructed on this street.

The idea of maintaining this land in its undeveloped state has much appeal as it creates an attractive entrance to the golf course and would give further protection to the Thomas Creek.

*maintain undeveloped state free planning
Dollart
- environment
- parkland*

Constraints

Care must be given to protect the creek in this area. Is there runoff containing fertilizers, pesticides, etc. from the golf course?

Any building more than 3 storeys high would appear intrusive here as there are few other structures in the area and the views of the trees, parks and golf course are significant factors that make this street attractive.

→ I'll add

d. Roche Point East

Recommendations:

of units - 18 single family units ?

priority listing - #5

With the intense development of apartments on the Tseil Waututh lands, there seems to be little reason to break from the single family units found on this street. We could not distinguish where the 2 lots on the west of the street would be so did not include them in our in our discussion. The cul de sac indicated on the map at the northern end could be a possibility for large duplexes.

*- Growth D.C.
parkland
out
support on
SR*

Constraints:

Roche Point Drive is very steep at the southern end. It could be hazardous to have heavy traffic in this area so we would not support a road here that would connect Dollarton and the Parkway. The green corridors should be protected as they appear to be a vital component to a healthy environment for the lower region. We would like to see the areas in Roche Point west which are presently a green belt designated as Natural Parkland. Concern that if the DNV 2 lots on the west side of an extended Roche Point Drive were developed, this would open up much of this area for future development, thus losing precious green space.

*] already a road
] add
no, part
of a park
area
here
could*

e. **Riverside Terrace (gravel pit) –**

Recommendations:

of units – ~~30~~ units. Although this area has 13.5 acres, it is our understanding that only 6 acres are potentially developable.

Priority listing – #6

This has residential potential with a mix of single family and low density multi-family units. Townhouses or duplexes would be appropriate here as nearby Maplewood would supply a good number of apartments in the area. Single family homes should predominate and would complement the development already in existence along Riverside Drive. It is quiet and attractive with Hogan's Pools area buffering the noise from the Parkway.

Access from Riverside Road appears to be the logical approach to this area.

Riverside area is one of the sites that should be considered for a future Seniors Retirement and Care Facility in Seymour*. It is in fairly close proximity to the planned Maplewood village and also, is closer to Lions Gate hospital than the other locations looked at today.

Constraints:

Development is limited due to the steep inclines around part of the gravel pit area. As there has been no building as yet in this area, it would seem that this would be one of the last sites to be considered for development amongst the 6, that is, it has been the least compromised. There are environmental considerations which need further examination before any development should begin.

*Seniors Retirement and Care Facility – Seymour should set aside land for a congregate care unit that would provide apartments where seniors could function independently if possible but where there would also be a section of the building for people requiring medical assistance and ongoing care. A dining room for all residents would be provided for meals, perhaps a laundry service, as well as a daily mini bus to help seniors get out to appointments, shopping, etc. This could be a 3 or 4 storey building with wings for different levels of care.

Growth
PIC
support
congregat
not for
Seniors
health
& not MF
> "Seniors
STAY"
c/b "not
Fu
congregat
care
100% need
accident
ant
future
but
some
medical
to care
congregat
want/need
develop
downtown
in middle
of town
etc.

In a general discussion on housing tenure, the group did not feel it was necessary to establish any particular area as being rental. There is support for maintaining the existing ratio of 80 % ownership and 20% rental but recognized that a higher proportion of rental accommodation would be found in the Maplewood area.

Apart from a Retirement and Care Facility, it does not seem to be necessary to set aside other units as senior or young family etc. By providing a number of different housing options, residents of all ages can select what is appropriate for themselves, which might provide for a healthy mix of ages in neighbourhoods. Regarding co-operative housing, it was noted that 5 non-profit (ownership and rental) and 1 equity accommodations exist in the Seymour area. Seymour Estates is investigating the possibility of low income units. It was felt that at this time no recommendation would be made for further social housing.

ADDENDUM

The following comments were additional contributions made by the members of the Housing and Schools Committee after reading the summary document on Site Visitations:

Re. Northlands – Concern was expressed that the recommended 300 units for this area is high, and that this level of development would have a negative impact on Seymour infrastructure and resources.

With recent development emphasizing multi-family units, Northlands should be used to reinstate the ratio of 64% single family, 36% multi-family (presently estimated to be 60% single family) by having a large concentration of the 300 units to be built on this site as single family dwellings. *see growth etc.*

Re. Parkway North - Suggestion was made that the recommendation for housing density should be changed to 118 units instead of 108 units, and development here should be described as a series of small tiered 3 storey buildings. When discussing access in this area, we should add: "...and from the right of way road allowance east of block 3200." Would like to see the sentence "... not all residents in the 3400 block have agreed with these suggestions. " removed as their objections stem more from different needs and concerns in this area. Suggested that it would be more practical to begin development on Parkway North rather than Parkway South as it could be done in phases compatible with the growth stages recommended by the SLP.

Re. Roche Point – The more one studies this area the more one is convinced of the absolute priority to preserve this parcel of land as green space. It has priceless old growth and serves as a pathway and habitat for a significant number of wildlife. The land to its west is being stripped, making the preservation of the forest doubly valuable. Would recommend that no further development be done in this area. Roche

*West
or
East?*

Point Drive should be left as is with the exception of a turnaround being constructed at the north end of the street

Re. Retirement and Care Facility – Should emphasize the changing demographics of an aging population to underline the need for housing and care that is appropriate for a significantly expanding older group that will populate the Seymour community.

Re. Anne MacDonald Way – Understood that Council has instructed the Planning Department to begin examining this area for future development decisions. Should this not wait until after the SLP has been completed?