

SEYMOUR LOCAL PLAN MONITORING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Monday, November 7, 2005

7:30 pm – 10:30 pm

District Hall, Room B

Meeting called by: Barbara Murray	Type of meeting:
Facilitator: Eric Andersen	Note taker: Karen Rendek
Attendees: Eric Andersen; Dennis Bevington, Alf Cockle, Bill Mauer, Barbara Murray IRCA Group: Fred Adab, Gerry Eckford, Bob Heaslip, Ghol Marzara, Mark Sager District staff: Doug Allan, Karen Rendek	
Absent: Catherine Sherlock, Don S. Williams	
Please bring:	

AGENDA ITEMS

Topic

✓ **Status Update of IRCA Application**

Committee members reviewed the phasing strategy with the applicant and expressed concerns regarding the unit counts to date in Seymour. The residential development potential in both Maplewood and on Tsleil-Waututh lands and the possible impacts these variables could have on driving up the unit counts in Seymour was also discussed.

The Committee noted that the count has already exceeded 250 units in Phase I: 2003 – 2007 and if consideration is given to borrow from Phase II it should be contemplated late in the Phase I period, therefore, discussion of this proposal is premature from the Committee's standpoint. The consultants were also asked if staff had informed them of the policies contained within the Plan, and more specifically, the community's expectation for slow and managed growth in the Seymour area. The consultants agreed that they have been duly informed and they would like to continue with the development review process.

Action: Committee (Bill) handed out a copy of the email dated October 13, 2005 outlining the official position of the Committee to each person in attendance (provided as Attachment A to these notes).

✓ **Presentation of IRCA Proposal - Options**

Bob Heaslip gave a brief overview of the various aspects of the project including the studies submitted to the District for review to address traffic, engineering (stormwater management), environmental and design issues etc.

Fred Adab presented three (3) site layout options and provided a model for illustration purposes. All three (3) options included combinations of one apartment building (varying in height from four (4) to eight (8) storeys) and multiple townhouse units (varying in height from two (2) to three (3) storeys).

Option 1: Apartment building – 8 storeys – 54 units; townhouses – 2 storeys – 25 units – underground parking throughout

Option 2: Apartment building – 4 storeys – 39 units; townhouses – 3 storeys – 28 units – underground parking for apartment building only

Option 3: Apartment building – 6 storeys – 53 units; townhouses – 2 storeys – 24 units – underground parking throughout

The options presented which include an apartment building exceeding four (4) storeys in height would

incorporate underground parking throughout the entire site, including the townhouse portion, and utilize the central portion of the site as greenspace.

The applicant's consultant pointed out that in order to create a scheme with internal greenspaces and underground parking throughout the site an increase in density would be required, from their point of view, to off-set the costs of construction as underground parking is very expensive. Therefore, option two includes an internal roadway and at-grade parking area for the townhouse units.

The applicant also offered to restrict the first two floors, of the proposed apartment building with each option, to accommodate seniors +65 (with levels 2 and 3 adaptability).

Action: Presentation by IRCA Group (Bob Heaslip and Fred Adab).

✓ **Discussion**

Briefly discussed various aspects of each of the proposed options. Members indicated that four (4) storeys is the maximum height recommended for residential buildings in the Plan.

Action: The IRCA Group thanked the Committee for their time and input.

✓ **Other Items (Community Amenities List/Strategy)**

Committee members discussed the need to meet to review their community amenity 'wish list' and draft a working document for review with staff. Members agreed that they would model the structure of the working document after the Public Benefits Strategy for Lynn Valley but they would like to explore further modeling the funding strategy after the Developer Public Art Program where the budget calculation is based on 1% of the gross construction costs as noted on the building permit for residential applications involving a rezoning. Briefly discussed amongst the members was the possibility of increasing the percentage of the gross construction costs from 1% to 2% for the Seymour strategy.

Action: Committee agreed to meet in December or early January to discuss further. Staff (Karen) will provide the Committee with background information on the Developer Public Art Program.

✓ **Next Meeting**

To be announced.

OTHER INFORMATION

Resources: Excerpt of the motion made at the Advisory Design Panel meeting held on October 13, 2005 (draft).

Pages 24, 25 and 29 of the Seymour Local Plan including policies 6.2.7; 6.2.10 and Table 6-1: Phasing Variables & Conditions of Development for Mount Seymour Parkway (Potential blocks 3200 to 3500).

Community Amenities List/Strategy:

- Suggestions – Summary to Date (distributed to Committee members only)

Special notes: Handed out at the meeting: email from Bill Maurer dated October 13, 2005 entitled 'IRCA development at 3294 – 3354 Mt. Seymour Parkway' outlining the official position of the Committee.

Attachment A

Email sent by Bill Maurer on Thursday, October 13, 2005 entitled
'IRCA development at 3294 - 3354 Mt Seymour Pkwy'

The SLP Monitoring Committee CANNOT ENDORSE THE IRCA DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL at this time due to the fact that the maximum allowable built units for phase 1 has already been exceeded. The SLP allows for this to be reconsidered as a phase 2 development in the 2008 to 2012 timeframe. In addition, the SLP Monitoring Committee does not support the rezoning of the affected properties at this time.

The maximum number of units which the SLP allows to be built in phase 1 (2003-2007) is 250. See the minutes of the April 4, 2005 council meeting for a detailed accounting of units as existed at that time. This is summarized in item 1 at

http://www.dnv.org/upload/documents/Council_Agendas_Minutes/cm050404.htm

Furthermore council agreed "THAT the procedure for processing preliminary development applications be consistent across the District and reflect the direction and spirit of the Official Community Plans." at the Sep 26, 2005 council meeting. See item 3 of

http://www.dnv.org/upload/documents/Council_Agendas_Minutes/cm050926.htm

Sincerely,

SLP Monitoring Committee
Alf Cockle - aacockle@telus.net
Barb Murray - murrllaw@shaw.ca
Bill Maurer - billm@millsoft.ca - 604-789-2172 Eric Andersen - andersen@sagafc.com
