

BOWEN ISLAND MUNICIPALITY

Minutes of the **regular meeting of the Surplus Lands Working Group of the Bowen Island Municipality** held on Wednesday December 6, 2006 at 7:45 a.m. in the Council Chambers of the Bowen Island Municipal Hall.

COMMITTEE IN ATTENDANCE

Neil Boyd –Chair
Sara Baker
Ross Carter
Jim Cox*
Frits de Vries
Tom Rafael*
Isabell Hadford – Chief Administrative Officer
Michael Rosen – Planning Consultant

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE

Jason Smith - Planner
Tim Wake – Bowen Island Housing Association
Councillor Wrinch
Gayle Ferguson – Minute Taker
(* Denotes partial attendance)

REGRETS

Councillor Barrett
Ross McDonald

CALL TO ORDER

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7: 26 p.m.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

By unanimous consent the agenda was approved as amended.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES**It was Moved and Seconded**

That the Minutes of the Surplus Lands Working Group held on November 9, 2006 be adopted. CARRIED

It was Moved and Seconded

That the minutes of the Surplus Lands Working group held on November 23, 2006 be adopted as amended:
Page 2 insert the following after No. 4 “*The above scenarios were based on anecdotal information, subject to verification and further exploration.*” CARRIED

Chair re: Submissions

The Chair noted the following:

- Correspondence had been received from Ed Sanders, representing nineteen Seniors from Bowen Court. The correspondence related to the desire to have a buffer zone between construction on the Surplus Lands and Bowen Court;
- Murray Skeels had submitted a proposal for Parcel One

'Welcome to Flat Iron Junction', a proposal for mixed use heritage style buildings;

- Further submissions to the Group - the Chair believed that the Working Group should welcome written submissions. If there were questions the Group had after reading the submissions they could then choose to invite those who had submitted to attend a Working Group meeting.

Updates

CAO Hadford reported that Council had passed resolutions proposed by the Civic Facilities Working Group regarding the following:

- Timeline to identify lands within the surplus lands package that can be disposed of to recover costs and eliminate the debt incurred to purchase the surplus lands. Council had agreed that the timeline was not a definite 12 month timeframe;
- Ensuring sewage capacity for a future civic facility;
- Staff to prepare a report on expanding the Cove Bay Water System to include land for a Civic Facility.

It was noted that the Planning Consultant and the Transportation Working Group would report on December 11, 2006 to Council on Phase One, ferry marshalling options.

The Planning Consultant reported that Paul Webster had agreed to donate to the community the topographical survey for Parcel One Lands .

Regarding the value of Parcel One lands, the Chair noted the following:

1. David Riddell, Realtor had reported one-quarter lots in Deep Bay sold for \$250,000;
2. Suggestion that the Municipality rezone in five acre lots for strata development and attach conditions on what the Municipality would like to have;
3. Clustering would allow for more density.

The following issues were raised:

- Clustering would allow for a better social mix - i.e. spread affordable housing across various lands through an allowable square footage formula;
- Advantages of creating land use designations for Parcel One

1. Other two parcels could be more flexible regarding future uses;
2. Establishing zoning for Parcel One would set the precedent for peripheral lands elsewhere;
3. Affordable Housing would move to Parcels Two and Three, which were closer to the Cove.

Frits re: Possible Scenarios for
Parcels Two and Three

Frits provided the Group with sketches of the following scenarios for Parcel Two and Three:

1. Parcel Two - Steepness of a portion of the land would indicate less clustered buildings for that area;
2. Less Options of Housing types due to topography.
Option One - suggestion to designate the unbuildable parts for 2.5 levels apartment building with some commercial. Buildings could be made higher. Apartments could be 9,1000 square feet with two bedrooms, parking underneath giving 37 two bedroom or 78 one bedroom units;
3. Adjacent land to Bowen Court could have one building given for Seniors;
4. Northern section behind the school
 - o Single family lots of 6,000 square feet = 16 lots.
 - o Second version clustered single family homes
 - o Third townhouses scenario gets forty units but ends up full
 - o Fourth apartment buildings gives approximately 52 units
5. Portion of Parcel Two on east side of Miller Road
 - o Mixed use Civic building on higher land, and behind the civic building, townhouse buildings. Could argue townhouses good form of development but problem is parking space;
 - o Second Scenario with 86 apartments.

The Group expressed their appreciation to Frits for his contribution and discussed the following issues:

- Parking – suggestion for a parking building and to restrict parking to one space per unit;
- Parcel Two Scenarios do not include single family dwellings;
- Next Steps
 1. Identify scenarios that have merit
 2. Have those scenarios evaluated;
 3. Establish a unit based price
- Include affordable housing;
- Civic Facility - possible location on the crest of the Hill

could be a signature building on a visible location.

Tom Rafael requested the Group to consider a more global approach. He recommended that a consultant be hired to work with representation from all groups to lay out a series of scenarios/alternatives. The consultant would come in with drawings and listen to the Groups in order to move us forward and try to integrate it all.

Michael Rosen, Planning Consultant noted the following:

1. Integration was occurring among the groups through the Chairs, and the provision of updates from the Planning Consultant and Municipal staff members;
2. The idea of hiring a consultant to overlook the process was discussed by Council. Council decided they preferred to use resources of the community, augmented by consultants;
3. Each group was set up to provide information to Council. Then at the end an overall global plan. Groups do not have to make any decisions.
4. Terms of Reference for the Surplus Lands Working group considered that they would contemplate all options without knowing the location of a civic facility site.

The Group discussed the following issues related to process issues:

- Timeline could be shortened by having outside expertise;
- More intercommunication between the groups was needed;
- Interim Step – presentations to Council by each of the working groups that identified potentials of each parcel
- Tom's idea to be presented to Council for their decision as they had previously considered his request;
- Present Tasks - identifying potentials and options;
- Overall Planning Issues
 1. What lands were to be sold and what lands were to be retained; future uses, park land and affordable housing;
 2. Identify and provide rationale for potential uses
 3. Parcel One – setting the tone for transition lands
- Next Steps for Surplus Lands Working group
 1. Determine approximate financial values for each parcel - single family, single family clustered, townhouses, apartments, commercial and civic facility locations with values for each including the densities

2. present other options with less financial value

It was Moved and Seconded

The Surplus Lands Working Group recommends to Council that following the initial presentations made to Council by the Working Group, that Council recognize this work has been done in isolation and this raw data must be integrated into a holistic plan before any decisions are made. CARRIEI

The group requested staff to advise the other working groups of the following recommendation to be presented and discussed at the Surplus Lands Working Group meeting on December 19, 2006:

“That the Surplus Lands Working Group recommend to the Civic Facilities Working group and the Transportation Working group that members of the working groups be prepared with the help of consultants to present integrated holistic plan options, which will recommend the sale of lands as well as densities, location of a civic facility, Municipal facility, affordable housing, and transportation”

December 19 Agenda Items

The Group agreed to meet at 7:45 a.m. on December 19, 2006 to discuss the following:

- Recommendation for retention of a consultant;
- Parcel One Scenarios using Webster's Topographical survey;
- Murray Skeels Proposal for Parcel One;
- Former Library Site

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 10:33 a.m.