



Date: Feb 11/14

Location: Lucas Centre, Hamilton Heights

Time: 7:00pm to 9:00pm

Attendees:

Executives:

Pam Pike

Mark Chevalier

Mark Clarke

Tom Wright

Will in place of Heidi Peterson

Monica Fraser

Hamilton Heights Neighbourhood Association Members: 50+

1. Pam called the meeting to order and reviewed the current agenda.
2. Pam provided the back ground to why the Hamilton Heights Neighbourhood Association including the recent meeting held by the School Board at Lucas Centre on Jan 29/14 and how “we” as residents were not invited unless “we” were part of an official formal association. She noted that this new Association was not just about the Lucas Centre but was currently the main driving focus for the Association at this time. She read out the Hamilton Heights Neighbourhood Association mandate.
Hamilton Heights is a self-contained, close-knit community of home owners and families in the City of North Vancouver. We value our environment, our quality of life and the character of our neighbourhood. The Hamilton Heights Neighbourhood Association is an inclusive organization that is dedicated to improving our community life and championing the values of the homeowners and residents of the community.
3. Pam introduced the Hamilton Heights Neighbourhood Associations Executive members.
4. Pam noted that there was a cost associated with the rental of the space at the Lucas Centre in the amount of \$164.00. Therefore, she asked for any donations from the participants in order to cover the costs. It was noted that in the future, other space locations will be considered in order to eliminate the costs of the rental such as the Capilano Mall community space.

5. Will and Tom on behalf of Heidi provided a current update on the status of the Lucas Centre.

The Lucas Centre and the Leo Marshall Curriculum Centre (referred to throughout as “The Lands”) opened in the 50’s and 60’s respectively. Both facilities closed as enrolling schools in 1982. They have functioned since as various institutions, including Continuing and Adult Education, Youth Learning Centre, Artists for Kids gallery, Windsor House (parent-participation/homeschool fusion facility), and the NV School District Works yard. The facility is in deficient condition and is in need of significant upgrades.

The land area in question today is just over 5 hectares – everything except the two gravel fields (though it should be noted that the City, which owns the gravel fields, has indicated that it could be persuaded to do a land swap with the NVSD and relocate the fields elsewhere on the Lands, depending on what else happens on the Lands.

The Lands are currently zoned as “School and Institutional”. The land to the east and west is designated “Parks, Recreation and Open Space”. Our neighbourhood to the south is zoned “Low Density Residential (RS-1)”.

The NVSD notes that the Lands are of adequate size to support a school. It also notes that road access is limited. However, the NVSD has determined the probability of needing an enrolling school in this location in the future is low.

The Lands, along with Cloverly School, are the last 2 of the NVSD “surplus” holdings, the rest having been sold or gone into long-term leases. The Lands are the most potentially valuable of all the surplus holdings.

In the City’s separate Draft Official Community Plan, the Lands have been designated as a “Special Study Area”. Mark Chevalier will elaborate more next.

The NVSD is to be steered by its Land, Learning and Liveability Principles in making its decisions. Options for the Lands include short-term lease, long-term lease, redevelopment and sale. The NVSD has hired DIALOG Design (Land management planning experts) to lead a public process which will most likely result in the sale of the Lands. DIALOG is charged with sharing information on the project, listening to the concerns of the community and offering opportunities for the community to share and hear from its members.

The Process:

Step 1: Understanding Neighbourhood Priorities – Jan – Feb 2014

(Community workshops, public open houses, site & feasibility analyses)

Step 2: Exploring Options March – April 2014

(Community workshops, public open houses, feasibility analysis)

Step 3: Reviewing the Preferred Option: May – June 2014

(Survey, ongoing updates, final analysis)

What DIALOG had heard so far:

Concerns

- Too many condos already
- Traffic issues
- Loss of facilities

Ideas:

- Keep Lands as community amenities
- Elder / senior care

Pam noted that the current ideas and suggestions proposed from the School Board for the end use of the property came potentially from the previous meetings held by the school board.

6. John from Cumberland spoke on the following items: He indicated that he was part of the Hamilton Fell Association and had worked in the past to assist with the Association on the development projects re: previous towers on Marine, current towers on Marine Drive, auto mall, and recently the Harbour Side development. He noted that the Association seems together in times of crisis. He was glad to see the new Hamilton Height Neighbourhood Association. He also addressed why Hamilton Fell was invited to the meeting as this was the only official Association which was registered with the City at the time. He indicated that when he was more involved in the Hamilton Fell Association, he had approximately 30 to 40 members! He wished the Hamilton Heights Neighbourhood Association good luck with the process and was there to support the Association as needed.
7. Mark Chevalier provided a brief review and summary on the current OCP and Draft OCP.

Mark noted that the OCP was also referred to as the City Shaping and the Official Community Plan.

The Draft OCP was now at Stage 4 re: Draft Report issued Dec 2013, noting that comments / feedback were required to be issued by residents on or before Feb 28/14. This feedback by means of paper forms, website comment and Open Houses. The City is vague on dates and refers to "seasons" rather than specific dates. He further noted that the OCP would be read for by-law in the spring / summer and ratified in the fall. He referenced the upcoming fall election for the City of North Vancouver. We need to act quickly to inform the City of our thoughts and ideas.

The current OCP allowed for single family plus a suite or coach house. The Draft OCP will allow for a single family home which can also have a suite and coach house. Therefore, we could expect more traffic based on this planning structure. This could potentially lead to 6 vehicles per house lot.

He noted that currently the Lucas property is zoned for institutional / school usage.

The Lucas Centre is being reviewed under a Special Study Area within the overall OCP and therefore the approval of the current Draft OCP will not potentially affect the overall final outcome of the Lucas Centre property.

It was noted that since the School Board is a private owner, they have hired a consultant to look at potential uses for the Lucas Centre land. This is an entirely different process than the OCP. The City and School Board technically are separate though they may very well be collaborating behind the closed doors.

Mark further noted the article from last year in the North Shore News which spoke to the City wanting an opportunity to consider the potential uses of the property. He also noted a June 17/13 vote by City Council which was 4 to 3 in favour of a motion for "City staff to report to Council on methods of preserving the Lucas Centre as a community Fields / Park Complex".

June 28, 2013 North Shore News - "City wants say on Lucas Centre Plans":
<http://www.nsnews.com/news/city-wants-say-on-lucas-centre-plans-1.391763>

The Lucas Centre has been designated as a 'Special Study Area' in the OCP. This is a placeholder in the OCP and the City has a 10 year period to generate their Special Study to determine the zoning and go through public hearings. Even if the OCP is approved no the Lucas site is still a school zone for now until they go through public hearings to change the zoning. The City has stated that they would like to see "no" net loss of park space. The City has also stated that they have proposed no changes to the existing gravel fields other than some improvements for the current sediment run-off. Mark noted that there would be a potential for a land swap with the City reference the existing gravel fields as long as the net difference did not result in a loss of land.

Mark noted that the City Planning Dept would be issuing a report on the Lucas Centre but currently this report was not available. He will continue to pursue the report from the City.

Mark confirmed that there was an error in the City's Transportation report referencing the new bus route along 21st Street. He will follow-up with the City to ensure this is removed from the final report.

Heather from 21st asked who owned the treed area behind the school. It was noted that this area was owned by MOT.

8. Pam opened the floor for all present to speak and present ideas for the end use of the land.
- Helen from Fell: she noted the past experiences with the potential development of the 7 houses along Fell as well as the city owned land between the groups of houses may potentially still be developed. She indicated that the residents had to be open minded! She indicated that the

School Board did not care and therefore the residents may need to reasonable and accept single houses vs duplexes and or multi level housing units. She indicated that you cannot replace the fields and the existing grass field was only one of 2 remaining grass fields. She thanked the Hamilton Heights Neighbourhood Association for coming together and wants us to work as a Team!

- Fred from 19th noted that the School Board was currently running the process but after some discussion it was agreed that a developer would only move forward if the City was in line with the proposed development, therefore, the City and the School Board would be working together behind the scenes to ensure that they had their processes coordinated.
- Ray from 19th noted separating the OCP and Special Study Area would have the most impact. After the Special Study area process, there would be a requirement for a public hearing to approve the process and decisions.
- Helen from Westmoreland indicated that the School Board could not sell the land without the approval of the Ministry of Education. The MOE has criteria that must be met for the School Board to sell property. She asked that “we go for what we think not personal wishes”! What would be a really good use for the area, be creative! Do not decide ahead of time what you cannot get! She noted that this was the only flat property left.
- Dina from 20th asked why a Special Study Area. It was indicated that Lucas and Cloverly were the only 2 remaining redundant properties and hence the Special Study Area. Mark noted there were no set reasons why these properties would be considered as Special study, this designation could also apply to non-school properties too.
- John from Cumberland noted that the School Board did not need to sell the property though the sale will allow for funding to cover the costs associated with seismic upgrades required at other school properties. He further noted that the School Board and the City were aligned with each other and therefore the Association would have to “fight’ both organizations. He suggested that the City will use the School Board’s report for justification to do what they intend. A general discussion took place reference densities and it was concluded that Mark Chevalier would obtain details from the City.
- Tracey from 20th indicated that she estimated approximately 8 properties per acre at a RS1 zoning. Based on a rough calculation the lowest possible residential zoning for the neighbourhood this could be potentially an additional 576 people.
- Jay from 20th indicated that he lived in the neighbourhood since 1975. He noted the previous work completed on the traffic calming of the neighbourhood. He further noted the current traffic issues at the intersection of Hamilton, 16th and Marine. At this location 5 streets meet. It was suggested that this intersection is currently at peak or greater than design volumes. Add to this the potential for 3 times the number of people in the neighbourhood, residents of Hamilton Heights would have an even greater problem. The Executive was tasked to look to ICBC for current accident data. The main concern is the City has already allowed additional density due to the new building at the old Roger’s Video store location. The current neighbourhood has only 3 potential access points re: Hamilton at 16th, 19th at Fell and 20th at Fell.
- Monica from 20th noted her concerns with the traffic and provided some back ground to her past interior design work which allowed her to study plans. She has reviewed the current traffic

photos and noted a potential for a bridge over Mosquito Creek, MacKay Creek to Pemberton to assist in traffic flows.

- Marianne from 21st noted that she has written the City reference the Hamilton Ave and 16th intersection. The City has indicated that they do not have any issues with the intersection and suggested that she use the Fell access point. She suggested a stop sign at the Hamilton 16th intersection to allow access from Hamilton but nothing has been received to date from the City. She indicated that she would forward the emails for reference.
- Helen from Fell noted that she suggested 'speed bumps' for Fell and was advised that this was a disaster route and hence could not have speed bumps. She indicated that was potentially the same for 16th.
- Helen from Westmoreland noted that as the density for the City increases, so would the need for additional schools. It was noted that the School Board has addressed this noting that they have additional capacity and space for expansion at their existing facilities.
- Individual asked who attended the recent School Board meeting. It was noted that the Hamilton Fell Association had members there along with the Hamilton Heights Neighbourhood Association plus others including Councillor Clark, a realtor and others. She further asked if the Vancouver Coastal Health been contacted and considered for the space. Tracey from 20th indicated that the property would be sold to a private developer and noted the current private developer for Delbrook.
- Dina from 20th suggested that she would like to see the property developed into a working farm noting this is compliant with the City's initiatives on sustainability, green space, environment, food security etc. Will from 20th supported this idea.
- Brent from 19th noted that he and his family moved here 7 years ago due to the low traffic volume and the safe area for his kids to play. He noted that single family houses would be better but expect higher density. He suggested looking at seniors facilities as they have no cars in terms of traffic. Need to be realistic, development will occur and we need to steer what development does occurs so it will not kill the neighbourhood with heavy traffic. He noted that developers in the past that he worked with provided additional benefits such as a \$16m seawall. These are extracted from the developer in order that the developer can move forward.
- Will from 20th noted that there is a proposed senior and mental health care facility for Edgemont.
- Brenda from Cumberland noted that the senior's development in Edgemont has been approved and there were development benefits provided for the old Capilano Winter Club property.
- Jane from 20th asked what would be the number of people expected if developed? A gentleman from the Westmoreland area indicated he was recently at a meeting where the density was indicated to be 200 units per city block for condos.
- Mark Chevalier noted that in response to the number of people and density stats that it was difficult to generate numbers at this stage due to the many factors involved, parking for playing fields, roads etc.
- Fred from 19th noted the following. Reference creative solutions, note that the School Board is selling the property and will want to make as much money (\$) as possible. Therefore would need to look at private developers / operators for facilities such as senior's complex. Need to

look at business solutions that would provide community benefit. He further noted that developers will use extract benefits for density bonuses from the City re: examples: provide a number of disability units, day care etc.

- Helen from Westmoreland advised that we should not decide ahead of time what we can't get. She quoted the outcome of the proposed sales of the Argyle and Plymouth school properties that were halted due to community and other pressures.
- Helen from Westmoreland asked that as many as possible come to the open house meeting on Feb 19/14. Pam noted the meeting was from 5 to 8. Please all come. Also, please check out the Hamilton Heights Neighbourhood Association web site www.hamiltonheights.ca that Dina Robertson and Ian Smith have prepared and provide any feedback and concerns you may have.
- Will from 20th noted that all the information provided to the City reference the Draft OCP Feedback forms will affect the OCP and the School Board. Consider that the City of Vancouver has approved community gardens, farm areas, parks etc. and want to develop small communities within the overall community.
- Heather from 20th noted her main concern was traffic! She further asked about the potential for any new roads?
- Mark C noted that the OCP has 5 pages devoted to transportation and that their projections of how people will use public transit, walking and so on are optimistic. The reality is that new residents who can pay the prices for properties in the area are all going to have cars.
- The OCP says they are not planning on upgrading any road systems unless it is for sustainable methods of transportation, bikes, public transport for example. This is significant.
- Jay noted that the area was a single family area and now with the changing neighbourhood, there are more kids coming into the neighbourhood. Concern from safety and traffic.
- Margie from Cumberland noted for the residents to stay positive and creative! Over the years, the residents have fought many items. Please realize that the OCP will continue to change and this will affect our focus.
- Helen from Fell noted that she felt that the traffic was her concern. It was dangerous. Please have a good attitude going forward. She further noted that the condos below Cumberland were promised a play ground but did not get it.
- Tracey from 20th noted to be creative. She further noted the concern over parking.
- John from Cumberland noted to keep in mind the upcoming fall election. With traditional low turn outs, a small group of people could potentially influence the outcomes. Peoples vote can make a difference. John further noted that Rob Clark and Pam Bookham of City Council are great assets and supportive.
- Will from 20th noted that early in the process they spoke to Pam Bookham and were encouraged to form the Association. He further noted that the current proposals for the property were a 4 story town house?
- John from Cumberland further noted the Voices group.
- John noted that there is never a need to provide the number of people in the Association and always use a "blind" copy to the members.
- Jay from 20th asked to get pictures of the neighbourhood to assist in the web page noting any pictures such as historical, current, field usage, wildlife etc.

- Lea from 20th noted the potential concerns with impact on environment and wildlife including the MacKay Creek.
- Mark Chevalier noted the following: neighbourhood character, the old trolley system, MacKay Creek, long time residents, heritage, Trans Canada Trail.

9. Next Steps:

- As many members as possible to come to the Feb 19/14 meeting!
- Hamilton Heights Neighbourhood Association will want to present info to the School Board based on the information received during the Feb 11/14 meeting.
- The Executives will meet prior to the Feb 19/14 meeting to provide a summary of what will be the “position” of the Hamilton Heights Neighbourhood Association re: the residents input. Tentatively this meeting will be scheduled for Sunday, Feb 16/14.
- Please ensure that everyone provides their own input to the Draft OCP by Feb 28/14.
- All to think about who we should be connecting with in the overall process.
- Please provide any contacts of individuals who can assist in providing support from a “field user” group.

10. Meeting adjourned at approximately 9:00pm.