

Land Use Committee minutes from video transcription July 7

Minute 4:41

JV – “(there are a) number of concerns by neighbourhood regarding the interface. (This is an) important one acre area in Grandview Heights ... more work to be done.

(It is) difficult because there has been an NCP completed in this area (across the street in area 5A) and that's often what people want and it does meet the guidelines of the NCP and I do think there is some people more involved with that now **but there is still a pretty heavy concern from the community so I think that we've had some conversation about this but that its really not at this point ready to go to Public Hearing until we have resolved some of those issues.**

So after listening to community concerns ... but I'm **not just convinced that we have the kind of community support that we need to move forward at this point** so that's why I am asking for referral back.”

MM – (refers to Cnsl V's comments) “I'm not completely satisfied with it and that's why I am going to support the referral back for the developers to work with staff and come up with a better plan”

BH- “I too will be supporting the referral and just to a point to you Madame Mayor and to Staff, I would really like us to have a look at 164A road there and what we're talking about there is those transitional densities and in the NCP is calling for between two and 10 UPA now I realize at the end of that was taking into account some duplexes but 2 to 10 my goodness is awfully broad range and I know that some residents are really interpreting that in the two and I know that others might interpret that in the 10 so I think this is potentially when some of the disagreement and some of the rub comes from with the local community having spoken with the local community as well I really think that **we should look at those transitional densities.** We do have an approved NCP and so I uh we want the project to go forward but we need it to work for everyone. So those are my feelings on that if I could just leave that with staff.”

LH – “I agree with Councillor Hayne that is a big disconnect between Large Lot family and Large Lot duplex from 2 to 10 and the neighborhood is certainly thinking 2 which would be a **closer mirror to the other side 26th** think the developer has done a significant remake in terms of coming down around 4, 4 1/2 **but it is not a mirror image in that transition and that landscape buffer is a bit of a problem as well so if there's an opportunity to reduce that 164A and then to allow those lots to be larger and closer to a mirror image that I think that would satisfy the neighborhood.** Do not seem to be as concerned relative to the RF and RF 10's that are farther to the south but certainly that buffer on 26th Ave. In satisfying the public domain I'm in support of bringing the referral back.”

BS- “I too support the referral back. I think it's important that we have more conversation I know it seems to of been a lot but I think there is still room for more conversation more dialogue on this between the neighbors and the developers. I think there is goodwill on both sides I think that people wanted to succeed but we've got that **stickler on 26th** across the street and the neighbors aren't happy with that and I think we can make something

work is for the suggestions made by Counselor Hayne as well. I will be Supporting the referral.”

Vote : unanimous for referral to staff.

Focus

- 164A – removal?
- Larger lots to effect “mirror” from north to south side