

**Varsity View Local Area Plan Meeting #16**  
**Wednesday, October 19, 2011**  
**Brunskill School Library**  
**101 Wiggins Avenue South**  
**7:00 pm**

**Attendees:** Dave Billard, Patricia Englund, Barb Gilles, Paul Halyk, Anne Hardy, Susan Hatfield, Shalene Herron, Brian & Donna Noonan, Brenda O'Connor, James Perkins, Allan Woo, Jack Rudolph, Betty Grudniski, Mark Josh, Victor Das, Patricia Funk, Will Robbins, Tammi Denby, Lavika Kushwaha, David Hutton, George Tannous, Councillor Charlie Clark, Dylan Czarnecki – Community Consultant, Mark Emmons & Courtney Johnson – Senior Planner, Brent McAdam – Planner, Shirlene Palmer – Recording Secretary

### **1. Welcome, Introductions & Agenda**

Meeting called to order at 7:05p.m.

Mark Emmons introduced himself, Courtney Johnson and Brent McAdam as facilitators of this LAP review meeting.

The purpose of tonight's meeting is to:

- Review the draft sections you have received to date and get your feedback and comments on each section
- Our goal is to receive all comments/edits this evening so that we can move onto the next sections of the report. Your time is valuable to us, so we want to make this as efficient for you.
- Sections include: Vision and Guiding Principles, The Planning Process, Yesterday & Today, and Traffic & Circulation

It was noted there were 4 new people at tonight's meeting.

### **2. Agenda & Ground Rules**

Through this Local Area Plan we have created Foundations for Success (or ground rules) to specify how meetings will be conducted. It ensures that group members feel comfortable in sharing their concerns, opinions and ideas with the group.

1. Listen to each other with respect
2. One person speaks at a time and no side conversations
3. Everyone has an equal voice
4. Let everyone speak
5. Stay focused
6. Speak loudly

### **3. LAP Review Process & Framework**

This LAP process began September 2009 with the final information gathering meeting taking place on June 21, 2011. We are now in the review/editing stage.

At the LAPC request, we are bringing sections out as they become available, which is different than what has been done in the previous 11 LAPs. As such, there can be some challenges in this review that we wanted to identify as we go through this process such as:

- Comments we have received to date may pertain or be better suited to another section that are coming soon – we will go over shortly what those sections are.
- City Administration has not review the document and may have edits or feedback that is different than what you have review tonight, thus the final document may be changed somewhat based on discussions with Admin and yourselves, thus you will be undergoing two reviews.
- All sections have been drafted using the LAPC meeting notes, data on the topic, feedback from group exercises and general discussions, current city initiatives and policies, and research from our section (i.e. Parking Benefit).
- Although City staff accept written comments regarding the draft sections prior to meetings, it is still important for authors of edits/comments to attend the review meetings if possible. We may not clearly understand what their comments are or need more discussion.

#### 4. LAP Sections Review

Now we wanted to go over the framework/outline of the report that we have laid out via discussions with the LAPC and topics to date so that we can stay focused on our topics for review tonight (about ½ hour per section).

We will briefly introduce the topic; the concepts discussed in the section then open it up for open discussion to the LAPC and will note those on the flip chart. We will begin with comments received to date.

A master will copy will be available for spelling/ grammar. Please feel free to place your edits on this document during coffee or during the meeting. We want to focus on content rather than wordsmithing at these meetings. We want the big goals, dreams, and vision you see for Varsity View. This is not to say the smaller details are not important, but keep in mind the LAP is one tool the neighbourhood has, so don't feel if you don't get in to the plan (i.e. A stop sign at X and Y Street).

Keep in mind some of us are detail folks and some of us are not. So what is important to your neighbour may not be as important to you. Try to be patient, remember the Foundations for Success above.

Lastly, please keep the discussion fresh. If a comment has been received, clarified and agreed upon, let's move on so everyone can get all ideas/comment across tonight. If there is a topic/idea that requires more discussion or we get stuck we will discuss what to do about this at the end of this meeting or "Parking Lot" the item.

#### 1. Vision and Guiding Principles – Mark

This is to help guide the neighbourhood into the future. To set short, medium and long term goals. How do you want to see your neighbourhood in the future?

At the onset of the Local Area Plan process, the Varsity View Local Area Plan (LAP committee worked together to create the following vision for their community:

*"Varsity View is a historic neighbourhood centrally located close to the river, the downtown, the University of Saskatchewan, and Royal*

*University Hospital. Its historic roots stem from the adjacent University of Saskatchewan campus. The neighbourhood is characterized by an eclectic mix of character housing, a vibrant school which attracts families from all areas of the city, a high amount of rental accommodation, and a mature urban forest. The residents are diverse in terms of age, culture, education level, and income. This adds to the overall vitality of the neighbourhood.*

*Varsity View is a safe neighbourhood with activity at all times of the day. It is a high energy, active neighbourhood which is amendable to cycling and walking, its central location also accommodates transit usage.*

*Varsity View strives to maintain its diversity, heritage, and architecture. Varsity View will be a model sustainable community.”*

**Comments Received to date:**

- Should we say something about changing housing stock, lots of new homes being built?

**Group Comments Tonight:**

- Maintain the Urban Forest – it is a great asset to the neighbourhood and need to add “should be protected and preserved”.
- Not all agree with statement of “the changes in the neighbourhood” – Mark noted these are others statements so they cannot be changed but can be clarified more if necessary
- Statements vs Principles?
- Principles should represent the collective discussion had within the group
- Statements are individual responses to questions. What you feel your community is.
- Statement on infill is required
- Accommodate pedestrian – welcome pedestrian/cyclists
- Infrastructure stress with density
- University/campus relationship
- Need be more specific in regards to the infrastructure in the neighbourhood and what the City plans on doing with all the new developments.
- Mark noted the LAPC members should each identify one or two key topics/issues for that are important to them. Are these reflected in the vision/guidelines/goals? Now is a good time to try to identify those as you have all put lots of time in.
- The overarching relationship between residents and the University is key.
- It is difficult to finish this section prior to all the other sections being written and reviewed.

It was agreed this section will be revisited after the full document has been reviewed. At that time goals and general principles can be looked at more specifically and make sure recommendations and goals are complete.

**2. Planning Process – Courtney**

**Comments Received to Date:**

- 118 Participants – The LAPC number seems high. Who is included in this?

**Group Comments Tonight:**

- 118 participants includes the sign in sheets from all of the meetings but not the people receiving the reading material. As some feel 118 is high while others things low may need to have some type of comparison with other LAP's such as Riversdale or Caswell. Since there are about 3500 in Varsity View 118 is not bad considering there are many apathetic people as well as a high student occupation in the area. Should clarify that "on average there were an average of 20-40 people per meeting.
- These numbers do put some weight behind the documents. Thought may be interesting to put numbers that were at each separate meeting as this may show which issues are of more concern the Varsity View e.g. Infill workshop was well attended.
- Develop goals for infill – Change to begin too....
- Characteristic areas with the neighbourhood
- Cumberland and Clarence – take out South as it includes North as well
- Blog – not updated regularly and some did not even know about it
- With a high percentage of rentals does not seem to be too bad of a turn out. Mark noted originally turn out was not as good but then working with Community Association were able to have meeting same night to be conscientious of LAPC's time.
- Clarify 49 neighbourhood surveys were mailed to all households. The process is been going on for 2.5 years do we need to look at reaching out to new community members now?

Mark noted the gathering process is complete and we are now in the process of writing and reviewing information of previous meeting. We now want to hear from people who have been here through most of the process; we don't want to have to start all over again. He noted there will be an open house once the final draft is completed before going to City Council so the neighbourhood will know what is being brought forward in regards to Varsity View.

#### **Questions:**

- **Was the infill workshop an entire meeting?**

Mark noted it was an entire meeting /workshop. At the end of the workshop the group developed a list of general goals for housing in Varsity View. Each group was randomly assigned an identified area and after discussion with their group created their general goals and then all goals were then collated.

Courtney noted when they go to write the Infill section it will be based on all infill meetings and comments and adjustments can be made. Remember they are general goals for all of the Varsity View and not specific areas.

Noted: Should maybe make change to say goals were developed from a "mock" assignment.

### **3. Yesterday and Today – Brent**

In previous LAPs these have been separated but thought they would tell the same story in one section. The purpose is to provide background and a base for the rest of the LAP, basic knowledge and data.

An overview of historical development, heritage, how street names came about, demographic, population figures, occupations, educations etc.

#### **Comments Received to Date:**

- Ethnic and Economic stats interesting. I don't recall seeing these in our meetings? The average income in the neighbourhood is of interest and may need some commentary.
- Bishop Murray School is meeting the need for grades 7 – 12. Very few students are from the neighbourhood? Speak with David Knight at the school for more info (Special School...more detail)
- The re-building of Brunskill School is not mentioned.
- The role of Shpatysky is not defined.

### **Group Comments Tonight:**

- Addition to first above "Ethnic" point – dispersion of income around the mean aging/retiring or students?
- Addition to third above "Brunskill School" point – School board – big push from the community to rebuild
- More recent stats required. If we get more updated data we should add a column. This will show more of a trend.
- Housing – compare to Grosvenor
- Average family income with inflation 1996 vs 2006
- Home ownership affordability – May be beneficial to compare housing affordability with Grosvenor or Caswell instead of City Park and Nutana as closer to same as Varsity View (pg 11).
- May be useful to put the disparity of ages and salaries. Also noted is not so much disparity in income but difference stages of life.
- Income level and home ownership are two things that need to be more detailed.
- Income & home ownership....owner occupied housing
- Property taxes: Value for, infill – reassessments vs other neighbourhoods
- It should be noted what type of high school Bishop Murray is.
- It was noted interesting that average family income increase all over except decreased in Varsity View.

Courtney reminded committee this section is to just use for a basis for the rest of the LAP. More details are given within other sections of the document.

### **Questions:**

- **Is 2006 the most recent data available to put into the LAP?**

Courtney noted this is the most recent information available at the time. There may be more up-to-date data available before the final draft is complete.

### **4. Traffic and Circulation - Courtney**

#### **Comments Received to Date:**

- 14<sup>th</sup> Street & Cumberland – is it not College Drive and Cumberland that is a pedestrian concern? Both, College Drive and 14<sup>th</sup> Street as a whole
- Discuss Parking Benefit District
- Data sources – can we get more current data from Clarence Avenue?
- Main Street & 14<sup>th</sup> Street are major 'cut-throughs' and are not mentioned in the stats or document
- Cycling Section – too much info on City wide approach. Need more info on Varsity View
- Cycling Section – Would like more details on how the \$2 million was spend forth bike plan

- Parking prior to RPP, cars were lined up – concerns with winter driving conditions and narrow streets, the ruts in the road. Is this a problem for Emergency vehicles?

**Group Comments Tonight:**

- 4 way stop at Cumberland & Main
- In addition to current map used suggest using also the SGI accident figures/map which identifies red flag areas. There were better maps when we first discussed earlier in the process could we get something more current as the traffic pattern will have changed lots since 2006 with Stonebridge and Willowgrove now in existence.
- Sub-heading for each of 6 main arterials
- The U of S must have done a traffic study when planning College Quarter we might be able to get the info from them.
- More current data – request to have it updated
- Hierarchy of streets – College, Clarence – emphasize it's an expressway in terms of numbers. Hierarchy was removed from this LAP just to compress it a little but could be added
- Varsity View remaining connected to its surroundings. We are surrounded by very busy streets and we are becoming unconnected from our neighbours, especially pedestrians and cyclists. There are at least 10 dangerous intersections that are dangerous in Varsity View.
- Bigger picture – traffic pressures coming from outside Varsity View

Courtney stated they only do counts every 3 years and not at all sights as there is not enough manpower. The City will do traffic study in areas where there is a huge concern if asked. This may be something that can be put in a recommendation in the LAP. Mark noted the information we are using is the most up to date.

- Clarify University entrance @ Wiggins? Or RUH?
- "LAPC supports moving ahead with College Drive Master Plan at the appropriate time" should be added. Don't want to lose the concept but would like to see final design.
- Mirror pedestrian improvements on both sides of College, it seems everything is just being developed on the U of S side. The community needs to be an equal.
- Parking – community-university relations
- Burden of costs to non-residents – pkg. costs/fines consistent with RUH
- Parking around Brunskill/KCC
- City of Regina RPP
- RPP is ok, but needs tweaks – hours and boundaries
- President Murray – opening sightlines, short term parking?
- Pg 12 – 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence – Eco Pass is in use currently, making transit accessible for residents/area employees
- Cover cycling, walkability, other topics at a later date.
- At times more regulations/rules are not always the answer as people don't always follow them.
- The reality is Varsity View is surrounded by 4 busy streets. We need to think about how can we "unbind" our neighbourhood.

Courtney noted it is very important to look at the big picture, look at a corridor rather than intersections. A stop sign at each intersection may not be the answer.

Councillor Clark noted it is important to take this opportunity to think about how we want to approach this issue, language is important. There is continued growth happening so need to have transportation planning, need to think things through. This will not be able to be solved tonight but need to make sure our issue/concerns are put in writing, not necessarily solutions. We need a better dynamic for pedestrians and cycling as well as vehicles. What are is really the issue? Is it the number of cars or the speed of the cars?

Mark noted when the College Drive Master Plan was reviewed by administration, it was agreed we needed to figure out how this street fits in with the big picture before implementing streetscape improvements. We need to look at it as a whole. At the appropriate time, the College Drive Master Plan will be pulled off the shelf and implemented. The work that has gone into the plan will not be lost, but may need to be tweaked. Perhaps support for following through on the College Drive Master Plan can be a statement within the LAP, rather than a recommendation.

### Parking

Courtney noted since there was discussion with the effectiveness of the Residential parking Permit (RPP) program she did some research on other options and added a possible solution Parking Benefit District (PBD) in the LAP for committee to review.

- Noted residents are not happy about paying \$25 a year for parking privileges, but for sure does not want to pay more which is what would happen if went with the PBD. The burden of cost should not be on the residence but on non residences.
- The issue is more RUH employees and with parking being cut back with Children Hospital being built it will only get worse so need to figure out how to deal with parking issues. The City needs to try to create some type of partnership with the hospital.
- At Bedford Road there is no parking on one side of street which helps with this parking issue.
- All money collected from RPP should go back to Varsity View.
- Some residents don't have a parking space when they come home from work and this is not fair. We are only allowed to have 2 permits for \$25 where as other cities can get more permits as well as some cost less.
- Need to look at parking issues around Brunskill School and President Murray Park. Should there be no parking across from school or around park? RPP expanded to there? Time limit? Concern with sightlines for kids when crossing street. Park side could be metered.
- Member noted Luther Tower is not a business as stated in the LAP, it is a home for about 200 residents.
- Clarification was made that employees of Luther Towers were the concern in regards to parking not the residents.
- It was noted that there are also patients that park in the neighbourhood while at the hospital so don't want to make things to difficult for them.
- Transit has a long way to go before it will work for all workers, but need to keep pushing.

The LAPC agreed the RPP should be maintained with some tweaking to make it work better for residents. Possibility of expanding the boundary, hours, President Murray and Brunskill School parking, etc.

Mark noted the LAP does not need to have specific solutions written in it. General recommendations are best as don't want to confine what happens in neighbourhood as it may not be what you want later on. Some general recommendations with suggestions as to what the LAPC would like to see changed with the RPP. And ask to have meetings with appropriate City staff to discuss details as required. We can identify problem areas and discuss further with consultation with City.

After discussion the LAPC decided a smaller subcommittee to discuss parking should meet and put together the main concerns that need to be addressed in the LAP as recommendations.

The subcommittee is Pat Englund, Susan Hatfield, Dave Billard, Brenda O'Connor and George Tannous. They will meet and bring their information to the next meeting.

Courtney noted there were some parts of Traffic & Circulation not covered tonight, so will be reviewed further at the next meeting along with subcommittees information on parking.

**5. Next Meeting:        January**

**Meeting adjourned: 10:10 pm**

Parking lot: Nil