Grandview Heights NCP 5A – Orchard Grove – Stage 2 Update  
Community Advisory Community Meeting

Attendees:

City of Surrey Team
Catherina Lisiak, P&D
Ron Hintsche, P&D
Heather Kamitakahara, P&D
Taryn Hayes, P&D
Mirjana Petrovic, Engineering (Transportation)
Jeannie Lee, Engineering (Drainage)
Sorina Mirea, Engineering (Utilities)
Ted Uhrich, Parks, Recreation & Culture

CAC Members
Janice Pardy
Ken Pardy
Atvar Mann
Jagdev Gandham
Mrs. Gandham
Hugh Carter
Viance Dominelli
Charlie James
Tim Baillie
Rupert Bullock
Ben Creigh
Dave Moffatt
Rusty Ward

Observer
Representative of Ranjit Rai, Property Owner in NCP 5A

Absent:

CAC Members
Dale Brooks
Stephen Watts
Maria Hong
Firoz Punjabi

Meeting commenced at 5:40 p.m.

Action Codes
1. Item Complete - meet with appropriate staff and explain decision or direction.
2. Communicate through Corporate Report.
3. Responsible for Corporate communication.
5. Obtain further input/information and bring back.
6. Discussion only - No further action required.
7. Other (explain).
1. **Introductions**

- Catherina Lisiak started off the meeting with an introduction of staff members.
- Catherina explained that the main purpose of the meeting is to discuss the engineering component of the plan.

2. **Stage 2 Drainage Update – Jeannie Lee**

- Jeannie Lee explained that she would be providing an update on the engineering servicing that has been done so far.

**Stage 1 – Land Use Plan**

- In Stage 1, the primary focus was on developing a land use concept plan. The servicing concept developed in stage 1 was very preliminary, and not based on any field analysis.
- Stage 2 of the process is where we look at more of the detailed engineering servicing components.

**Drainage Background**

- Jeannie summarized the drainage conditions in the NCP 5A Area:
  - NCP 5A drains north towards fish-bearing watercourses.
  - Unmitigated increased runoff due to development is expected to contribute to erosion and flooding of downstream, lowland areas.
  - The 2005 Grandview Heights NCP recommended a detention pond to service NCP #5A. This pond was designed to “not worsen” lowland flooding only.
  - Current City design standards encourage better controls for post-development peak flow, runoff volume, and maintaining base flows because of changes in Best Management Practices.

**Stage 1 – Proposed Drainage Servicing**

- Stage 1 preliminary servicing proposed underground stormwater detention and infiltration into the ground.

**Stormwater Management**

- There are four main concerns for stormwater management:
  - Peak flow control, runoff volume control, water quality treatment, and base flow.
- Detention and infiltration are both needed. Detention deals with larger storms, to contain and detain increased runoff due to development. Infiltration deals with the more frequent, smaller storms.

---

**Action Codes**

1. Item Complete - meet with appropriate staff and explain decision or direction.
2. Communicate through Corporate Report.
3. Responsible for Corporate communication.
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7. Other (explain).
Stage 2 – Initial Drainage Results

- Consultants have done some geotechnical testing and found two main characteristics of the soil.
  1. Very shallow depths to the groundwater. High groundwater table makes underground detention unfeasible in this area.
  2. Low percolation of stormwater into the ground.
     - The revised drainage strategy proposes the use of a detention pond instead of underground detention.
     - Infiltration is still recommended to address volume reduction. This may take the form of a roadside infiltration corridor, boulevard rain gardens, and on-lot infiltration features.

Detention Ponds – what do they look like?

- Some examples of detention ponds were illustrated with photos.
- Jeannie explained that the pond would serve multiple uses and would be a public amenity within a park-like setting.

Possible Pond Locations

- Jeannie explained that there are three possible locations under consideration for the pond:
  - Option 1: at the proposed park NE of 25 Avenue and 164A Street.
  - Option 2: at the SW corner of 26 Avenue and 164 Street.
  - Option 3: North of 26 Ave; outside NCP area.
- Each location has impacts to the NCP.

Option 1: Within Proposed Park

- Will not service the entire NCP area, because it is not located at the lowest point.
- Area is constrained/too small – would have to look at expanding the park or making the pond a good public amenity with greenspace and paths.
- Adjacent areas would not be suitable for basements.
- Basements would not be allowed for some areas. Won’t be able to get MBE low enough.
- Requires purchase of land from 2 separate owners.
- Requires limited modification to the Stage 1 Land Use Concept.

Option 2: NW corner of NCP (164 Street and 26 Avenue)

- Provides service to the entire NCP as it is located at the lowest point in the NCP.
- Some adjacent areas would not be able to achieve basements.
- Requires purchase of land from 1 owner.
- Requires some modification to the Stage 1 Land Use Concept.
- Provides a good suburban interface for the 26 Avenue boundary.
Option 3: Outside NCP area

- Would be able to service entire NCP and some areas outside of the NCP 5A, in NCP Area 5.
- No impact to the Land Use Concept developed in Stage 1.
- Does affect the future development of properties outside of NCP 5A. Therefore, locating the pond in this location may involve adding new players into the whole discussion, in terms of where the pond is located and what impacts may result. It may require the City to expand the NCP area or develop a land use concept for this pocket outside of NCP 5A.
- Further assessment would be required in order to determine how the pond at this location would be financed. The costs would be paid by NCP 5A. However, some properties outside of the NCP area may benefit without contributing to the costs of the pond.
- Because of the steeper topography north of 26 Avenue, engineering and construction at this location may be more costly.

Drainage Financing:

- The financing is very preliminary at this time, and based on estimates in Stage 1.
- There is a DCC shortfall for drainage in this area. That shortfall needs to be equitably compensated over the entire NCP area.

Feedback

- We are seeking feedback for preferred options for the pond location.

3. **Drainage Questions (“Q”), Answers (“A”), Comments (“C”)**

**Q:** Does the pond have to be constructed before development begins?
**A:** The land required for the detention pond would have to be secured before development can occur in the area.

**C:** It doesn’t seem reasonable to go outside the area; it would be opening up a can of worms. If you look at the options, the Option 1 is not going to meet the demands of the development, so therefore Option 2, at the NW corner, seems the most logical one because you only having to deal with 1 property owner and have the ability to serve the needs of the entire NCP area.

**Q:** Is Option 1 in an area already designated as park?
**A:** Yes, the area is shown as park on the current land use plan.

**Q:** Please explain how Option 1 would work if it is not the lowest point in the plan area.
**A:** This location, from an engineering perspective, could be oversized to compensate for the area downstream. It could still serve the entire area but it would have to exceed the area that’s shown as park on the Land Use Concept Plan. Some modifications to the Land Use Concept Plan would be required.

**C:** Option 1 seems to be the least onerous.
Q: To clarify: having a detention pond is the only option? There is no other option?
A: Yes, there needs to be a pond. With the high groundwater table, development in the area is not feasible without a pond.

Q: Doesn't the size of the pond depend upon the other measures you're looking at with regards to infiltration?
A: Not really; infiltration only deals with small storms. Detention ponds are sized for more substantial rainfall.

Q: Does the detention pond replace the drainage feature in the roundabout? I thought that the roundabout would cost a lot more money to build than a detention pond.
A: Yes, we don't need the roundabout anymore for drainage purposes.

Q: Will there be an increase to the current DCC’s?
A: The financial numbers were based on preliminary servicing, and still need to be confirmed.

Q: Is there an increase in the original DCC shortfall that was anticipated in Stage 1?
A: No, the shortfall should be around the same amount as was originally anticipated, but these numbers still need to be confirmed.

Q: Does it cost a huge amount of money to build underground filtration?
A: Usually there is more land acquisition involved. These are engineered features so there are some substantial construction costs associated with them.

Q: Did the engineers do any soil testing on private property?
A: No, the engineers stayed within City right-of-ways when doing soil testing; they did not go onto private property. The geotechnical engineer was able to do the drilling on City property.

Q: Is it typical to not do the testing before we spend the money having an engineer design bioswales?
A: After the Stage 1 process, is when we go into the details on the servicing.

Q: There are 75 acres of land within the site area and none of us were approached to ask if we have any geotechnical information or if the engineers could come on site and do the testing.
A: The results of the geotechnical testing was consistent enough that additional testing on private property was not warranted. The soils are the same within the right-of-ways as they are on each private property. There was no need to ask to go onto private property.

During the Stage 1 process, we don’t do any geotechnical testing. Based on NCP Area 2 and others in area, we had no reason to believe that there would be a problem with the water table. If there were people who did geotechnical testing on their property and had information, we would have hoped that people would bring that information forward. The original concept was that the drainage would have a dual function: detention and infiltration. To some degree we still need the infiltration at the surface, but the detention is the part that we can’t do. That’s why we need the detention pond.
Q: Have you looked at the costs of the pond at different locations? Option 3 seems more expensive – it is further away and larger.
A: We don’t have cost estimates prepared.

Q: Is there any leniency on the area required for the park? The reason we have to have the park is because the issues were not adequately addressed before for NCP Area 1. Now we are stuck with the bill.
A: NCP Area 1 paid for the interceptor. Each area has some financial burden.
A: With the new pond proposed, we can revisit our calculations for required park area. Some of the pond area will not be useful for open space, but yes, the pond will have some dual purposes. The actual size of the park will be determined considering that it is a public amenity. So the slopes have to be gentle, and there would be a walking trail (loop).

Q: Has McElhanney calculated drainage volume?
A: They have done some preliminary calculations for volume based on our design standards for side slopes. We asked McElhanney to review all previous Stage 1 calculations and other works that had been done previously.

Q: Even though Option 1 doesn’t service the entire NCP area, if that was the option the CAC wanted, would it still be an option?
A: It could be designed so that it could service the entire area. The pond could over-detain to compensate for the area that is free-flowing. So the ultimate outflow would be the same – as though the pond was located at the lowest point.

Q: Do any one of these options hold up the process longer than another option? Option 3 sounds like a huge barrier.
A: If we get clear direction from our Engineering Department and the public that hypothetically we are all in favour of Option 1, then we can finalize the reports and get things done quickly. If there are divergent opinions, the process will be lengthened.

Q: I am curious about the location. You are saying that Option 2 is at the lowest point, but the water does not flow/gather there.
A: All these locations are not specifically concrete. According to the topography, Option 2 is at the lowest point.

C: If we go with Option 3, we will have to start over again and wait another 5 years.
A: The key benefit of Option 3 is that it does not substantially affect the land use in Area 5A, including the ability to achieve basements.

Q: How big does the pond have to be?
A: We have some preliminary figures, but further assessment is required. We’re looking at about one acre for the pond, and about one acre around the pond.

Q: The land for the detention pond has to be purchased before development can start in the area?
A: The first development that comes in has to secure the pond location. The developer has to
secure the land for the detention pond, but not build the detention pond. The land for the detention pond is to be owned by the City.

Q: *The City is proposing a major community park to the east on 168 Street. Why do we need smaller parks if we are going to have a major community facility on the other side of 168 Street?*

A: We have three park classifications: City Park, Community Park, and Neighbourhood Park. The park east of 168 Street would be a Community or City-scale park. The one in NCP 5A is a Neighbourhood Park, which fills a different kind of role.

Q: *If there's a high water table and you can't do detention, how can you do infiltration?*

A: There are 2 components to stormwater management – detention and infiltration. It was originally thought that we could do both together. We still need the infiltration, but can't do the detention underground.

We also still need the habitat wildlife corridor.

4. **Stage 2 Transportation Update – Mirjana Petrovic**

Mirjana Petrovic went over four road cross-sections that could apply to NCP Area 5A.

24 Avenue – Major Arterial
- 24 Avenue provides a connection between Highway 99 all the way to Campbell Heights.
- We are protecting for 6 lanes on 24 Avenue, in the future.
- The cross-section for 24 Avenue includes 1.8 metre wide bike lanes. We want to try to encourage biking throughout the City. Our existing bike lanes are not at the standard width, so we cannot apply for provincial grants for standard bike lanes. This is why we have increased the bike lane standard.
- We have increased the boulevard width to accommodate big trees.
- In order to accommodate a multi-use pathway, we have a Statutory Right-of-Way on the north side of 24 Avenue.

168 Street – Arterial
- 168 Street will be an arterial road with not more than 4 lanes.
- For this road, we require a 30 metre transportation corridor. There will be a left turn bay whenever there is an intersection. 50% of the corridor will be for other purposes besides cars, including pedestrians, boulevard, and bike lanes.

164 Street – Collector
- 164 Street is classified as a Collector Road, in-between a Local and an Arterial Road.
- The Transportation Corridor will be a total of 24 metres.

Local Roads
- Parking is a huge issue in the City of Surrey. Residents are constantly complaining that there is not enough parking.
• Local roads are to accommodate 2-way traffic and on-street parking. The road width for local roads is 20 metres.
• There is no need for separate bike lanes on local roads.

Flex Road
• It is anticipated that there will be 1 flex road within the NCP area.

5. Transportation & Drainage Questions ("Q"), Answers ("A"), and Comments ("C")

Q: Have the pedestrian and bike lane areas shown in the corridor already been dedicated to the City?
A: No, everything will need to be dedicated. The City develops infrastructure at the same time as land densifies. Developers are required to provide access to their development and dedication is required for the fronting road. Roads are financed by developers up to a certain pavement width.

Q: 164 Street is getting very busy. Are speed humps being considered on 164 Street?
A: No, any collector road is planned to be a road that could accommodate transit, shuttle buses with no traffic calming. With all traffic control devices, speeds will be regulated. When you have traffic signals, that’s when block length is extremely important. If we have stretches of 300 metres, drivers can get up to high speeds.

Q: In other areas we have 17 metre wide internal roads with parking on both sides. Then the City puts up “No Parking” signs and there is very limited on-street parking. This is a huge problem.
A: The “No Parking” signs are safety features. There was a period when we were asked to experiment with narrow pavement and introduce queuing streets. Our Fire Department asked us to remove parking, to be accessible for emergency vehicles. Then residents started complaining, and we don’t have the dedication to widen the road.

In order to avoid conflict with emergency vehicles and residents complaining, we now ask for a wider road width.

Q: There is no public transit out in the 160 Street / 24 Avenue area. Do you have any idea of when transit is expected?
A: The City is working with TransLink on a South of Fraser Transit Plan. If we want to have transit, we have to prove that we have the density and ridership to support it. I have seen a plan where 24 Avenue will have transit all the way to Campbell Heights. TransLink has a plan but there are other priorities as well.

Q: We continue to have an issue with the density of roads in the multi-family designated areas. This makes development difficult if not impossible. For example, Arbutus Walk in Vancouver achieved an FSR of 2.0 and had only 60% of the road density of the Grandview
A: We want to introduce a proper pedestrian network, and have townhomes fronting public roads. The pavement width is the same with townhouses as it is with 4-storey apartment buildings. The idea is to build community and have eyes on the street.

C: So if the issue is pedestrian linkage, then meet with the development community and let’s try to solve this. There’s only 1 developer that’s stepped up to do anything in Grandview Heights NCP Area 2. Have a workshop and look at these densities. It doesn’t sound like it’s cars that are the issue, and I’m talking about roads.

6. Wrap-up and Next Steps

Catherina concluded the meeting with a discussion of next steps, as follows:

1. E-mail or fax feedback forms to Catherina Lisiak.

2. Determine the pond location.
   - If there is a unanimous decision on the best location for the detention pond, Catherina will send an e-mail to let the CAC know. If there are many conflicting opinions, another CAC meeting may be required to talk about the option that has been chosen and why, or to explore other options.

3. Completion of the Engineering component of the plan.

4. Public consultation – Public Open House tentatively scheduled for September, but depends on the resolution of the detention pond location.

5. Proceed to Council with a Stage 2 Report.