



Corporate NO: C434

Report COUNCIL DATE: September 13, 1999_

COUNCIL-IN-COMMITTEE

TO: Mayor & Council **DATE: August 23, 2000**

FROM: General Manager
Planning and Development Department **FILE: 2300-003**

SUBJECT: 1999 Annual Review of the Official Community Plan

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that Council:

1. Receive the information in this report regarding:
 - a) the status of Surrey's development trends in relation to OCP growth policies to June 1999;
 - b) the status of current OCP Amendment applications that have previously been given approval to proceed by Council.

2. Approve amendments to the map designated as Schedule A. Land Use Designation Map, Division A of "Surrey Official Community Plan By-law, 1996, No. 12900", as amended, to include the following completed In-Stream OCP Amendment applications as shown on the map in Appendix A:
 - a) Application No. 93-0479 13975 Hwy #10 Newton Suburban to Urban
 - b) Application No. 95-0279 12258 58A Avenue Newton Suburban to Urban

3. Approve in principle the following Type 3 OCP Major Amendment applications to proceed in conjunction with the companion rezoning application:
 - a) Application No.98-0271 8044 - 152 St Fleetwood Suburban to Urban
 - b) Application No. 97-0118-01 8604 - 168 St Fleetwood Suburban to Urban

4. Deny in principle the following Type 3 Major Amendment application, pending the opportunity for applicants to address Council at the next available Regular Council - Land Use meeting:

Application No. 99-0102 3316-155 St South Surrey Suburban to Urban

5. Defer decision on the following Type 3 Major Amendment application until the next Annual Review of the OCP, or to a special report to Council, to allow the applicant time to consult with neighbourhood residents and to undertake further adjustments to the development proposal.

Application No. 98-0092 15303-Hwy #10 Newton Suburban to Commercial

6. Close the remaining In-stream OCP amendment applications that are not scheduled to complete rezoning before the Council imposed deadline date of October 8, 1999, pending the opportunity for applicants to address Council at the next available Regular Council - Land Use meeting.

7. Approve the following housekeeping amendments to the Surrey Official Community Plan, 1996, By-law No. 12900 as amended, as described in this report:

a) Amend Schedule C. Development Permit Area Guidelines - Designated Development Permit Areas 3. to state, "Despite the foregoing, a Development Permit is required where the said industrial development occurs on a parcel which abuts lands within any non-Industrial OCP Land Use Designation (Suburban, Urban, Multiple Residential, City Centre, Town Centre, Commercial, Industrial, Rural, Agricultural, Conservation, Indian Reserve), or is to be used for a business/industrial park."

b) Amend Schedule C. Development Permit Guidelines - Development Permit Area Guidelines C.1.3 c). to rectify a typographical error in the guideline that states the maximum width of a driveway for a duplex be 18 meters rather than 6 meters. Wording in the passage should read, "In the case of a duplex or a corner lot, separate driveways (each a maximum of 6 metres [20 feet] wide) to the two units within the duplex should be provided from the abutting streets."

c) Amend Section C. Land Use Strategy, Descriptions of Land Use Designations, Indian Reserve to read, "Indian Reserve (IR) - Indian Reserve Designation is intended to include Semiahmoo First Nations lands and any other properties located within or traversing that OCP designation boundary. Within this designation the City assumes no jurisdiction over land use."

d) Amend FIGURE 4-10: Heritage and Archaeological Sites Map to include sites recently added to Surrey's Heritage Register.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Surrey's Official Community Plan was adopted by Council on October 8, 1996. Section 7. Administration and Procedures states that the City will conduct an Annual Plan Review to update relevant information, and to evaluate and report to Council on the status of Plan implementation.

The 1999 Annual Plan Review monitors OCP implementation up to June 1999. This report includes 4 sections:

1. Surrey Development Overview (page 3) - This section summarizes residential and commercial development

activity in Surrey and GVRD over the past 3 years.

- 2. Status of Growth in Relation to OCP Growth Management Policies** (page 8) - This section provides a status report on residential growth trends and projections in relation to the OCP *Urban Growth Concept*.
- 3. OCP Land Use Amendment Applications** (page 10) - This section summarizes and makes recommendations on current applications to amend the OCP Land Use Designation Map.
- 4. OCP Text Amendments** (page 24) - This section recommends 4 text amendments intended to clarify policy statements or update information.

There are 4 general conclusions coming from the 4 sections of the 1999 Annual Plan Review:

1. Despite a slowdown in residential development over the past few years, Surrey remains the fastest growing city in B.C. and one of the fastest growing cities in Canada. Predictions of a modest recovery in the regional economy suggest that the demand for new housing will stimulate Surrey's growth rate over the next few years, but not to the levels reached in the 1991 to 1996 period.
2. Lower than projected growth over the past 3 years will potentially extend the amount of time it takes to reach capacity within the City's planned growth areas (existing Urban and NCP areas). Assuming a moderate growth rate of 3,000 single family and townhouse dwelling units per year (equivalent to average growth rate between 1991 and 1995), the City has enough development capacity in existing Urban and NCP areas to accommodate the projected residential growth for the next 7 to 12 years.
3. There are 36 active applications to amend the OCP Land Use Designation Map. Of these, 32 have previously been approved to proceed in conjunction with a companion rezoning application; and 4 are major new applications requiring Council consideration. Two of the four major amendment applications are recommended to proceed as they will not seriously challenge the intent and implementation of the Plan. One of the four major applications should be denied as it conflicts with existing plans or surrounding land uses. Decision on the fourth and most recent major application should be deferred to allow the applicant time to consult the surrounding neighbourhood and prepare enhancements to the development proposal.
4. This review recommends only four minor text amendments that serve to clarify details contained in policy statements in the OCP or to update previous information.

1. SURREY DEVELOPMENT OVERVIEW

During the past 3 years development activity has shown mixed effects in Surrey and throughout Greater Vancouver. The downturn in the British Columbia economy over the past few years, and the lower number of people moving to the region, reduced the demand for housing and led to a decrease in housing starts. However, activity in the commercial/industrial development sector saw construction values increase to record levels.

Population Growth

Surrey's population is estimated at 330,000 residents for mid year 1999. Over the past year Surrey grew by about 7,500 residents - about 1,300 less than the previous year's growth. Assuming a modest recovery in the regional economy over the next few years, growth could increase to an average of 10,000 residents per year over the next 3 years for a total of about 361,000 residents by the year 2002.

Population Growth by Community



Development Activity Summary - Residential Housing Starts



The downturn in the Greater Vancouver housing market produced a 30% decrease in GVRD housing starts over the past year - down from a total of 16,000 in 1997 to 11,900 in 1998. Housing starts in Surrey reflected the regional market conditions, although less severely. Starts in Surrey decreased by 27% from 2,740 in 1997 to 2,000 in 1998.



In 1998 Surrey retained its traditional share of about 18% of all GVRD housing starts. However, Surrey's single family and townhouse market fared better than other cities, while apartment starts fared much worse.

Surrey continues to be the most productive city in the GVRD single family housing market. Although 1998 starts were down both in Surrey and the GVRD, Surrey took more than its typical 27% share with 1,210 starts or 36% of the regional market. However, the number of Surrey starts decreased by 130 from the 1997 total.

Surrey Building Permits / Housing Starts by Type

Townhouse starts remained steady in 1998, as Surrey was the strongest market in the region with 408 units or 35% of the regional market. The number of new townhouse units was down from 512 in 1997.

Apartment starts continued to decrease after an unusual peak in 1993. In 1998 apartment starts

decreased to the lowest point since the mid 1980's with just 177 units - 3% of the regional market. The number of new apartment units was down from 489 in 1997.

Development Activity Summary - Commercial and Industrial Development

Despite the Provincial economic slowdown, investment in commercial construction in Surrey increased significantly over the past 2 years. Surrey had a particularly good year in 1998 as the city reached \$180 million in commercial and industrial construction, increasing Surrey's share of the regional market from an average of 15% during the 1990's to a high of 22% in 1998.

In 1998 commercial construction activity jumped to a total value of \$130 million, more than doubling the \$52 million achieved in 1997. This increase reflects Surrey's growing share of GVRD commercial construction as the City almost doubled its percentage share from an average of 13% through the 1990's to 25% in 1998.



Regionally, commercial construction reached \$582 million in 1997, and fell slightly to \$523 million in 1998.

After a jump to \$78 million in 1996, industrial construction values levelled off to \$42 million in 1997 and increased to \$50 million in 1998. Surrey maintained its traditional 17 % share of GVRD industrial construction in 1998.



Regionally, industrial construction values reached \$341 million in 1997 and fell to \$291 million in 1998.

The following maps show the location of residential and commercial / industrial construction activity in the City during 1998.



Residential Development 1998



Commercial and Industrial Activity in 1998

2. STATUS OF OCP GROWTH POLICIES

A primary purpose of the OCP Annual Plan Review is to monitor housing development trends and to assess the City's planned development capacity as set out in the OCP growth strategy.

Manage Growth for Compact Communities - the OCP Urban Growth Strategy

The intent of the OCP growth strategy is to co-ordinate development within comprehensively planned communities in a way that most effectively utilizes land and city resources. The strategy co-ordinates growth by allocating development priorities to support 4 growth categories or phases:

1. Infill development of remaining vacant land within the pre-NCP Urban designation.
2. New community development within the approved Neighbourhood Concept Plan areas.
3. Redevelopment of the ageing housing stock within older Urban neighbourhoods.
4. Anticipating the need to begin planning for new Urban growth areas.

To co-ordinate community plans with market trends, the City monitors development trends to ensure that there is 3 to 5 years of growth capacity within existing planned Urban communities. Currently, City growth is taking place in categories/phases 1 and 2 of the strategy -- within Infill and NCP areas. When growth capacity in the Infill and NCP areas is less than five years, the City should begin planning for new growth through redevelopment of older Urban neighbourhoods or by opening new Urban areas.



Infill Development

Over the past 3 years about 80% of the new Urban single family housing and townhousing was built in the Infill areas, while 20% was located in NCP areas. The adjacent chart shows the number of units built, the projected growth and remaining capacity for Infill development in each of the six towns. Growth projections for the next 3 years suggest that Infill areas will take only about 45% of the Urban single family housing and townhouse growth as available land diminishes and more of the NCP areas develop. Fleetwood and Newton were the most active Infill areas and will continue to be the most active Infill areas over the next 3 years. Infill in the other communities will be modest in that much of the remaining vacant land consists of parcels that may be difficult to develop.

Neighbourhood Concept Plan Areas

The majority of residential growth over the next 15 years will be located within the City's NCP areas. These areas combined have planned capacity for about 23,000 dwelling units and 66,000 residents. To date, there are 13 completed

NCP's and 1 in progress. The East Clayton NCP is expected to be complete by late 1999.

About 20% of Urban residential growth between 1996 and 1999 was within the NCP areas. The chart below shows the units built, the projected growth and remaining capacity for each of the NCP areas.



North Cloverdale East, the first NCP to be approved, has had about 446 dwelling units built to mid year 1999, and is just over 1/3 complete. Although the South Newton NCP was just recently completed, some areas included in the plan (Panorama Village) have already begun to develop. East Newton North, West Newton and Rosemary Heights Central NCP's began to develop in 1998.

Growth projections for the next 3 years suggest that about 55% of the new Urban growth (about 5,000 units) will be located within the NCP areas. As development in the NCP areas is still in the early stages, there is currently sufficient capacity in the combined NCP areas to absorb all of Surrey's Urban single family and townhouse development for the next 7 years.

Redevelopment of Housing in Older Urban Areas

OCP policy anticipates that, once the Infill and NCP areas reach capacity, the market will put redevelopment pressure on the ageing housing stock in some of Surrey's older neighbourhoods. In some areas this could mean 1 to 1 replacement, but in other areas this could mean increased densities by replacing existing housing with higher density small lot housing, duplexes, multi-plexes, townhouses or even walk-up apartments.

Although there is currently some replacement of older traditional single family homes with much larger dwellings, the

large amount of remaining capacity in the Infill and NCP areas will alleviate market pressures for any large scale redevelopment for the next 7 to 10 years. However, as the NCP areas develop, the City should begin preparing strategies to manage the increasing demands and related issues for Neighbourhood redevelopment.

Anticipating New Urban Growth Areas

The OCP identifies areas of Clayton, Grandview Heights and Port Kells as Suburban areas with potential for long term Urban development. The recently completed Clayton NCP - General Land Use Concept establishes the Clayton area - outside of East Clayton - as the first of these areas to be planned as a new Urban growth area. The future Urban area of Clayton has capacity for about 5,300 dwellings and 16,000 residents. Projected development trends and the large amount of existing Urban development capacity suggest that the opening of new growth areas can be deferred for at least 5 years.

Conclusion

The large amount of planned capacity in the OCP's Urban Growth Concept, coupled with lower than projected growth over the past 3 years, will extend the time it will take to reach saturation of the primary Urban growth areas - Infill and NCP areas. Presently, Infill and NCP areas have enough capacity to absorb projected Urban growth for the next 7 to 12 years. With this remaining capacity, market demand for major redevelopment in older neighbourhoods will be minimal and planning for the opening of new Urban growth areas should be deferred for at least 5 years.

3. OCP AMENDMENT APPLICATIONS

There are currently 35 OCP land use amendment applications in process:

- 12 are continuing 1996 OCP In-stream applications;
- 6 are carried over from the previous OCP Annual Plan Review;
- 17 are new applications - 13 are currently proceeding with a companion rezoning application and 4 are presented in this report for Council decision.

1996 OCP In-Stream Applications

Part 7 of the OCP includes Transitional Provisions for In-stream OCP Amendment applications received and in process prior to adoption of the OCP in October 1996. All such applications were to proceed with accompanying rezoning applications and were given 2 years to achieve final adoption of the Rezoning application. Final adoption of the rezoning application would also mean final adoption of the OCP amendment application, and the appropriate land use designation changes could then be incorporated onto the OCP Land Use Designation map. Of the 24 original In-stream applications, 4 have completed rezoning, 8 have closed, and 12 remain in process.

Two of the four completed In-stream applications must be incorporated through this review into the Land Use Designation Map in OCP By-law 12900.

Recommendation: It is recommended that Council approve amendment to the map designated as Schedule A. Land Use Designation Map, Division A of "Surrey Official Community Plan By-law, 1996, No. 12900", as amended, to include the following approved applications as shown in Appendix A, Map 1.:

- a) Application No. 93-0479 13975 Hwy #10 Newton Suburban to Urban

b) Application No. 95-0279 12258 58A Avenue Newton Suburban to Urban

Closure of Expired In-Stream OCP Applications

In February 1999 Council approved a one year extension to allow all remaining In-stream applications until October 8, 1999 to complete the rezoning process. Following approval of this extension, letters were sent to each of the In-stream applicants advising them of the new completion deadline. (See a complete list of In-stream applications and their status in Appendix B).

Recommendation: It is recommended that Council authorize the Planning and Development Department to close all remaining In-Stream OCP Amendment applications that are not scheduled for final approval on or before the October 8, 1999 deadline, pending the opportunity for applicants to address Council at the next available Regular Council - Land Use meeting.

OCP Land Use Amendment Applications Carried Over From the 1998 Annual Review

The 1998 Annual Plan Review included 9 city initiated applications and 7 non-city initiated applications for Council consideration.

City Initiated Land Use Amendments

In March 1998, during consideration of the previous OCP Annual Review, Council approved 7 of the 9 proposed city initiated amendments to the Land Use Designation map.

Non City-Initiated Land Use Amendments

Of the 12 non-city initiated OCP Amendment applications considered in the March 1998 review, 4 have been completed, 6 are currently proceeding along with companion rezoning applications and 2 have closed. Project 97-0118 was closed as the applicant substantially altered the original proposal, and has submitted a new OCP Amendment application (97-0118-01). Therefore, the new application is included in this report as a new Type 3 Major Amendment application.

New OCP Amendment Applications

In February 1999, Council approved a new method for reviewing newly submitted OCP Amendment applications. New applications are to be classified into 1 of 3 possible types (see table below). Upon submission, those applications deemed to be minor, or major with significant community benefit, are recommended to proceed in conjunction with a companion rezoning application. Major amendment applications with no significant community benefit are to be referred to Council for consideration during the Annual Plan Review.

Criteria for Reviewing Non-City Initiated OCP Amendment Applications

Type	Amendment	Criteria & Review Process
Type 1	Minor OCP Amendment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Means an application that can be evaluated based on available information, has minimal community impact (including but not limited to servicing and amenity requirements), supports

		existing plans, and is not precedent setting.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To be reviewed concurrently with a rezoning application.*
Type 2	Major OCP Amendment Application with Significant Community Benefits**	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Means an application that fails to meet one of the attributes of a Minor OCP Amendment Application but presents an opportunity to achieve significant community benefits. To be reviewed concurrently with a rezoning application.*
Type 3	Major OCP Amendment Application	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Means an application that fails to meet one of the attributes of a Minor OCP Amendment Application. To be reviewed with the Annual Review.

* If a public hearing has not occurred within 2 years of Council's consideration of the application, Planning & Development may recommend to Council that the application be closed.

** Significant Community Benefit means immediate, tangible community benefits such as affordable housing, community amenities, additional park land, or land dedication, local employment, etc. The items excluded from consideration include construction jobs, increased assessment or property taxes, and private economic benefits typically associated with new developments.

Summary of New Amendment Applications

Since the previous OCP Annual Review there have been 19 new applications to amend the OCP Land Use Designation Map:

- 11 are deemed to be Type 1 Minor Amendments and are proceeding with a companion rezoning application.
- 4 are deemed to be Type 2 Major Amendments and are proceeding with a companion rezoning application.
- 4 are deemed to be Type 3 Major Amendments and are presented in this report for Council consideration.
- 2 have been approved by Council.

The following map and tables summarize the location, proposed development and current status of the new applications.

Type 1 Minor Amendments - proceeding concurrently with a rezoning application.

	Project Location	Description of the Proposed Development	Current Status
1	14694 84 Ave Fleetwood	Suburban to Urban To allow approximately 66 RF lots.	Rezoning 3rd Reading Jan 4, 1999 OCP (BL13608)
2	8060 146 St Fleetwood	Suburban to Urban To allow approximately 148 RF lots.	Approved June 14, 1999 (OCP BL 13537)

3	16641 108 Ave Guildford	Suburban to Urban To allow 36 RF lots	Pre-Council
4	15772 34 Ave South Surrey	Multiple Residential / Urban to Urban To amend the OCP and Rosemary Heights Central NCP to allow a storage shed for the Morgan Creek golf course.	Pre-Council
5	13697 16 Ave South Surrey	Suburban to Urban To extend the Urban designation west along 16 Ave to allow for 6 CD lots.	Rezoning 3rd Reading Sept 7, 1999 (OCP BL13784)
6	8710 160 St Fleetwood	Urban to Multiple Residential To allow development of 113 RM-30 townhouse units. Application is located within the area proposed for Multiple Residential designation by the Fleetwood Town Centre Plan. The land use plan was approved by Council on April 12, 1999.	Pre-Council
7	13216 104 Ave City Centre	Multiple Residential to Commercial Comprehensive Development to accommodate redevelopment of existing gas station into a gas station and convenience store.	OCP 3rd Reading Sept 7, 1993 OCP (BL 11947)
8	8776 160 St Fleetwood	Urban to Multiple Residential To allow development of 113 RM-30 townhouse units. Application is located within the area proposed for Multiple Residential designation by the Fleetwood Town Centre Plan. The land use plan was approved by Council on April 12, 1999.	Pre-Council
9	16747 108 Ave Guildford	Suburban to Urban To allow 16 RF Urban lots.	Pre-Council
10	16940 Friesian Dr. Cloverdale	Suburban to Urban To accommodate rezoning and subdivision for an existing house.	Pre-Council
11	10608 151A St Guildford	Multiple Residential to Commercial To construct an apartment / retail building.	Pre-Council

NEW OCP AMENDMENT APPLICATIONS



Type 2 Major Amendments - Providing Community Benefit

Proceeding concurrently with a rezoning application.

	Project Location	Description of the Proposed Development	Current Status
12	8239 140 St	Suburban to Multiple Residential	Approval in Principle

	Newton	To allow construction of a multiple residential seniors' complex consisting of 80 residential units and a care facility with 15 bed care units.	October 1998
13	10530 Lincoln Dr Guildford	Multiple Residential to Town Centre To accommodate a multi-purpose community centre - a Surrey Community Recreation Facility	Rezoning 2nd Reading July 5, 1999 (OCP BL 13781)
14	3025 152 St South Surrey	Suburban / Industrial to Commercial To allow for the development of a retail commercial centre and BC Transit park & ride facility	Approved May 31, 1999 (OCP BL 13711)
15	7548 120 St Newton	Multiple Residential to Commercial To construct a hotel / retail complex.	Rezoning 3rd Reading Sept 7, 1999 (OCP BL 31777)

Type 3 Major Amendment Applications - No significant community benefit.

Summary Table - A map and detailed assessment of each Type 3 application is provided in the following section.

	Project Location	Description of the Proposed Development	Current Status	Recommendation
16	8044 - 152 St Fleetwood	Suburban to Urban To create 8 single family lots. City will take initiative to include 2 abutting properties to complete the in-fill of the existing Suburban pocket north of Eaglequest Golf Course.	Pre-Council	Support in principle and proceed concurrently with rezoning application.
17	8604 168 St Fleetwood	Suburban to Urban To extend the OCP Urban boundary to allow Urban residential development.	Pre-Council	Support in principle and proceed concurrently with rezoning.
18	3316 155 St South Surrey	Suburban to Urban To amend the OCP and Rosemary Heights NCP to allow Urban single family lots.	Planning Report to Council 9/28/98	Deny the application in favour of the established NCP and community opinion.
19	15303 Hwy#10 Newton	Suburban to Commercial Retail and service development.	Pre-Council	Defer decision pending changes to application.

Detailed Analysis of Type 3 Major Amendments

Application No: 98-0271-00 Map Index 16

APPLICANT: Panther Developments Ltd.

LOCATION: 8044 - 152 Street - Fleetwood

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be processed concurrently with the accompanying rezoning application, and by City initiative, include 1 adjacent City owned property in the OCP amendment application.

OCP AMENDMENT PROPOSAL

The applicant is requesting redesignation from **Suburban to Urban** of the property located at 8044 - 152 Street to allow subdivision into single family RF lots.

Surrounding OCP Designations, Zoning and Land Uses:

- North: Suburban RA Suburban residence approximately 1.17 hectares (3 acres).
- South: Suburban Eaglequest golf course.
- East: Urban City park (.6 ha) and developed single family (RF) subdivision.
- West: Suburban 152 Street and A-1 zoned residential properties.

DISCUSSION

The subject property (.6 ha.) is located in the southwest corner of Fleetwood and is one of 3 remaining Suburban properties in the residential area north of the Eaglequest Golf Course and east of 152 Street. The Golf Course and 152 Street provide a logical boundary for Urban development in this community. As such, it would be appropriate to extend the Urban designation to include this property.

It would also be appropriate for the 2 adjacent Suburban properties to be included in the Urban designation of this area. One of the properties is a City park and will be added to the current application by City initiative. However, the second property is a private residence and Urban redesignation should be left to the discretion of the property owner. Including this property in the current application at this time would serve no purpose other that to raise the land value and property taxes.

Development potential of the property is constrained by a creek and lack of direct road access. The property fronts 152 Street, but is unlikely to be allowed direct access from 152 Street. Development of the property will require negotiation with adjacent property owners for road access right-of-way.

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban designation of this site would be consistent with the Urban residential pattern in southwest Fleetwood. • The site is contained by a major arterial to the west and golf course to the south, and will not encourage further Urban development in unplanned Suburban areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The initial application property has no direct road access and will require temporary road access right-of-way from adjacent properties. • The site is traversed by creeks and may be difficult to develop.

CONCLUSION

Urban designation of the subject property plus the adjacent City park will extend the Urban designation pattern in southwest Fleetwood to the logical boundaries of 152 Street to the west and the Eaglequest Golf Course to the south. Development of the site would not have a negative impact on the implementation of the OCP. Therefore, it is recommended that this OCP amendment application should be given approval to proceed concurrently with a companion rezoning application.



Application No: 97-0118-01 **Map Index** **17**

APPLICANT/ AGENT: Suncor Development Corporation

LOCATION: 8604 - 168 Street - Fleetwood

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council approve the application in principle and authorize the OCP amendment application to proceed

concurrently with the companion rezoning application.

OCP AMENDMENT PROPOSAL:

The applicant is proposing to redesignate the subject property (2 hectare) from Suburban to Urban to accommodate CD zoning for townhouse development. This application was originally considered in the 1998 OCP Annual Review, and was given approval to proceed. However, the applicant has revised and resubmitted the application to include the whole property (rather than just the southern portion), and is proposing low density townhousing rather than single family development.

Surrounding OCP Designations and Land Uses:

- North: Suburban Developed RH-G single family residential properties.
- South: Urban RF-G single family residential development.
- East : Suburban Undeveloped RH-G single family residential properties.
- West: Urban Undeveloped Urban properties.

DISCUSSION:

This is a complex site fragmented by 2 creeks and the Greater Vancouver Sewer and Drainage District sewer trunk line. In addition, the property owner would be required to dedicate land for GVRD sewer trunk right-of-way and the widening of 168 Street. The location of the creeks and the rights-of-way make the property difficult to develop as Urban or Suburban single family housing.

Given the site constraints, the applicant suggests that low density townhousing is the only economically viable way to develop the property, and intends to create a site design that respects the natural features of the site and blends with the Suburban properties to the north and east.

The site is contained on the north and east by existing Suburban RH-G subdivisions which will limit the potential for this development to encourage further Urban development into the Suburban area.

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant suggests this proposal is the most economically viable form of development on a difficult property. • The applicant is willing to provide land for road widening on 168 St and right-of-way for future twinning of the GVRD sewer trunk line. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site has many geographic constraints and will be difficult to develop. • Townhouse development does not normally provide an adequate transition between Urban and Suburban land uses. Approving this application could set a precedent.

CONCLUSION

Townhousing does not normally provide an adequate transition from Urban to Suburban land uses. However, given the complexity of the site and the proposed low density of the townhousing, a carefully designed site plan could provide an acceptable interface with the adjacent Suburban properties. With this application the onus will be on applicant to submit a site plan that is acceptable to the City and area residents. Therefore, it is recommended that the

That the application be denied pending an opportunity for the applicant to address Council at the next available Regular Council - Land Use meeting.

AMENDMENT PROPOSAL:

The applicant is proposing to redesignate 6 properties located in the Rosemary Heights Central NCP neighbourhood from **Suburban** to **Urban** to allow development of single family lots.

Surrounding OCP Designations and Land Uses:

North	Suburban/Urban	One-Acre subdivision and future park site.
South	Urban	Newly approved townhouse and single family subdivision.
East	Urban	Acreage parcel with an active rezoning application for single family lots.
West	Urban	Vacant parcels with an active rezoning applications for single family lots.

DISCUSSION:

The site is located within the Rosemary Heights Central NCP Suburban pocket. This pocket was incorporated into the NCP specifically to accommodate the wishes of the existing one acre property owners. To protect the character of these Suburban properties within the surrounding Urban development, NCP guidelines require Urban properties abutting the Suburban properties to include a 25 foot buffer along the adjoining property line.

As Rosemary Heights develops, 34th Avenue will separate the Suburban pocket into north and south portions. This application includes 6 of the 7 properties located in the south portion who now believe the area south of 34th Avenue should be Urban. However, the majority of property owners in the Suburban pocket north of 34th Avenue are opposed to this application, arguing that it would erode the character of their Suburban properties and the agreement reached in the NCP process.

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is surrounded by Urban-designated properties and, with the exception of 1 remaining Suburban property, would consolidate the Urban area south of 34th Avenue. • 34th Avenue separates the application site from the remainder of the Suburban pocket. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would require amendment to the Rosemary Heights Central NCP - approved in November 1996. • The proposed redesignation would erode the character of the established Suburban neighbourhood. • There is strong opposition from residents of Suburban properties north of 34th Avenue. • Redesignation of 6 of the 7 properties south of 34th Avenue would isolate the one remaining Suburban property not included in the application.

CONCLUSION

The proposed development would erode the character of the established Suburban neighbourhood within the Rosemary Heights Central NCP area. The residents of this Suburban neighbourhood fought hard to retain this Suburban pocket in the NCP, and the majority of former NCP steering committee members are strongly opposed to the redesignation. In order to maintain the integrity of the NCP and the existing Suburban neighbourhood, it is recommended that this application be denied.



Application No: 99-0102-00 **Map Index** **19**

Applicant/ Agent: Sukhi Sandhu

LOCATION: 15303 - #10 Highway -- Newton

RECOMMENDATION: That Council defer decision on this application until the next Annual Review of the OCP, or to a special report to Council, to allow the applicant time to consult with the adjacent neighbourhood residents and to prepare enhancements to the development proposal.

AMENDMENT PROPOSAL: The applicant is proposing to redesignate the property from Suburban to Commercial to allow retail and service commercial development on the northeast corner of the intersection at 152 Street and

Highway #10.**Surrounding OCP Designations and Land Uses:**

North:	Suburban	A-1 zoned property occupied by a residence and equestrian use.
South:	Industrial	Highway #10 and Industrial designated properties.
East :	Suburban	Large RA zoned properties with older dwellings.
West:	Commercial	Future commercial centre on the west side of 152 St.

DISCUSSION:

The application site is located at one of the City's major intersections and is across the street from a new major commercial centre (Panorama Village) to the west and business park development to the south. However, the site is in close proximity to an established Suburban neighbourhood (Sullivan) which is located 81 meters to the east and 134 meters to the north of the site.

Although the application site is located at a major intersection, any development at this location must ensure that there will be no negative impact on the Sullivan neighbourhood. To ensure protection of the Sullivan neighbourhood, the Planning and Development Department has advised the applicant that a development proposal on this site should include a comprehensive site plan that includes the remaining developable properties and a land use interface that is acceptable for the Sullivan neighbourhood. The applicant is presently attempting to address these issues.

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is located at a major intersection and across the street from a major commercial centre and business park development. • The applicant is currently engaging a neighbourhood consultation process and pursuing enhancements to the development proposal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is adjacent to an established Suburban residential neighbourhood. • Sullivan residents oppose commercial development at this location. • May have an economic impact on Panorama Village Shopping Centre.

CONCLUSION

An OCP amendment application at this location must include a comprehensive site plan that protects the established residential neighbourhood in this area. Following Planning and Development Department advice, the applicant is presently attempting to address this fundamental land use issue. This is a recently submitted application (May 1999), and given the scope of the planning issues, it may be premature to judge the merit of this application at this time. Therefore, it is recommended that Council defer decision on this application to allow the applicant time to consult with neighbourhood residents and to undertake further adjustments to the proposal.



4. OCP POLICY AND TEXT AMENDMENTS

The following list of proposed amendments include text clarifications and updates to previous information.

1. Development Permit Guidelines - Multiple Residential Development

Page SC-19 of the OCP document contains a typographical error in reference to guidelines for Access, Circulation and Parking in a Multi-family development. In part C.1.3 c), the current policy states, “In the case of a duplex or a corner lot, separate driveways (**each maximum 18 metres [59 feet] wide**) to the two units within the duplex should be provided from the abutting streets”.

To rectify the error, wording in part C.1.3 c) should be revised to state “In the case of a duplex or a corner lot, separate driveways (**each maximum 6 metres [20 feet] wide**) to the two units within the duplex should be provided from the abutting streets”.

2. Designated Development Permit Areas

There is an unintended discrepancy in the existing definition of Designated Development Permit Areas for Industrial development (page SC.- 2). The existing definition in part 3 specifies that a Development Permit is required for industrial development on a parcel that abuts lands within the Urban, Suburban or Multiple Residential designation. However, a situation has occurred where there is an industrial parcel abutting properties within the Town Centre designation.

To adequately control industrial development abutting any non-industrial area, a DP should be required for development on industrial parcels abutting any non-Industrial designation. Therefore, the definition on page SC-2, Part 3. should be amended to read:

“Despite the foregoing, a Development Permit is required where the said industrial development occurs on a parcel which abuts lands within any non-Industrial OCP Land Use Designation (Suburban, Urban, Multiple Residential, City Centre, Town Centre, Commercial, Rural, Agricultural, Conservation, Indian Reserve)”.

3. Definition of Land Use Designation - Indian Reserve

There is concern that properties located within the OCP Indian Reserve designation are implied as being owned by the Semiahmoo Band. OCP Land Use Designations do not imply ownership; rather, the Designation only specifies land use. However, since confusion has arisen from the current definition, the definition of the OCP Land Use Designation of Indian Reserve should be clarified to state that the designation may include lands not owned by the Semiahmoo Band.

Therefore, Section C., page 3-3, Land Use Strategy, Descriptions of Land Use Designations, Indian Reserve should be amended to read,

“Indian Reserve (IR)

Indian Reserve Designation is intended to include Semiahmoo First Nations lands and any other properties or portions of properties located within this OCP designation boundary. Within this designation the City assumes no jurisdiction over land use”.

4. Heritage and Archaeological Sites Map

In 1997 Council passed a resolution establishing the Surrey Heritage Register. Recent fine tuning to the Heritage Register requires that OCP Figure 4-16: Heritage and Archaeological Sites Map, be updated to reflect the most recent status. Therefore, Figure 4-16 should be replaced by the map shown below.

Heritage and Archaeological Sites Map



CONCLUSION

The Annual OCP Review provides an update on the progress of Surrey's Official Community Plan land use policies.

Despite a slowdown in residential development over the past few years, Surrey remains the fastest growing city in B.C. and one of the fastest growing cities in Canada. Predictions of a modest recovery in the regional economy suggest that the demand for new housing will stimulate Surrey's growth rate over the next few years, but not to the levels reached in the 1991 to 1996 period.

Lower than projected growth over the past 3 years will potentially extend the amount of time it takes to reach capacity within the City's planned growth areas (existing Urban and NCP areas). Assuming a moderate growth rate of 3,000 single family and townhouse dwelling units per year (equivalent to average growth rate between 1991 and

1995), the City has enough development capacity in existing Urban and NCP areas to accommodate the projected residential growth for the next 7 to 12 years.

There are 36 active applications to amend the OCP Land Use Designation Map. Of these, 32 have previously been approved to proceed in conjunction with a companion rezoning application; and 4 are major new applications requiring Council consideration. Two of the four major amendment applications are recommended to proceed as they will not seriously challenge the intent and implementation of the Plan. One of the four major applications should be denied as it conflicts with existing plans or surrounding land uses. Decision on the fourth and most recent major application should be deferred to allow the applicant time to consult the surrounding neighbourhood and prepare enhancements to the development proposal.

This review recommends only four minor text amendments that serve to clarify details contained in policy statements in the OCP or to update previous information.

Murray D. Dinwoodie
General Manager
Planning and Development Department

TH/bea

- APPENDIX A Completed 1996 OCP In-stream Applications
- APPENDIX B Table B1. and Map B1., 1996 OCP In-Stream Applications
Table B2. and Map B2., Status of Non-City Initiated Applications -
Applications Carried Over From Previous Annual Review