

NOTES

Development Advisory Committee

File: **360-20 (DAC)**
Date: **January 27, 2011**
Time: **2:30 p.m.**
Location: **Planning Room 1,
Surrey City Hall**

Members:

Ted Dawson
Kevin Shoemaker
David Porte
Gopal Sahota
Clarence Arychuk
Amy Spencer-Chubey
Steve Kurrein
Tim Bontkes
Bill Kruger
Andy Aadmi
Patrick Santoro
Greg Sewell
Jas Sandhu
Deana Grinnell

City Staff:

Don Luymes
Judith Robertson
Remi Dube
Sheila McKinnon
Liane Davison

Regrets:

Jean Lamontagne

1. Acceptance of Previous Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of November 25, 2010 were amended and received as amended.

2. Public Art Program (Sheila McKinnon, Arts Manager, Parks, Recreation and Culture)

Sheila reviewed the status of the Public Art Program, and specifically, the private sector contribution policy:

- The initiative came out of the Parks, Recreation and Culture Strategic Plan with a recommendation from Council for larger, iconic works
- OCP, City Beautification initiatives aligned with the Program
- Corporate Report has now gone to Council and was passed (December 2010)
- Council did query how much funding has been invested and as of today, the amount is approximately \$4.5 million over the past 10 years
- Goals for the program were reviewed
- There was a Best Practises Review
 - reviewed several US and Canadian cities;
 - they reviewed recommendations from Creative City Network of Canada-Public Art Toolkit; and
 - The City of Richmond model was viewed as being a reasonable approach for the City of Surrey to follow.
- Feedback from the PAAC was:
 - Public art enhances the attractiveness, marketability and value of a property;

- Make it a mandatory program;
 - Apply the contribution requirement across all categories of development;
and
 - Welcome development industry involvement.
- Feedback from the DAC:
 - There should be equity across all forms of development;
 - Timely processes and approvals;
 - They liked the Richmond model;
 - Contributions should be tied to a comprehensive public art plan and budget;
and
 - The City should continue its public art contribution.
- Public Art Plans include:
 - City Centre Art Walking Loop
 - Greenways Art Plan
 - Cultural Corridor
 - Surrey's six town centres
 - Sculpture park in Fleetwood Park gardens
 - Public art for infrastructure such as traffic circles, bridges and roadway underpasses.
- Corporate Report was considered by Council on Dec. 13, 2010:
 - Staff and stakeholders will develop a Public Art Plan including a financial strategy for the Public Art Reserve
 - Iconic public art = + \$750,000
 - Smaller public art = \$200,000
- The program will be phased in over 2 years, starting March 1, 2011
- In the first year, developments will be required to provide 0.25% of construction value
- In the second year, developments will provide 0.50% of construction value
- Will apply to multi-family residential developments with more than 10 dwelling units and commercial and industrial developments with a total floor area of 1,000m² or greater
- Certain types of projects will be exempt (hospitals, schools, affordable housing, etc.)
- Recommendations to Council included:
 - Approve Private Development Public Art Policy
 - Instruct staff to prepare administrative procedures and a Communications Plan
 - Approve revisions to the Terms of Reference for the Public Art Advisory Committee to include a representative from the DAC
 - Instruct staff to review and update the City's Public Art Master Plan and related financial strategy
 - Instruct staff to report on the Public Art Program annually

Comments from Members:

- Ted Dawson: prefers payment at Building Permit stage, similar to DCCs
- Deana Grinnell – at the Building Permit state, costs are known - this is the appropriate stage to charge
- Judith Robertson – the reason for recommending contributions at Rezoning is to ensure that the group that is raising the value of the land is the one who pays
- David Porte – queried how much was collected from existing Surrey residents and new development; Sheila replied that public contributions vary depending on the amount of money spent on public infrastructure projects in a given year; amounts estimated at \$285,000 in 2009. He also asked if contributions from development in Campbell Heights would be used for public art in the industrial area of Campbell Heights. Sheila replied it may be located in Campbell Heights or somewhere in South Surrey.
- Clarence Arychuk asked about the Grandview Heights area and Fleetwood area (which is well developed). In the case where an area is well developed, the public art would stay within that Town Centre. He also asked if a report would be coming to the DAC on an annual basis, which Sheila confirmed it would.
- Steve Kurrein wanted to know if there will be a matching of funds with tax \$'s. Sheila replied that this may be reviewed at a later date
- Deana Grinnell – DAC represents the voice of new residents and feels there is inequity between new and existing residents and wonders if there is a way of a more equitable cost distribution.
- Kevin Shoemaker – disproportionate cost allocation; it's easy to collect \$\$ on new development, but harder to collect from existing taxpayers.
- Clarence Arychuk – public art is part of the “creep” of additional costs applied to new development, and asked if there is a financial plan. Sheila replied that this would be coming through the Cultural Plan process and should be ready in June 2011.

3. Small Lot Review (Don Luymes, Manager, Community Planning Division)

Don reviewed information discussed at the last DAC meeting on the City's small-lot single family residential zones. The City is beginning a review of these zones, which have been in place for about 10 years. This review is linked with a Council request to review the East Clayton neighbourhood in advance of planning for the West Clayton area.

Main issues related to the development of neighbourhoods using small lot residential include:

- High percentage of site coverage with buildings and pavements, resulting in storm drainage issues;
- Parking issues in neighbourhoods with a high percentage of small lots, particularly along arterial roads with no on-street parking and where there are many coach houses and secondary suites;
- Aesthetic issues related to density, site coverage and building form;
- Urban forest issues related to the difficulty of growing canopy trees in dense single-family developments.

General discussion included:

- Clarence Arychuk – don't ignore geography; slope/grade relationship in NCP's with small lots; every lot should be designed so that it can have a "good" house placed on it
- Deana Grinnell – encourage diversity of housing types, design and lot sizes in a neighbourhood
- Clarence Arychuk– if small lots are enlarged somewhat, can the City review its requirements for road widths and network requirements to compensate for the loss of development yield?

Don invited participation in a sub-committee of DAC to work with staff to produce options that address concerns. These will then be reviewed by DAC and other stakeholders before potential policy and zoning amendments are brought to Council for consideration.

4. Sustainability Check List (Don Luymes, Manager, Community Planning Division)

Don reviewed the progress towards developing a Sustainable Development Checklist, which had been reviewed and discussed with DAC in the Fall of 2010. Recent consultation with the Sustainability Working Group, which had been involved in the development of the Sustainability Charter, has led to a proposed approach to implementing the Check List:

- Seeking Council approval of the 2-stage Check List, as presented at DAC;
- A 6-month pilot period, in which the Check List will be used for new development applications, tested and refined;
- During this 6-month period, the best way of communicating the results of the Check List in Planning Reports to Council will be determined;
- During the 6-month period, "benchmark" measures (or "targets") in appropriate categories will be developed and reported to Council for possible incorporation into the Check List

Comments from DAC members:

Kevin Shoemaker recommended that information derived from the Check List be reported periodically to Council in aggregate form, and not attached to individual development applications. Don responded that the idea has always been to communicate the sustainable development features of individual applications to Council, but that there are a couple of ways that this can be done that can be tested in the 6-month pilot period, including:

- Summarizing the information in the Checklist in the Planning Report
- Attaching the completed Checklist to the Planning Report

Kevin Shoemaker asked about electronic checklists, so that information can be aggregated easily for reporting purposes. Don agreed that this is a good goal that should be pursued.

5. Comments on the Market

None

6. Other Business

7. Next Meeting (February 24, 2011)

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.