

NOTES

Development Advisory Committee

File: **360-20 (DAC)**
Date: **November 24, 2011**
Time: **2:30 p.m.**
Location: **Planning Room 1,
Surrey City Hall**

Members:

Andy Aadmi
Clarence Arychuk
Tim Bontkes
Ted Dawson
Jeff Fisher
Jake Friesen
Amritpal Gill
Deana Grinnell
Bob Heaslip
Bill Kruger
Steve Kurrein
David Porte
John G. Purewal
Jas Sandhu
Greg Sewell
Kevin Shoemaker
Jeff Skinner
Amy Spencer
Thomas Woo

City Staff:

Tom Ainscough
Jeff Arason
Jaime Boan
Rob Costanzo
Owen Croy
Nicholas Lai
Sam Lau
Don Luymes
Richie Sidhu
Fay Keng Wong

Councillor:

Marvin Hunt

Guest:

Esther Bérubé, Metro Vancouver

Regrets:

Debbie Gallichen
Charan Sethi

1. Acceptance of Previous Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of July 28, 2011 were accepted as distributed.

- Amy Spencer noted that the figures for the “Residential Development Summary 2011”, which was most recently sent to DAC members, appear to have the same figures as the summary from the previous month. Don Luymes will check this.

2. DAC representative on the ADP (Tom Ainscough, City Architect)

- Tom Ainscough spoke to the DAC to inform the committee that 2 membership positions have opened up on the City’s Advisory Design Panel (ADP). These positions represent the development industry and were formerly held by Norman Couttie and Michael Mortensen. Ivanhoe Cambridge is being considered for one of the positions. For the other position, ADP is looking for someone with a multi-family residential background. The position is for a 2-year term. The ADP meets every 2 weeks throughout the year and meetings are held from 4pm – 6pm in City Hall. There are usually 2 items per meeting. Packages are sent out to the ADP a week in advance and members are notified 1.5 weeks in advance. The ADP schedule is posted on the City’s website.
- The DAC will recommend some potential development industry representatives for the ADP position to Tom by November 30th.
- Tom’s contact information is as follows. Phone: 604-591-4501. E-mail: tainscough@surrey.ca.

- Not including the 2 development industry representatives, the ADP currently includes 18 members, including 8 architects (endorsed by PIBC), 3 landscape architects, 2 disabled access advisors, 2 representatives of the Surrey RCMP, 1 heritage advisory, and 2 sustainability advisors. The architect representatives are rotated and the same can be done for the development industry representatives.

Comments:

- John Purewal expressed his interested in the position.

3. Traffic Control Strategy for Work on Roadways (Jaime Boan, Manager, Transportation)

- Jaime Boan presented the City's traffic control strategy for work on roadways and, specifically, the new practice and process for Traffic Obstruction Permits. A copy of this presentation is attached.

Comments:

- General consensus from the DAC that the contractor should pay 100% of the traffic obstruction permit related fees
- Does the Traffic Control Plan have to be completed before construction begins? Jaime responded that the City needs the plan approved before the pre-construction meeting is scheduled.
- Schools should be considered as their peak traffic times are half an hour before and after school. Richie Sidhu responded that permitted traffic obstruction times within school zones will be limited during peak traffic times. The typically permitted hours will be from 9am – 2:30 pm and 3:30 pm – 10pm, which will allow for drop-off and pick-up of students.
- It seems like this new process increases bureaucracy. It does not differentiate between small scale developments (e.g. one day of traffic obstruction) and major developments (e.g. a couple of weeks of traffic obstruction), nor the road classification (country lane vs. arterial). Will these be considered? Jaime responded that country roads are local roads so there will be a simplified process for these. Whether a road closure is 2 hours or several days, ultimately, we will need to have safety measures in place.
- Steve Kurrein added that traffic obstruction cases are not just straight out of a standard book. Some are straightforward, others are complicated. Fees stay the same, but the efforts will vary. It would get too complicated if we adjust it for each type so the rates established have been based on typical review time required.
- Clarence Arychuk asked if this will be a red-tape process. Jaime responded that the new software being created in conjunction with this change will improve efficiencies for City staff and contractors and thus should make this process pretty easy. Technology such as the use of mobile devices will streamline the process. Leaving the traffic control needs solely to the contractors was causing operational and safety issues. Hence, this process was set up.
- Deana commented that limiting traffic obstruction during school peak hours can really lengthen the construction process. The company she represents has had projects near schools and simply met with the schools to find out when would be the best timing. It takes discretion. Do not have general restrictions. Jaime responded that yes there can be flexibility. The permitted traffic obstruction times of 9am - 2:30 pm and 3:30 pm – 10 pm are a default standard.

- Deana asked if the City has met with the contractors. The number of hurdles for a developer is so great. Jaime responded that they have been working with contractors over the past year. Traffic control plans are submitted for all projects and inspections are being undertaken. We will also be meeting with them to explain the process changes and new fees established to cover city costs.
- Andy Aadmi agreed that there should be more flexibility. Jaime commented that paving, which is weather dependent, can be a challenge in terms of timing, so they are still reviewing options for more flexibility in the notification of construction.
- Deana added that traffic control is not a problem for everyone and suggested maybe having a different set of guidelines for those who disobey.
- Amritpal Gill commented that as the population grows, more people will complain. There will always be complaints. Why add more work to the current process? Jaime responded that for smaller projects, we can look at how these can be handled differently. There are issues with the current process and a need identified by Council to address it. The process laid out we believe will best address the issues, but we will monitor it and refine or modify the process in the future as appropriate.
- John Purewal commented that contractors should have the ability to phone City Hall to ask permission to do minor adjustments.
- Steve commented that for lane closures on arterial roads, if you take care of signage, it will reduce the associated traffic impacts.

4. Development Cost Charge Review/Service Plan Update (Jeff Arason, Utilities Manager)

- Jeff Arason presented on the Development Cost Charge Review / Service Plan Update. A copy of this presentation is attached.
- The City is looking at an increase of about 2%, but not higher than 2.5%.
- Jeff A. will send the feedback he receives to the DAC by e-mail.

Comments:

- Clarence asked if the increase in arterial rights-of-way rates were factored in this DCC update. Jaime responded no, he will have to come back to this group to discuss and address this. A lot of the arterials that are not upgraded have nice new homes in front. The issue will likely not be part of this DCC update, but will likely be incorporated into the DCC's at a later time.
- Steve commented about riparian areas and that 5-10% will be taken from developers. The understanding was that that would be taken from DCC's. Jaime responded that the DCC's do not always go to the 30 m. It depends. We do not have a definite answer at this point. Owen Croy added that for parkland acquisition, adjustments will be made.
- Jeff Fisher commented that parkland DCCs are the largest by far. We may have to look at parks. In the future, we may end up paying a lot for park DCCs. Owen responded that there are constraints (such as parks on agricultural land), but the City does acquire land for future parkland although it is not always publicized.
- Steve asked why the Anniedale-Tynehead NCP is not included in the DCCs. Jeff A. responded that the Anniedale-Tynehead NCP has not got Stage 2 approval, yet. Hence, it is not on the chart, which only includes approved NCPs.

- Some developers will not develop until they qualify for the rebate so they may delay construction a year.
- Clarence asked if DCC's should be moved to specific neighbourhoods. Jeff A. responded that that may be where we are going.
- It is hard to get the pro-forma/financing for the banks now.
- David Porte commented that the City should be the one to buy the land first and to buy it at a better price. Don responded that Parks has done a lot of land banking. Owen added that this is something Parks can discuss with the DAC at a later time.

5. Other Business – Ecosystem Management Study (EMS)

- Don provided a brief update on the status of the EMS.
- The EMS looked at sensitive ecosystems in the City. 3 areas were examined – hubs, sites, and corridors. A hub is a larger area, often a forested block sometimes found in Surrey regional parks. The ecological value of the hubs has been assessed by a consultant. Sites are smaller areas of lesser ecological value and are found in city parks and on private property. Corridors provide a linear connection for wildlife and ecological processes, and include greenways/greenbelts that may follow creeks, gas lines, etc.
- The EMS will be discussed in detail at the next DAC meeting.

6. Metro Vancouver Recycling Reports (Esther Bérubé)

- Esther Bérubé presented two by-laws that Metro Vancouver has been developing: Mandatory Recycling of Construction and Demolition Materials; and Mandatory Recycling Space and Access in Multi-Family & Commercial Buildings. The latter presentation is for information purposes only as Surrey already has requirements in place for recycling space and access in multi-family and commercial buildings.
- Copies of both presentations are attached.
- Feedback forms (one for each topic) were distributed to the DAC members. They can also be found online at <http://www.metrovancouver.org/services/solidwaste/planning/Pages/default.aspx>.

Comments for Mandatory Recycling of Construction and Demolition Materials:

- There will not be a 100% refund? Esther responded that right now, the refund is 90%, which is a result of a 100% refund minus a flat fee administrative charge of 10%.
- David Porte asked what is the purpose of the proposed waste disposal and recycling fees. Esther responded that the builder will provide the refundable fee in the beginning and when the builder has completed the project, the builder will have an incentive to inform the municipality that the builder has complied with the bylaw, that the waste was brought to the right place, by providing the receipts (stapled to the form). The municipality will then refund the builder for complying with the bylaw. This is what is being proposed.
- John Purewal commented that the 10% is high for major projects. Maybe pro-rate it. What are we doing to educate? Esther responded that this is a bylaw and there has to be education, too.

- Tim Bontkes asked if it will cost builders more to bring construction and demolition materials to the licensed facilities than to not. Esther responded that for some projects, such as single-family demolition that contain over 80% wood, which is currently accepted for a low tipping fee at the Vancouver landfill, it could cost more to bring material to licensed facilities. However, other projects save money by taking material to licensed facilities that can recycle materials. To create an incentive for compliance, the refundable fee would be higher than the additional amount of tipping fees that could be spent if these materials were brought to the right facility instead of directly to disposal. The program should pay for itself.
- Jake Friesen commented that part of his company's problem is being subject to illegal dumping. If waste disposal and recycling fees are onerous, people will dump their material on a developer's property assuming that they can easily dispose of it, but the developer has to pay for it to be removed and cleaned up. It is not the major developers that do not comply, it is the people who do renovations on their site. There should be no exemption for small projects.
- Deana and Jake commented that it seems like those who already recycling/complying are those who are being penalized. Steve suggested putting a fee or restrictions on what landfills take. Esther responded that there could be an incentive for developers who are already doing the right thing.
- John commented that what will likely happen is that people will end up bringing their waste and recycling to where it costs them less. For example, there is a place that will pay money for excess wood to turn it into wood chips.
- Amritpal commented that there is also the issue of widespread asbestos contamination during the transfer of waste and recycling.
- John added that for new construction, developers should be required to prepare a plan explaining what they will do for waste disposal and recycling of construction and demolition material, and be randomly checked to see if they are complying. Rob Costanzo responded that Metro Vancouver has engaged stakeholder dialogue north of the Fraser River and it will need the dialogue with the south of the Fraser River, as well, to look at best practices. This is a starting point for that discussion.
- Amritpal commented that educating on what is allowed for recycling beyond household items is more important.

Comments for Mandatory Recycling Space and Access in Multi-Family & Commercial Buildings:

- Deana asked how the issue of storage and vehicle access to underground storage is doing in other municipalities, and whether it has changed from the documents circulated in the past? Esther responded that the vehicle access requirements have not changed. What is needed is that the trucks can clear the overhead restrictions to have access to the areas where the storage is located. Jeff F. commented that this is less of an issue with Surrey at the moment, but will become more of an issue in the future, especially with increased development in the City Centre.
- Deana added that sometimes storage requirements and vehicle access requirements reduce the number of units that can be built, and if the trucks meet fire engine standards, it should not be a problem. Higher clearance in PQ would have a big impact on the efficiency of the design.
- Jeff F. commented that recycling space and access meets fire truck access, they should not have to be included in the by-law.

- The Building Code accepts fire truck access from the periphery of the site under certain conditions, so there might not be a requirement for a fire truck to access a recycling storage area directly.
- Metro Vancouver should work with municipalities on how these issues are addressed rather than requiring more.
- Fire truck access is important.
- There was also discussion around private haulers being able to provide more flexibility with smaller trucks and different service levels than municipal collection services. Why should buildings have to be designed to comply with municipal collection services?

7. Next Scheduled Meeting - January 26, 2012

The meeting adjourned at 4:54 p.m.