

# MINUTES

## Development Advisory Committee

File: **360-20 (DAC)**  
Date: **May 23, 2013**  
Time: **2:30 p.m.**  
Location: **Planning Room 1,  
Surrey City Hall**

### Members:

Clarence Arychuk  
Tim Bontkes  
Maginnis Cocivera  
Roger Jawanda  
Curranne Labercane  
Mark Sakai  
Jas Sandhu  
Charan Sethi  
Greg Sewell

### City Staff:

Carrie Baron  
Trent Hatfield  
Jean Lamontagne  
Sam Lau  
Don Luymes  
Fay Keng Wong

### Regrets:

Steve Forrest  
Deana Grinnell  
Guy Young

### 1. Acceptance of Previous Minutes

The notes of the April 25, 2013 meeting were accepted as distributed.

### 2. Proposed Erosion & Sedimentation Bylaw Changes (Carrie Baron, Engineering – Drainage & Environment Manager)

- A draft Erosion and Sediment Control By-law was distributed to the DAC members.
- Carrie Baron provided an update on the proposed changes to the Erosion and Sediment Control By-law (By-law No. 16138). A copy of her presentation is attached.
- Submit comments to Carrie Baron or Trent Hatfield by June 13<sup>th</sup>.

### Comments:

- Mark Sakai asked if the Greater Vancouver Home Builders' Association can send information about this to its members for their comments. Carrie Baron responded yes.
- Greg Sewell asked if there are minimum sizes for holding tanks. Trent Hatfield responded that there are no defined criteria for holding tank size. As long as what is built is able to deal with the site's discharge, it is fine. The tank itself is very effective if used correctly. Tanks do require regular maintenance and water dosing, PH mitigation. PH affects the performance of the tank. Carrie Baron added that tanks are often at large downtown construction sites, not so much on single family. Charan Sethi commented that for one of his developments, he ended up building his own system on deep sites.
- Maginnis Cocivera asked about the re-inspection fee. Carrie Baron responded that it will be around \$80 for the first inspection and \$140 for the second inspection. The fees will be consistent with inspection fees of other departments and will be in the fee setting bylaw (not in the Erosion and Sediment Control by-law). The bill will go to whoever put the deposit in. The problem has been the City being called in for an inspection when whole scale things have not yet been done.
- Charan Sethi commented that Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) is the one who charges the huge fines. Carrie Baron responded that the re-inspection fees are not intended as a revenue source as the money that would be collected is not significant enough to even cover staff salaries.

- Maginnis Cocivera commented his concern that the inspection requirements under Erosion and Sediment Control By-law permits are too onerous and used the Township of Langley as an example. Trent Hatfield responded that while the City reviewed the requirements of other municipalities, it had chosen to be less rigorous, allowing for site specific inspection frequencies and seasonal variations, seeking to reduce the number of inspections required over the life cycle of a project. Compared to other municipalities with active Erosion Sediment Control requirements, Surrey has the lowest inspection frequencies and it would be a disadvantage to the development community if we harmonized our requirements.
- Jean Lamontagne commented that the webcams that are used for security monitoring could be used to monitor development sites, saving staff from having to go out and do multiple re-inspections and allowing them to check from their computers, instead, if anything has been done on the site, yet. Jean Lamontagne has seen a camera that was very clear, having the ability to zoom in and out. Carrie Baron responded that usually there are things (such as on the ground) that cannot be noticed via camera. Trent Hatfield commented that 80% of the sites that staff inspect are not okay even though the builder/developer had said that everything has been signed off. A camera would not be able to see the catch basins, etc.
- Carrie Baron commented that erosion and sediment control has improved significantly in recent years (for example, six years ago, tanks were not commonly used), but there is room for improvement.

### 3. Comments on the Market (All Members)

- Charan Sethi. The market has been slow. Tien Sher's new product, micro suites, has been very successful. Banks have been very tough on purchasers who only put, for example, a 5% down payment. Micro suites have a much lower price point. Charan Sethi does not agree with the City's parking requirements. On one of his buildings, less than 50% of purchasers are buying a parking stall. Parking stalls are cheap at \$12,000/stall (\$15/month) and can be sold to others. In his first building, the first units that were sold did not come with parking stalls. Will be left with empty parking stalls. Larger units have not sold, yet. Purchasers consist of 60% homeowners, 40% investors. These are people coming from rentals who are downsizing. There was a time when 16 ft wide units were thought too narrow. Have to look towards the future – a transit-oriented city. Developers should not be required to hook up to the district energy system because it adds an additional cost to development. More developers are needed to make the district energy system work. A lot of people (80%) came by SkyTrain to see Tien Sher's development, which shows the change in the ways people are thinking of travelling. Mark Sakai commented that a lot of young people do not have a car and some do not even have a driver's license. This is a trend among young people. Clarence Arychuk commented that a long time ago, 18 ft wide units were introduced in Clover Valley Station and they sold very quickly, were surprisingly popular, such that some of the subdivision had to be redesigned because people liked them and they were more affordable. Developers who would like to reduce their parking requirement should just apply for a DVP for their project because reducing parking citywide will be a problem. For example, reduced parking requirements may not work in Clayton as it may in City Centre.

- Maginnis Cocivera. Polygon has not experienced that far a drop in sales. Richmond is doing particularly well. Abbotsford and Coquitlam are not doing as well. Polygon has an opening coming up in June in Surrey.
- Greg Sewell. No comments.
- Mark Sakai. The Greater Vancouver Home Builders' Association is embarking on a major project. Preparing a baseline report looking at municipalities and residential development, similar to the NAIOP (Commercial Real Estate Development Association) study. Looking at three types of developments: single family, townhouse, high rise apartments. Working with SFU Geography students who will be doing research (as a third party) to evaluate how the municipalities are doing. Talked to NAIOP and have their survey template. The report will be ready to go out probably in August. Will test run them with all municipalities in the region except for small municipalities such as Belcarra.
- Clarence Arychuk. Hunter Laird continues to do work in Surrey, but much less than before.
- Curranne Labercane. UDI has an event on June 13 regarding jobs/transit and how it relates to economic development. Also, UDI has not heard from DAC, yet, regarding who will be the City of Surrey representatives for the UDI Subcommittee working on Letters of Credit and Bonding best practices.
- Jas Sandhu. There is a lot of demand for commercial real estate, especially for office close to transit/SkyTrain similar to Metrotown. The land side is cautious.
- Tim Bontkes. Slow start for single family but Infinity has sold off most of their product in months. Used to be 18 months, now 30 months. The layerings of the City's requirements, a more active Council, and a limiting supply of single family lots, have been challenges. Infinity has sold a lot of lots because there is high demand. It is hard to find good land. The recent election results may have a positive effect on the market.
- Roger Jawanda. Work has been steady, but would like it to be busier. Only one large project – a 100 unit development in Surrey. Other projects are 10-15 unit developments. It is hard to get capital works. Hopefully, it will pick up.

#### 4. Other Business

- Clarence Arychuk asked if the following could be added to the agendas of future DAC meetings:
  - Road exchange policies. Sometimes realigning roads is really important and should be sped up. It can take 9 months to deal with at the most efficient rate. We know road exchange will happen. Why do developers have to wait until PLA's are approved?
  - Any updates on the Environmental Review Committee (ERC) process. Jean Lamontagne commented that, although the ERC process works very well for us, it will not continue. At this time, applicants that are not proposing 15 or 30 metres setbacks will have to do the full Riparian Areas Regulation (RAR) process which will be subject of a peer review.
- Greg Sewell asked about the status of rapid transit in Surrey. Don Luymes responded that the government structure of TransLink is up in the air and progress has stalled. TransLink does not have the funding. Maginnis Cocivera commented that the new Provincial government has not mentioned anything about transportation. However, Mark Sakai commented that a lot of former municipal leaders were elected, which may have an impact.

5. **Next Scheduled Meeting – June 27, 2013**

- The meeting adjourned at 3:53 pm.