

# MINUTES

## Development Advisory Committee

File: 360-20 (DAC)  
Date: September 24, 2015  
Time: 2:30 p.m.  
Location: 3W Meeting Room A, Surrey City Hall

---

### Members:

Clarence Arychuk  
Tim Bontkes  
Adam Donnelly  
Jeff Fisher  
Nathan Hildebrand  
Roger Jawanda  
Steve Jedreicich  
Jas Sandhu  
Charan Sethi  
Jag Shergill  
Kyle Wright

### City Staff:

Philip Bellefontaine  
Megan Fitzgerald  
Dave Harkness  
Jean Lamontagne  
Sam Lau  
Shawn Low  
Mehran Nazeman  
Judith Robertson  
Fay Keng Wong

### Guests:

Maureen Kirkbride, TELUS  
Mark Neath, TELUS  
Jaswinder Randhawa, TELUS  
Ben Shih, TELUS

### Regrets:

Councillor Bruce Hayne

### 1. Previous Minutes

The notes of the June 25, 2015 meeting were accepted as distributed.

### 2. Fee for Staff Attendance at Developer Initiated Public Information Meetings (Shawn Low, Current Planning Manager)

- Shawn Low provided an update. As a result of a recent internal audit, a small change had to be made to the City's fee structure.
- The City will be charging a \$400 fee for City staff attendance at developer initiated public information meetings. The fee will cover the cost and time of two City staff.
- This fee existed in the 1990s but when the by-law was changed, it was left out. At the next Council meeting, the fee will be put back in.

### Comments:

- Tim Bontkes asked why there is no fee for staff attendance at, for example, NCP Public Open Houses. Some municipalities have staff attend developer initiated public meetings if they can. Shawn Low responded that the fee will only be charged for staff attendance at developer initiated public information meetings. For example, for a developer initiated development application for an OCP amendment which requires a Public Information Meeting to provide more information for the public.

### 3. Zoning By-Law Part 5 – Off-Street Parking and Loading/Unloading Update (Philip Bellefontaine, Transportation Planning Manager; Megan Fitzgerald, Transportation Planner)

- Megan Fitzgerald provided an update on the City's parking requirements. A copy of her presentation is attached.
- This is the first of at least 2 or 3 conversations Transportation Engineering will be having with the DAC regarding parking.

- The purpose of this initial presentation is to provide an overview of the process, highlight some of the different aspects of parking that the City is reviewing, and provide the DAC with an opportunity to provide feedback on the general scope of work.
- The last comprehensive review occurred in 1999 and there have been minimal formal changes since then. Parking is becoming increasingly complex and is an important issue for residents, businesses, and Council. Parking is also fundamental to City goals such as increased travel choice, compact and connected communities, and housing affordability.
- A few months ago, the City initiated a joint Planning-Engineering review focusing on Part 5 of the Zoning By-law, which deals with off-street parking requirements. The primary focus of this round of updates is housekeeping-related edits and updates for parking facilities. This includes surface lots, parkades, and underground parking lots but does not include garages attached to single family and townhouse developments. The objectives of the parking review are to introduce new definitions where needed, simplify language to improve clarity, and delete or combine redundant land use categories. For example, simplifying the visitor parking section under Section A. General Requirements; changing Section B. Parking Dimensions and Standards into an easier to read format and removing the footnotes; streamlining the table of land uses under Section C. Required Off-Street Parking Spaces; and moving accessible parking requirements to relevant sections under Section D. Additional Requirements. The proposed changes will help set the stage for future updates, including future discussions around transit supportive development and LRT. Broadly speaking, there are no major changes, apart from a modest increase in the proportion of small parking spaces within parking facilities.
- As part of the review, City staff looked at parking dimensions in parking facilities in an effort to ground truth the City's current requirements. A jurisdictional scan was done and it was found that minimum parking dimensions vary by municipality and Surrey generally falls in the middle or on the low side of the regional average. Analysis of ICBC vehicle registration data was also done to determine the average vehicle dimensions for popular cars, trucks, and vans.
- Parking Dimensions in Parking Facilities (not including garages) Findings:
  - The width and length of regular parking spaces accommodate most vehicle types, including 100% of cars, so, for regular parking spaces, keep current length and width as-is.
  - More than 50% of cars fit in a small car parking space but most trucks and vans are too large. For small car parking spaces, consider increasing the length from 4.9 m to 5.0 m to accommodate a greater range of vehicles, but increase the small car parking maximum.
  - The average height of a truck is 1.9 m and the average height of a van is 2.0 m. Surrey currently requires a minimum vertical clearance, as per the BC Building Code. Consider increasing the vertical clearance from 2.0 m to 2.1 m to accommodate a greater range of vehicles, including vans and trucks.
- City staff are also looking at parking rates and will be doing some minor edits to the wording to simplify the language and deletion of redundant/obsolete land uses. A consultant will also review select land uses to confirm that these rates are still fit for purpose. Light industrial business parks, office uses, retail uses, eating establishments, drive-through restaurants, child care centres, schools, and indoor recreational facilities will be reviewed first, but this list will likely expand to include other land uses. There are also a few studies that have been completed in the past 5 years that have yet to be formally

incorporated in the bylaw. The review process is an opportunity to incorporate rates for residential care facilities and churches.

- There are two forms of shared parking provisions: shared parking for shared trip ends (e.g. shopping), and shared parking based on temporal distribution (e.g. day use of parking and night use of parking). A clause currently exists that permits a 25% reduction where temporal distribution exists. Shared parking is important because it is an efficient use of land, reduces construction costs and maintenance costs, and has urban design benefits. A consultant is doing some parking counts where shared parking exists and will be looking at opportunities for improvement based on their findings.
- The 2015 scope of work is about “setting the stage” for future updates (ongoing process).  
Next steps:
  - DAC discussion: Parking rates for specific land uses (October)
  - DAC discussion: Accessible parking & bike parking (November)
  - Presentation at Transportation & Infrastructure Committee (November)
  - Corporate Report to Council (December)

**Comments:**

- Adam Donnelly asked what methodology is being used for this review. Megan Fitzgerald responded that different methodologies were used. For some, such as how to amend wording, desktop analysis was done. For others, such as determining parking demand and rates, the consultants are doing counts at different times of day. Methodology varies by site, occupancy, and neighbourhood. Philip Bellefontaine responded that recommendations will be based on managing risk (e.g. ensuring tenants stay and customers visit), increasing efficiency, and trying to get a number that will be a better fit. It might not ever be exactly right, but the context will be looked at and the numbers will be adjusted; it will be an estimate.
- Jas Sandhu asked if the material of parking surfaces has been looked at. People are moving away from black top, etc., but one would probably have to go through a relaxation. Dave Harkness responded that there are new technologies. Concrete in Blackie Spit has had some success. Philip Bellefontaine responded that in the West Clayton NCP, there are provisions for permeable surfaces, etc. Megan Fitzgerald responded that the City has design guidelines, as well.
- Charan Sethi commented that the use of extra storage lockers for bikes has worked well.
- Kyle Wright asked for clarification on parking for small cars. Mosaic has received comments for one of its projects that small car parking will not be acceptable. Developers can make small car parking work to a certain extent for nice urban design. Megan Fitzgerald responded that the parking review that is being done is not for tandem parking or garages, but for structured parking lots. Jean Lamontagne responded that transportation engineering looks at the long term. For example, allowing for small car parking may meet the first occupant’s needs, but it may not suit the next occupant who may have a large vehicle. Philip Bellefontaine reiterated that it is about finding the sweet spot.
- Clarence Arychuk commented that parking should be designed for uses, not an occasional occurrence/activity. There has to be some practicality, not just suiting the one person who complains.
- Charan Sethi asked how much study has been done around the SkyTrain station? Requirements seem excessive for his projects in City Centre. Concerned that parking stalls will be left vacant. Philip Bellefontaine responded that transit supportive parking

requirements are not part of this round of reviews, but it may be looked at more thoroughly when the LRT comes in. We have to make sure the rates are right sized and then have a mechanism for adjustments. In the by-law, there is a minimum amount of parking stalls required. As the City Centre develops, walkability and transit improves, so the target moves.

- Charan Sethi commented that in Toronto, the developer has the right to amend the parking structure. Philip Bellefontaine responded that there are some developments that want more parking (e.g. those that are targeting more luxurious or larger units) and others that want more parking relaxations (e.g. those that are targeting students or smaller units) who would like more parking relaxations.

**4. TELUS Servicing Policy Change (Sam Lau, Manager Land Development; Maureen Kirkbride, TELUS; Ben Shih, TELUS; Jaswinder Randhawa, TELUS; Mark Neath, TELUS)**

- At the last DAC meeting, it was requested that TELUS provide an update to the DAC on the issue of some developments not being serviced by TELUS. Sam Lau arranged for TELUS representatives to present at this meeting. In May 2015, the City became aware that TELUS was not servicing some areas in Surrey. Surrey's Subdivision and Development By-law requires that every new lot is serviced with adequate telecommunications infrastructure, but not prescriptive as to who the telecommunications provider should be. There are 11 residential developments to date in Surrey that are not serviced by TELUS. The City requires that developers inform the City who the telecommunications provider will be for their development. Where TELUS is not providing service, the developers have Shaw as their provider. The City requires that the developer include a notation in their Disclosure Statement or Purchase/Sale Contract that TELUS service is not available for this development.
- Maureen Kirkbride, Director of Local Government Relations at TELUS, introduced the TELUS staff in attendance and noted that TELUS is behind.
- Ben Shih, Director of Planning and Engineering at TELUS, provided an update on TELUS servicing. A copy of his presentation is attached. Rapid population growth and rising customer requirements for data-intensive new communications technologies are increasing demand for TELUS' capital investments. The number of new living units in BC and Alberta requiring connections doubled in the last year, from 40,000 to more than 80,000. The trend is expected to continue through 2016, with an anticipated additional 70,000 new living units in both provinces. TELUS is currently assessing 950 developments in BC and Alberta. This has put tremendous pressure on TELUS' capital budget and led to a review of the way in which TELUS funds access to capital for new developments.
- TELUS' review found that many new subdivisions and MDUs (multi-development units / apartments) are capital intensive to connect, yet often yield benefits to only a few customers. TELUS' infrastructure is often under-utilized or un-utilized for years. Developers pay for other pre-provisioned services (e.g. sewer, water), while TELUS bears the lion's share of connection costs. This pointed to a need to re-examine TELUS' policies prioritizing TELUS' significant, but limited, capital investments for new developments.
- TELUS' revised policy calls for:
  - Prioritization of capital investments to maximize the benefit to as many customers as possible.

- Evaluation of every development based on the specifics associated with the development, including capital costs, customer benefit, and partnership situation.
- In some situations, a request that developers partner with TELUS to share more of the upfront costs of connecting new communities, enabling TELUS to stretch their capital dollars further. Similar to how developers partly or entirely fund connections to other services – sewer, water, local roads, etc.
- TELUS believes they are taking the right approach to stretch their capital dollars further to serve the greater good.
- In June, TELUS began proactive communications with the development community. Outreach was based on immediacy of occupancy.
  - Contact numbers: 310-4DEV to deal with general questions, and 310-BICS to respond to developers wanting specifics regarding design, planning, or construction.
- Face-to-face meetings booked with mid to large volume developers.
- In Surrey, 166 developments were identified with occupancy dates 2015 – 2017. Of these developments, 15% have partnerships with TELUS. To date, 54 Surrey developments have been assessed, 43 of which have received a TELUS -funded build decision.
- Every new development requesting to be provisioned by TELUS is entered into their assessment process. Each request is unique and considered on a case-by-case basis. Requests for service are prioritized based on immediacy of occupancy and number of customers affected. TELUS reaches out proactively to developers to discuss build options including: TELUS partnership program, TELUS-funded phased build, and a developer-funded option.
- Option #1: TELUS partnership program. Partnership programs established to unlock unique fibre service benefits for developers and customers. TELUS supplies all fibre inside the building, replacing risers and horizontals; installs fibre riser to secondary equipment rooms in developer-provided conduit in MDUs and to the demarcation point for town homes; and provides dedicated TELUS Project Manager to work with developer's electrical engineer and site personnel to ensure timely construction process. Developer and customer benefits include increased home value, free show home service, free fibre cabling, smart panels for each unit/amenity room, marketing and construction support, and one year free Optic TV and HSIA service.
- Option #2: TELUS-funded phased build. TELUS will fund builds for developments determined to achieve strong customer benefits. The phased build approach is to align completion with maximum customer occupancy. Build requirements are broken into phases (such as design, conduit placement, fibre placement and completion). Developments go through the assessment process by phase. TELUS funds the required build components to meet immediate infrastructure requirements (such as placing conduit when trenches are open) and adjusts the completion date to align with maximum customer occupancy. TELUS pays the cost of engineering design time, labour, inspection, permitting, and material.
- Option #3: Developer-funded build option. Alternative option for builds with fewer customer benefits or where developers want full service prior to maximum occupancy. TELUS aligns with the developer to build to the developer's timeline. This option allows developers to ensure build completion at the time when they complete their project. TELUS engages developers during the assessment process to discuss the build option and the benefits of entering into a TELUS partnership. For a developer-funded build, the developer pays the cost of engineering design time, labour, inspection, permitting, and material. TELUS provides complimentary services for developers to offer to end customers.

**Comments:**

- Jeff Fisher commented that Alberta will not likely see much increase in demand for new residential units with its current economic climate due to the drop in oil prices. How is this accounted for? Ben Shih responded that the Alberta UDI informed TELUS that they still anticipate a significant increase in demand in Alberta for new residential units. TELUS does not have the market research. Developers risk money three years in advance and they do not see a reduction. TELUS is doing a check in Edmonton and knows time is of essence when roads are put in, etc. Mark Neath commented that the information that the developer gives to TELUS is what is most important in order to get a more accurate idea of when a project will actually complete. There are many projects whose developers say will be finished by a certain date, but maybe only 35% actually complete by that date. This holds up TELUS' capital which could have been used for other projects.
- Clarence Arychuk asked if other types of uses, such as commercial, were looked at in TELUS' review. Ben Shih responded that TELUS looked only at the return on their capital. Greenfield subdivisions cost a lot more. There are not necessarily as many customers based on MDUs. Clarence Arychuk disagreed with TELUS' data. For the past 30 years, Surrey has produced a significant number of single family lots. The form has also changed from single family to multi-family. Most of the new subdivisions in the region are occurring in Surrey.
- Roger Jawanda asked if there is any opportunity to go back to shared infrastructure. Mark Neath responded, in the past, yes. TELUS is not ruling it out but is not presently discussing it. People have asked TELUS if they could use TELUS' conduit but TELUS is not actively pursuing it.
- Charan Sethi asked if Shaw comes in, does that mean Telus is banned? Ben Shih responded that if they leave their facility, then Telus would have to lease that duct.
- Tim Bontkes commented that from a cost and revenue standpoint, it sounds like Telus is still putting in a duct because developers are required to put in one extra duct in their subdivision. This increases developers' costs unnecessarily. Mark Neath responded that TELUS has always put in ducts but their understanding is that Shaw is putting in their own ducts. Ben Shih responded that revenue TELUS receives from Shaw is very minor. In BC, CRTC regulations do not allow Telus to charge more than one third of what they had to pay. The issue does not have to do with revenue now but revenue in the future. TELUS does not get revenue until the units are sold. Clarence Arychuk commented that once the units are sold, TELUS would have customers for a lifetime so the amortization of this future revenue should be considered. Mark Neath commented that TELUS probably approached it poorly in the beginning. The ideal approach would be TELUS saying yes to all the developments, but there are so many projects that they have not even responded to some inquiries, yet.
- Adam Donnelly asked why Shaw does not have this backlog? Ben Shih commented that he is not sure if that is true. Capital plans are different.
- Clarence Arychuk commented that it seems like TELUS wants to have the developer subsidize before TELUS puts in the infrastructure.
- Charan Sethi asked if TELUS' review considered the trend towards younger people not using landlines. Ben Shih responded that TELUS loses about 50,000 customers every quarter due to copper based service. This will not be the case for fibre optic. The fibre technology will outlive us.
- Tim Bontkes commented that, since May, he has three projects that cannot get TELUS. They cannot wait so they will likely end up going with a different service provider, which will actually save costs for his company. His consultants have tried to contact TELUS for a

long time. No response. His customers (the home buyers) are fine with Shaw. Shaw is providing such good packages that it has been a 100% uptake. His company does not have a preference. His engineers tell him that they should put in two ducts. If the home buyers want to change service providers in the future, he does not want to have them stuck with one service provider. Ben Shih responded that TELUS is not the one that requires two conduits.

- Sam Lau commented that the City has not heard back from Telus.
- Clarence Arychuk commented that if future providers want to come in, they will go in and put it in. Mark Neath responded that since 2010, all of TELUS' wire has been fibre, but fibre infrastructure is about four times the cost of copper. TELUS wants to provide service to every development in Alberta and BC. The problem is when are they doing the design? Have to make sure that the capital is useful.
- Roger Jawanda and Tim Bontkes asked if there is an opportunity for a rebate, such as Hydro's rebate program. Jaswinder Randhawa, Director of Marketing at TELUS, responded that Option #1 is something that has been around for a long time. It can be a win-win for the developer, customer, and TELUS. It is an agreement with the developer that gives TELUS exclusive rights. The customer gets a year's worth of free service. It gets the penetration rate much faster for TELUS, which helps with cost. TELUS works with the developer to market TELUS, but the development can still allow Shaw to come in. It future proofs.
- Jeff Fisher suggested that TELUS do a breakfast seminar at UDI and referred TELUS to Urban Analytics (Michael Ferreira) which can track residential real estate data and has contacts with developers.
- Adam Donnelly asked that since we are going wireless, does that mean we do not have to go underground? Ben Shih responded that fibre wire is expensive and fibre spectrum is even more expensive. Cellphones are broadcast through a particular pipe rather than through a central system (e.g. if everyone's calling at same time, it will not work and there will be a busy signal. Not everyone wants a cell phone tower and there are the problems of congestion, dropped calls, and decreased quality of service. Fibre will not have these problems. Cell tower also get backlash from nearby residents.
- Tim Bontkes commented that his projects are usually delayed for about 7 months. Sometimes their projects do not make it to Council so they do not meet their target date. Ben Shih commented that it is understood that there are permit delays, material delays, construction delays, etc. TELUS is asking for a partnership with developers such that the developers inform TELUS at different phases so TELUS can release that capital as those phases are reached.
- Jeff Fisher asked how long the delays will be for Option #2. Mark Neath responded that TELUS does not know. The percentage of occupancy to start is what is being determined right now. It is a lot cheaper for TELUS to provide the service for MDUs than a greenfield because a splice is needed for each single family home and MDUs have economies of scale.
- Sam Lau commented that he is not sure if Option #2 is truly an option. As soon as the servicing (final conduits) is done, the building permits are in so people want to move in right away. Jaswinder Randhawa responded that if there are nuances, the gap could be adapted in the phase. Mark Neath responded that the difficulty TELUS has is that they have a limited capital budget. Option #2 allows TELUS to increase their footprint.
- Jeff Fisher commented that Option #3 could be done as a sort of latecomer agreement. Sam Lau commented that would be a third party agreement between the developer and TELUS. The City cannot be a part of it. Mark Neath responded that a latecomer agreement

between the developer and TELUS would be a great idea and suggested Jeff Fisher talk to TELUS' marketing team.

- Clarence Arychuk commented that there are differences between Alberta and BC. It is impractical to compare the Alberta model with the infill that is occurring in Surrey. Ben Shih responded that TELUS has placed a significant push in BC.
- Jeff Fisher asked, for Option #2, where would it be stated in the disclosure statement for service dates for telecommunication because some disclosure statements state the specific service provider so they would have to be amended.
- Steve Jedreicich asked if MDUs are still being serviced first because of existing infrastructure. At the end of the day, developers will sell their condos with or without TELUS. Mark Neath responded that it is about validating the developments that are actually finalizing by a certain date.
- Roger Jawanda asked when it will be decided if developers are able to use TELUS. Mark Neath responded that TELUS looked at 50 projects this week and 100 projects last week to see which ones are finalizing. TELUS is now looking at projects in stages, as they get permits, etc. Typically, it takes about 18 months to 2 years before developers contact TELUS and TELUS releases its capital. Now, TELUS will wait for the developer's drawings, design, etc.
- Roger Jawanda and Clarence Arychuk commented that they are consultants and they usually send the drawings to TELUS but have to wait for a long time before they hear from them. Ben Shih responded that he will give them the direct contact for the appropriate TELUS manager.
- Clarence Arychuk commented that it is not the 80,000 units on the drawing board but the individual projects that need to go quickly. Ben Shih responded that TELUS will not take the capita and use it for a 5 lot subdivision, for example. The Option that will be used will likely be Option #2 most of the time. Roger Jawanda commented that it sounds like a development with a low number of units will not get TELUS.
- Adam Donnelly commented that Option #2 reflects badly on the developer because it makes it look like the developer chooses not to upfront the costs. Ben Shih responded that TELUS will come in once and build all the infrastructure once.
- Jean Lamontagne commented that it would be good to have an offline meeting between the City, UDI, and TELUS, to inform TELUS of the stats. Maureen Kirkbride agreed.
- Jeff Fisher commented that BC will not require a lot of wire because of the compactness of land (urban containment and ALR) compared to Alberta. For example, there are not many 150 unit subdivisions.

#### 5. Scheduled Meeting – October 22, 2015

- The meeting adjourned at 4:56 p.m.