

# MINUTES

## Development Advisory Committee

File: 360-20 (DAC)  
Date: June 28, 2018  
Time: 2:30 p.m.  
Location: 3W Meeting Room  
A, Surrey City Hall

### Members:

Andy Aadmi  
Royce Bernard  
Dwight Heintz  
Nathan Hildebrand  
Marc MacCaull  
Phil Magistrale  
Scott Pelletier  
Andrew Peterson  
Natalie Pullman  
Gopal Sahota  
Mark Sakai  
Sunny Sandher  
Jas Sandhu  
Kiegan Scharnberg  
Stafan Slot

### City Staff:

Ryan Gilmore  
Dave Harkness  
Ron Hintsche  
Patrick Klassen  
Jean Lamontagne  
Fay Keng Wong

### 1. Previous Minutes

The notes of the May 24, 2018 meeting were accepted as distributed.

### 2. City Centre Residential Parking Update (Ryan Gilmore, Transportation Planner)

- Ryan Gilmore provided an update on residential parking requirements in City Centre. A copy of his presentation is attached.
- Background. The City Centre Parking requirements have not been updated since 1994. Developments in the City Centre are eligible for a 20% reduction from the City's parking requirements. Current minimum parking requirements for City Centre are comparable to those of other Metro Vancouver municipalities. All municipalities are oversupplying parking, particularly in town centres and near transit.
- City Centre Plan. The City Centre Plan was updated and adopted in January 2017, and talked about right-sizing off-street parking requirements near frequent transit. The Plan also recommends exploring cash-in-lieu as a tool to fund transportation alternatives, as well as opportunities to support the growth of car share operations in City Centre and opportunities for development-led provision of car sharing spaces.
- Surrey LRT Supportive Policies Agreement. This Agreement between the City and TransLink was approved by Council earlier this month and, among other things, calls for the exploration of parking reductions along the LRT corridor, and parking reductions to support the development of affordable rental housing. While this agreement relates to the broader LRT corridors that extend beyond City Centre, the principles and intent are applicable to City Centre.
- Metro Vancouver Regional Apartment Parking Study. The proposed revisions to the City Centre parking requirements are based on a number parking studies. Metro Vancouver has

conducted 2 regional apartment parking studies in recent years (the first in 2012, and a more recent update completed earlier this year). The 2012 study revealed that, on average, parking was over supplied by 17%-38% across the region. The 2018 study confirmed that the trend towards lower rates of car ownership has continued region-wide, with parking being oversupplied by 45% in strata developments, and 46% where developments are located close to rapid transit. Both studies confirmed that parking demand was lower for buildings near rapid transit, and lower again for rental-only buildings. Some factors that are driving the trend include: transit service expansion; increased transit oriented development; sustained higher gas prices; higher housing costs/costs of living, which leaves less income for vehicle ownership; and expanded mobility options, such as car share, bike share, and expanding cycling networks.

- 2017 City Centre Study. Since Metro Vancouver's studies took a region-wide sample of buildings and did not include a very large sample from Surrey City Centre, the City of Surrey's Parking Services undertook its own City Centre-specific study and followed the same methodology as Metro Vancouver's studies. The City's findings were similar. The City surveyed 52 buildings in City Centre and found that supply exceeded demand by 51% on average; 1 in 3 parking spaces were vacant; and the average demand rate was 0.76, which means that for every 4 units, there were only 3 cars. It was also found that no building had a full parkade and parking occupancy ranged from 47%-84%.
- Project Scope:
  - 1) Reduced parking requirements and establish a parking "range" (minimum and maximum).
  - 2) Formalize and refine a Cash-in-Lieu Policy.
  - 3) Formalize and refine a Car Share Incentive.

Focus on non-ground-oriented multiple unit residential uses in City Centre only. Excludes ground-oriented townhouses, single-family, and other land uses such as commercial and institutional. Lessons learned from this phase will inform subsequent phases, which may include updated parking requirements to support land use planning around future LRT stations and corridors and to support and incentivise the construction of rental housing.

- Proposed Parking Minimum. 0.9 stalls per residential unit, and 0.1 visitor stalls per unit. This is less than the current "official" parking minimum of City Centre that has the 20% reduction, and less than the "unofficial" City Centre rate that is typically used for City Centre developments that seek a parking reduction. The parking rates used for the Prime of the Plaza development, which represents one of the more aggressive parking reductions in City Centre in recent years, is also shown in the table. The proposed rate of 0.9 stalls per residential unit and 0.1 visitor stalls per unit will be applied evenly to all unit types, from studio to 3 bedroom units because we do not want parking requirements to influence the unit mix in new developments. Unit mix should be determined by market demand and community needs. This approach may make it easier for developments to include a greater proportion of 2 and 3 bedroom units that are targeted to families, as the City Centre should be a place for families, as well as for students, singles, and couples. Parking demand is less than 1 stall per unit.
- In addition to the new minimum requirements, we are also recommending the introduction of a parking maximum. We know from practice and from our parking studies that developments are oversupplying parking by 51% on average. This oversupply makes developments more expensive and these costs are ultimately passed on to owners. In addition to reducing parking minimums, we are recommending new parking maximums, effectively establishing a parking "range". We are currently recommending that the new maximum be set to the current minimum for City Centre (1.2 stalls per unit), which we know from our study is oversupplying parking. There are numerous precedents for this approach in Canada, and many of these applications are for areas around LRT stations, and specifically new LRT lines in the cases of Ottawa, Hamilton, and Calgary. To help put the proposed maximum into perspective, a development could still provide 1 stall for every unit

(including all studios and junior 1 bedrooms), and still allow for 15% of units to have 2 parking stalls. Such a development would be providing 50% more parking than will ultimately be needed.

- Cash-in-Lieu of Parking. Cash-in-Lieu is the practice of providing a voluntary cash contribution in exchange for not building a parking stall. The intent is to give developers the option to not build parking where to do so is too costly or when parking is demonstrated to be unnecessary. Currently, there is no formal Cash-in-Lieu practice in Surrey. However, it is used occasionally, and the current practice is to accept \$10,000 per stall. We know from our research that the actual cost of constructing an underground parking stall ranges from \$20,000 - \$45,000 or more, with costs increasing with the depth of excavation.
- Cash-in-Lieu Recommendation.
  - Zoning By-law amendment to formalize the existing cash-in-lieu practice.
  - Maximum stall reduction using cash-in-lieu is proposed to be 10% of the minimum requirement.
  - Potential for an additional 10% reduction (20% total) when Transportation Demand Management measures are provided.
  - Cash-in-lieu amount proposed to be increased to \$20,000. This amount is more in line with the known costs of construction.
  - Cash-in-lieu funds to be invested in local parking and transportation investments (i.e. not general revenue). For example, pedestrian and cycling infrastructure, car share, transit improvements, and new/improvements to City-owned off-street parking.

The formalized process should greatly reduce the need for parking variances, which should also reduce the associated time and expense for both developer and staff.

- Car Share Incentive. A new car share incentive is also being proposed as part of the parking update. This would formalize and improve a pilot program that was introduced in 2007. To date, 3 car share vehicles have been achieved in City Centre under this policy, but very few developers are aware this option exists. One 2-way car share vehicle, such as Modo or ZipCar, has the ability to replace 9-13 vehicles, and provides an excellent alternative to households that are thinking about purchasing a car or getting a second car. The car shedding capacity of 2-way car shares support parking reduction. Modo currently operates 13 cars in City Centre and is planning on growing their Surrey fleet by 4 cars this year. ZipCar has not yet expanded to Surrey.
- Car Share Incentive Recommendations. The proposed Car Share Incentive would give credit of 5 parking stalls for each shared vehicle that is provided as part of the development (net 4). Only 2-way car share providers (e.g. Modo, Zipcar) will be eligible for this incentive (i.e. 1-way car share vehicles such as Car2Go and Evo are not eligible). There will not be a maximum number of car share vehicles. However, there will be a number of checks in place to ensure that the car share vehicles are actually provided, including a shared vehicle agreement with a service provider for a minimum duration (3 or 5 years). We are exploring ways to incentivize surface locations over underground locations as they are preferred by the car share providers and are proven to have much higher utilization. This is important because car share vehicles are intended to be an amenity for the larger community, not just the subject development. We are also considering the potential to incentivize electric vehicle (EV) charging stalls for car share vehicles. i.e. by providing a larger 7:1 substitution rate for EV stall vs. 5:1 for standard stall. The additional 2-stall credit covers the additional cost of the EV vehicle and cost of the electric vehicle supply equipment (EVSE) infrastructure. As part of the implementation process, we will also develop design guidelines and constructions standards for shared vehicle parking.
- Scenario 1: High-Rise. This example is a hypothetical City Centre high-rise development, a composite of typical high-rise developments in City centre in terms of unit number, mix,

height, etc., and illustrates how the proposed requirements and incentives would actually work in practice.

- Under the current By-law, this development would be required to provide 437 residential stalls and 64 visitor stalls, for a total of 501 parking stalls. Under the proposed new minimum, only 360 residential stalls and 40 visitor stalls would be required, which represents a reduction of 101 stalls. If this development were to provide 2 car share vehicles, this would eliminate an additional 8 stalls (net reduction of 4 stalls per car). The developer would have the option of eliminating up to an additional 40 stalls (or 10%) using cash-in-lieu. 16 stalls are eliminated for a total of \$320,000 in cash-in-lieu. All combined, the reduced minimum, car share, and cash-in-lieu could eliminate an entire level of underground parking. The resulting supply rate of this sample development would be 0.84 stalls/unit. This development could reduce parking even further by supplying additional car share vehicles and maximizing the cash-in-lieu option. If parking were to be provided at the maximum rate, each of the 400 units could have their own stall, and up to 61 units could have 2 stalls. If parking is supplied at the maximum, the development would be over supplying by approximately 51%.
  - Comparison: Cash-in-Lieu Versus Car Share. Providing 2 car share vehicles would earn a net 8 stall reduction in parking stalls. Modo estimates the cost of providing a vehicle to be \$20,000, and the City estimates the cost of constructing a surface parking stall to be \$10,000. If the developer chose to put in 2 car share vehicles (net 8 stall reduction in parking stalls), it would cost the developer about \$60,000. If the developer chose to pay cash-in-lieu instead, it would cost the developer about \$160,000 for the same 8 stall reduction. The developer would save about \$100,000 if the developer chose to put in car share rather than paying cash-in-lieu.
  - Summary.
- Proposed Zoning By-law Amendments:
- New “parking range” (minimums and maximums). Reduced minimum parking requirements and the introduction of parking maximums, which will bring the City Centre parking minimums in line with actual parking demand and help to ensure that parking is not being grossly oversupplied.
  - New “Alternatives to Parking Provision” – Cash-in-Lieu and Car Share.
  - Formalizes and refines existing practices. The introduction of a formalized cash-in-lieu policy and a car share incentive that provided less costly alternatives to building parking.

Benefits to Development Community:

- Increased transparency and certainty for developers when planning projects.
- Reduced need for parking variances, saving time and money for both developers and City.
- Additional flexibility to developers to reduce parking supply to reflect the expected parking demand for each project.

This update also sets Surrey apart from other municipalities in the region as an innovator and helps support the shift to sustainable modes of transportation in City Centre. No other municipality has parking maximums. Very few allow cash-in-lieu “as of right” and most are far more restrictive with respect to the maximum stall reduction. Very few include car share provisions directly in their zoning By-law.

- Staff would like to receive input from DAC. No specific Council dates have been set but staff intend to include EV charging policies with the proposed amendments.

**Comments:**

- Andy Aadmi asked for more details about the car share incentive. Ryan Gilmore responded that a credit of 5 parking stalls would be given for each car share vehicle that is provided

- (net 4). Modo is an example. Agreements are typically for a duration of 3 or 5 years. The developer pays for the car and the stall where it is housed. The operator maintains the car.
- Andy Aadmi asked how multiple units know that a car share vehicle is available. Ryan Gilmore responded that you have to become a member and use an app to book the vehicle.
  - Marc MacCaull commented that the cost of this would trickle down to the homeowner. Added costs of this program, any extra cost, has to be transferred to the owner. Ryan Gilmore responded that it is less expensive to put in car share vehicles than paying cash-in-lieu. We also want to make sure that car share is not for strata use only but used as part of a network of car share fleet.
  - Marc MacCaull commented that StreetSide Developments did this for the River District and thinks the car share was for the strata only. If the car share vehicles are underground and requires fob access, how do the public get a fob? Ryan Gilmore responded that the public can get access if the car share vehicles are located on-street early in the process.
  - Andy Aadmi asked for clarification on where the funds collected through cash-in-lieu go. For example, cash-in-lieu that had been collected for beautification 20 years ago on a project he did does not appear to have resulted in any beautification done on the street. Ryan Gilmore responded that he is not sure for the broader cash-in-lieu but the cash-in-lieu that will be collected for City Centre parking will be invested in local parking and transportation investments (not general revenue).
  - Dwight Heintz asked if the proposed amendments will apply to the 104 Ave corridor. Ryan Gilmore responded that the focus of this is City Centre but lessons learned will likely be applied to town centre and corridor areas, as well.

### **3. Meeting Demand for Electric Vehicle (EV) Charging Infrastructure in Surrey (Dave Harkness, Parking Services Manager)**

- City of Surrey started to supply EV charging in 2014. At the time, charging was more limited. Since 2013, there has been rapid utilization, which is consistent with trends across North America. In Surrey, currently there are approximately 1,000 individual charging connections per month. Surrey will have 41 public chargers by the end of 2018, 10 fleet chargers, and 10 EVs in fleet.
- The key element in a person's decision on whether or not to purchase an electric vehicle is the ability to charge the vehicle. The ability to charge in public places is the way to go. There is no organization that oversees this. 90% of people charge overnight at home.
- Only 1.7% of the vehicle market is electric.
- Technology is disrupting private vehicle paradigms in airport parking (great reductions in parking congestion due to the ability of apps to more accurately determine when to pick up arrivals, so people don't have to go so early) and in municipal parking supply (use of ridesharing apps reduces parking lot demand).
- Bloomberg Energy Finance estimates 35% of cars worldwide will be EV by 2040. SFU Energy Research Group predicts 23% of unit sales in BC to be EV by 2030.
- In 1900, the predominate mode of transportation was horse and buggy. 13 years later, electric vehicles were the predominate mode of transportation. Reason: horse manure associated with horse and buggy was making it unbearable. Today, the trend is moving away from carbon emissions (gas) and towards renewable energy. Various countries (e.g. Norway, Netherlands, Germany, France, Great Britain, China) have targets to no longer accept vehicles with internal combustion engines. Experts have stated that there are no more efficiencies to be found for internal combustion engines. The number of components of an EV (80-90) are a lot less than internal combustion engines (over 1,000), so the former has less maintenance costs.
- Why we will see more EVs.

- Autobuyers: lower total cost of ownership
- Automakers: market access/diminishing returns for internal combustion engine optimization
- Fleet operators: significantly reduces single greatest operating cost
- Utilities: have recognized EVs as new customers.
- Electric bus sales are growing fast. The economics work.
- The average battery pack price has dropped by 77%, and will continue to drop. Batteries are being developed so that the range is being extended.
- The transportation sector is the largest source of greenhouse gases in BC. BC's power advantage is that hydro energy is clean and cheap.
- Roadblocks to EV adoption. 40% of the population in MURBS are unable to install chargers. Most people charge at home. No Canadian business case for the private sector to provide charging. Lack of regulation creates uncertainty or prevents resale of power. Rapidly changing technology. Land values and time to charge prevent "gas station" model. If we do not act, this growing resident group will be "shut out" from EV ownership. People expect to charge their cell phones at home; it should be the same for cars.
- Proposed policy to meet future EV charging demand:
  - 100% of new residential parking spaces and 20% of visitor spaces to provide power sufficient for Level 2 EV charging (low management, allows 40 Volt circuit to charge 4 cars on a single circuit).
  - Same in 20% of new commercial parking spaces. Office settings would probably be best to have 100% of spots with EV charging.
  - Consistent with 2018 policy in Richmond, Port Coquitlam, Vancouver, Burnaby, LUBC, and New Westminster (late 2018).
  - Based on consultation with Building Owners and Managers Association, Urban Development Institute, Greater Vancouver Home Builders Association, TransLink, BC Hydro, Modo, Metro Vancouver, BCIT, other local governments, EV owners, Surrey Board of Trade, Downtown Surrey Business Improvement Association, and internal stakeholders.
- Connections to City policy:
  - OCP Energy, Emissions, and Climate Resiliency Policy: "...accommodate infrastructure for... EV charging stations" and "supporting the expanded use of alternative fuel vehicles."
  - Sustainability Policy: "...Desired outcome: Low emission vehicles predominate and are supported by the necessary fuelling infrastructure."
  - Community Energy & Emissions Policy: "Expand opportunities for low emission vehicles" and "electric vehicle charging infrastructure".
- Developer impact and offsets. In City Centre, a 400 space parkade would cost \$625/stall or \$250,000 total. Offset: new parking ratios would allow 125 stall reduction, which would result in a \$3,750,000 net saving. Market value of EV charging = \$3,500 - \$5,000/space. Configuring 100% of spaces with load management is cheaper than 20% dedicated circuit.
- The City is working with Tesla to figure out a dedicated level 2 Tesla charger.
- Over time, there will be a phased fee introduction and new utility/profit centre opportunity.

#### **Comments:**

- Jeff Fisher asked what would happen if you build in excess of what is required? Dave Harkness responded that there will be a corporate report and technical bulletins in the autumn. The report may go to Council in early November, followed by a phase-in period to allow for in-stream permits. Implementation may start in December.

- Mark Sakai asked if the charging station would only be used by the car share company. Most car shares do not have EVs. Dave Harkness responded that we would probably want them publicly available.
- A DAC member commented that the EVs need to be focused on separately from car shares. Dave Harkness responded that car share places say that they would switch to using EVs if they had more range (e.g. more than 200 miles) because drivers have range anxiety.
- The DAC member asked what if the strata wants to put it in later? Dave Harkness responded that the Province changed the strata act to allow stratas to redistribute power. Charging networks have developed “turnkey” packages where they will manage the billing, etc. so that the strata does not have to manage it.
- Dwight Heintz asked if EVs will be required everywhere in the city. Dave Harkness responded currently in the City Centre but it may be required in other areas in the future.
- Dwight Heintz commented that DCCs, etc. are going up. EVs will be an additional cost. Dave Harkness responded that there has been rigorous investigation into the costs.
- Mark Sakai commented that autonomous vehicles are another potential future disruptor. There will be a number of these vehicles. It is estimated that there will be widespread adoption of autonomous vehicles by 2025 and EV adoption is seen as a stepping stone to it.
- Gopal Sahota asked if EV outlets could be roughed in and in the future the stratas can decide to bring in the cables, etc., to connect. Dave Harkness responded that it is significantly more expensive to put in later. For example, in Vancouver, stratas end up not putting it in because of the costs.
- Phil Magistrale suggested a 50% requirement, cash-in-lieu. He finds it hard to believe that 100% of a strata would have EVs. Dave Harkness responded that putting forth the requirement/policy early on is future proofing.
- Sunny Sandher asked how, for the office space, you would get 100% EV. How many employees? Wesgroup has a development in Vancouver’s Mount Pleasant neighbourhood and EV usage is only 20%. Dave Harkness responded that the City is discussing with other cities.
- Mark Sakai asked if the stalls would all be stations or if people can buy a charger just for their stall? Royce Bernard commented that people can individually buy a charger.

#### **4. Parks, Recreation & Culture Strategic Plan (Patrick Klassen, Community Planner Manager)**

- Patrick Klassen provided a brief summary of the award winning Parks, Recreation & Culture Strategic Plan. A copy of his presentation is attached.
- The Plan guides all spending for parks. It presents the vision of a healthy, green, inclusive community, where individuals, culture, and the environment thrive. To achieve this vision, the Plan outlines important funding, infrastructure and program decisions, including where and how money should be spent.
- A comprehensive community engagement program was launched in March 2017 to generate ideas and establish priorities for the Plan. More than 5,000 residents, businesses, and community stakeholders provided their ideas via a variety of forums, including seven open houses, 11 stakeholder workshops, four surveys, and numerous stakeholder interviews, focus groups, community meetings, and pop-up events. There were also 6 multi-lingual project ambassadors out in the community. The results are demographically and geographic representative of participants, providing statistically relevant results.
- What We Heard. The community’s top priorities included:
  - Protect and celebrate nature
  - Greater program variety
  - More community engagement
  - Inclusion and access

- Intercultural appreciation and connection
- More Parks, Recreation, and Culture destinations
- People want more stuff. The last plan was very recreation heavy. This plan has more of the culture component (e.g. places for where people can learn pottery, dance, etc.).
- Plan Recommendations.
  - Park Services Objectives:
    - 1) Provide parkland to match the pace of growth
    - 2) Acquire and preserve natural areas
    - 3) Foster environmental stewardship and nature connectedness
    - 4) Provide amenities that are well-maintained and resilient
    - 5) Create welcoming, relaxing and playful spaces
    - 6) Increase accessibility and participation in outdoor sports

Highlights:

- 25 new neighbourhood level parks. (Timeframe: Throughout)
- Nicomekl River Park. (Timeframe: Short to Medium)
- Urban parks: Newton, Guildford, and Fleetwood Town Centres. (Timeframe: Short and Long)
- Community parks: Orchard Grove, Sunnyside, and West Clayton. (Timeframe: Short and Long)
- Athletic parks: Grandview Heights & Fleetwood. (Timeframe: Medium)
- Park Ranger Program. (Timeframe: Medium)
- Short term is now. Medium term is 4-7 years.

- Community and Recreation Services Objectives:

- 1) Increase equitable access for all to participate and be active
- 2) Create new facilities that are welcoming and supportive
- 3) Strengthen our approach to community engagement
- 4) Develop recreational leadership capacity

Highlights:

- New ice rinks – North Surrey and Cloverdale (Timeframe: Short)
- New community centres: Clayton and Grandview. Will continue to support City Centre YMCA. (Timeframe: Short and Medium)
- Early childcare development spaces and programming (Timeframe: Short and Medium)
- Community centre expansions: Fleetwood and Chuck Bailey (Timeframe: Medium and Long term)
- Outdoor pool refurbishment (Timeframe: Long)
- Recreation program expansion. Program focus areas: families, Indigenous youth, diversity, job skills, outdoor recreation (Timeframe: Throughout)

- Culture Objectives.

Art Services Objectives:

- 1) Grow the capacity of local artists and art organizations
- 2) Promote learning and engagement with the arts
- 3) Support and showcase art and performance
- 4) Foster community connections through the arts

Heritage Services Objectives:

- 1) Promote and celebrate Surrey's heritage & cultures
- 2) Support and showcase heritage & culture across the City
- 3) Develop partnerships to engage people in Surrey's heritage
- 4) Use technology to engage people in Surrey's heritage

Special Events Objective:

- 1) Host vibrant events & celebrations

Highlights:

- Grow the Cultural Grants Program (Timeframe: Throughout)
- Museum of Surrey expansion (Timeframe: Short)
- South Surrey Art Gallery & Café (Timeframe: Short)
- New community arts centres in Clayton, Grandview, and Fleetwood (Timeframe: Short and Medium)
- Strawberry Hill Farmers Institute Hall (Timeframe: Medium)
- Interactive Art Museum (Timeframe: Medium)
- Department Wide Objectives:
  - 1) Infrastructure sustainability and renewal
  - 2) Sport tourism and hosting
  - 3) Indigenous Collaboration
  - 4) Administrative and management efficiency
- Plan Implementation. 10-Year Capital Plan. Approximately \$357 million in total new capital investments.
  - \$51 million (14.25%) of capital is self-funded
  - 62% of total capital is funded within the current (2018) 5-year Financial Plan
  - \$98 million of general capital remains to be funded over the final 5-years (2023 – 2027) of the Plan, and may require external borrowing or other sources of revenue.

**Comments:**

- Andy Aadmi commented that there are no indoor tracks. Indoor tracks would generate revenue. Patrick Klassen responded that the idea of an indoor track facility was brought up, but it was not a high priority among surveyed residents. We are investing a lot in athletic fields (artificial turf, etc.) so kids will have access to them year round. Consultants did a cost benefit analysis. If the City invested in an indoor track or swimming pool, it would have to take away from other recreational investments that have higher priority. The Plan presents the most feasible options. If opportunities come up, the Plan has some flexibility. The Plan is high level.
- Jeff Fisher asked how the Plan will affect DCCs. Patrick Klassen responded that it is pegged to land value.

**5. Habitable Rooms Fronting Streets – Ron Hintsche**

- This Agenda Item will be presented at the September 27, 2018 meeting.

**6. Comments on the Market (All)**

- Sunny Sandher. Costs of trades. 25% margin for steel. There is currently a 4-6 month supply of steel due to tariffs. Wesgroup is budgeting for it. It will be a hit.
- Gopal Sahota. On the buyer's side, it is slightly easier to negotiate compared to last year.
- Marc MacCaull. Listed a few townhomes on sale and they were instantly gone. Price and construction costs are going up.
- Dwight Heintz. Pollyco does not currently have anything on the market in Surrey. One in Langley. Confident that it will sell high. Some anxiety about the selling price.
- Mark Sakai. The Greater Vancouver Home Builders' Association's townhouse survey is out. If you have not received it, let him know.
- Scott Pelletier. Pretty busy. WSP has some projects in Maple Ridge. A lot of the trades live out there, so it is easier.
- Phil Magistrale. There is a bit of uncertainty with what is going on in the market.

- Natalie Pullman. It has been pretty busy.
- Kiegan Scharnberg. Looking at land costs. Smaller product continues to move. Investor side, product is moving.
- Nathan Hildebrand. A bit anxious about their closings in Abbey Ridge. Some of their builders are in South Surrey. Single family sales have been on the pause.
- Andrew Peterson. Has a project on 103 Ave (Kinsman Lodge).
- Jeff Fisher. Noted the upcoming municipal election.
- Andy Aadmi. The market needs more affordable housing. Some people are living in storage units. There should be more purpose built rental housing. Developers should consider being more innovative in creating housing that is more accessible.

**7. Other Business (All)**

- Patrick Klassen commented that Community Planning can provide updates on NCPs and Town Centre Plans for DAC input at a future DAC meeting.

**8. Next Scheduled Meeting – July 26, 2018**

- The meeting adjourned at approximately 4:29 pm.