

**Present:**

A. Schulze - Chair  
Councillor Bose  
B. Campbell  
C. Dragomir  
K. Keshvani  
G. Sahota  
G. Sangha

**Regrets:**

B. Burnside  
M. Harcourt  
B. Stewart

**Agricultural Advisory Committee  
Representative:**

S. VanKeulen

**Staff Present:**

C. Baron, Drainage and Environmental  
Manager  
D. Luymes,  
L. Pitcairn,  
O. Croy,  
B., Planning & Development  
L. Anderson, Legislative Services

**A. ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

It was Moved by C. Dragomir  
Seconded by G. Sahota  
That the minutes of the Environmental  
Advisory Committee meeting held on September 22, 2010, be adopted.  
Carried

**B. DELEGATIONS****1. Rob Costanzo, Deputy Operations Manager**

Rob Costanzo, Deputy Operations Manager, provided an update on the organic waste processing facility and the upcoming Public Open House. Comments were as follows:

- The proposed Public Open House for the organic waste processing facility has been postponed until January.
- The Open House is in regard to the rezoning of City owned lands surrounding the proposed facility.
- There is no point of reference for this type of facility anywhere in North America.
- The major concern from the public is expected to be the issue of odor. Currently staff researching facilities globally to get real examples of potential odor impacts.
- With respect to the process itself, Metro Vancouver and Surrey are initiating a request for qualifications process. A short list will be developed from the submissions. Short list participants will be invited to submit proposals for the works.
- On another front, Surrey has initiated its pilot project of kitchen waste collection. Handouts were delivered to each household in advance of the project (copies provided to the Committee on table), following which City

representatives went door to door to explain the process and to ensure the materials were received. The responses were very positive.

- 400 households are involved in the pilot. Two different collection models are being conducted with results from the pilot leading to the implementation at a future date to all of Surrey.
- The carts are being distributed this week; ready to hit the ground on Monday, November 1st, starting in South Surrey. The 400 households are all contained in one specific area.
- The Metro Vancouver Solid Waste Management Plan, was approved by the Board, July 30, 2010, and is currently with the Deputy Minister of Environment for approval. The Plan supports the target of a 70% diversion by 2015.

Discussion ensued regarding the operation of digesters, the creation of biogas and the concerns that have been expressed. Comments continued:

- The “healthiness” of the organic materials should not be significantly affected if the collection is weekly or biweekly. A significant concern with the garbage collection is the issue of diapers. Some facilities can accept diapers while others can't. A number of the facilities being looked at by the RFQ process can take those materials and have certain ways of dealing with them.
- Most technologies require a certain amount of yard waste mixed in. In addition, there is the concern of using too many trucks (using fuel, wear and tear on the trucks, etc.).
- The City has a mandatory requirement to collect yard waste. There is the benefit of diverting because it doesn't go to the land fill. The proposed facility will be accepting the yard waste and kitchen waste combined.
- There are two prevalent technologies for the biogas facility. One is the wet digestate, where material is taken into the facility, water added to the material to make a slurry mixture from which is collected from. The wet digestate will not benefit from branches as branches do not generate a lot of biogas. The benefit of wet digestate is that the footprint on the land is much smaller and generally the amount of biogas generated is larger. The second technology is dry digestate which requires more land and a larger facility. At the end of the process, you will still have the yard waste compostable material. The benefit of this process is little odor.
- What has been learned from the public consultation is that the number of residents that are already composting was above 30%, which is a significant number. The City encourages people to continue to compost, as on lot facilities are good overall.
- The City is not going to deal with multi-family residents at this time on advice from other Cities such as Kent. The level of contamination in multi-family is very high and will need larger education campaigns. It is however, something to explore in the future.
- The proposed facility site is 10 acres. The facility will take anywhere from 6-10 acres depending on the decision to use wet or dry digestate technology.
- The site will also include a fueling station. The intent is to have the trucks use biogas and be able to drop off and fuel at one location. The City has a fueling station at the Works yard at the present time and will receive delivery a garbage truck in February, 2011.

- When the consultant is in town, arrangements will be made to attend an EAC meeting to discuss the technology and proposed facility in further detail.

2. **Don Luymes, Manager, Community Planning Division,  
Planning and Development**

Don Luymes, Manager, Community Planning Division, provided revised land use options for the Grandview Heights Area #4 NCP. Comments were as follows:

- As requested by the Committee in September, the three land use options have an overlay of the results of two environmental mapping studies.
- The previous presentation to the Committee provided three options that were more schematic and a little looser. Shadowing of the environmentally sensitive areas have been noted on the three new drawings.
- The shadowing shows both the existing stands of trees and the most important segments of those stands of trees that are likely to survive if there is development that cuts into the land. The consultant tried to place the corridors, etc., overtop of the best tree stands and then tried to connect with corridors.
- The three options differ by the degree to which clustering is closer to the ALR boundary. Option "A" offers the highest density (96% multi-housing with only 4% single family; 6,000 units) to allow for somewhat more green space; option "C" is lower ground development that offers lower density, however it provides for the least amount of green space; and option "B" is between the two and offers the same density as option "C" (approx. 4,600 units). (The next presentation to the Committee will accentuate the differences in the land use option plans.)
- One of the challenges, in order to patch together a green network, is land acquisition. Acquisition for park land in this area is expensive. The rapid escalation of land prices has outstripped the ability to keep up with park acquisition. The DCC charges would yield somewhere in the area of 13-15 acres of park land which is not enough for the whole area. Other opportunities that could be explored, although very challenging, would be to have some sort of density bonus or density transferring for both park land acquisition and protection of environmentally sensitive areas. It is fair to say that DCC rates need to be re-examined.
- There is some thought at the citizens' advisory committee, that one way to potentially pay or compensate land owners, would be some kinds of green levy, something that collects money from all of the development and compensates the land owners, but there are challenges there from those that cleared their land 10 years ago and then now have to compensate those that didn't.
- With respect to the environmentally identified values of the land at present, option "A" would provide more than half of the existing ecological function.
- It is clear to say that overall, there is a loss in each of the schemes presented. There may be no way around that except without developing the area at all.
- The area is not as remote as some might think. TransLink does see 24 Avenue for frequent transit. This is peripheral development that does have the prospect of transit in the future. In addition, within the community itself, there is a commercial core.

Additional comments were as follows:

- A better presentation map is required. It is important that the Committee have the opportunity to look at the land as it is today, in terms of the environmental, ecological, etc., before the overlay of the above noted land use options. The net loss information needs to be provided.
- Development of the area will add approximately 10,000 more cars on the road.
- Where do we go from here once these plans are developed and Anniedale-Tynehead is developed? Haven't we then consumed the acceptable developable land?
- We are getting near the end of outward development. We are now filling in with the NCPs, which are really implementing the land use plans.
- With regard to buffering, the gross density within that band is similar to that of Anniedale. Here, the challenge is that the really good ecological areas, in terms of environmental protection, is up the hill. To protect some of that means a push back towards the ALR edge; because of the topography, buffering is not in accordance with Policy 0-23.

In conclusion, comparisons to the Annidale - Tynehead NCP development and the financial challenges faced in that area were briefly discussed.

3. **Don Luymes, Manager, Community Planning Division,  
Planning and Development**

Don Luymes, Manager, Community Planning Division, provided an update on the Official Community Plan (OCP) Review. A PowerPoint presentation was given and comments were as follows:

- An OCP is a set of high-level plans and policies that guide land use planning; social, economic, and environmental policies; and civic infrastructure investments. (Details of what an OCP must include and may include, was outlined.)
- Future plans, policies, projects, practices and procedures need to be made consistent with OCP directions over time.
- An up-to-date OCP is a requirement of the Province's *Local Government Act* and Metro Vancouver's *Regional Growth Strategy*.
- The current OCP has a number of Land Use Designations. OCP Land Use Designations are not zoning, they are broad categories of permitted land uses on which Secondary Plans (e.g. NCPs) or rezoning applications can be approved. Each allows properties contained within it to be zoned to any of a particular set of zones from the Surrey Zoning By-law.
- The City has made a commitment to a major OCP review approximately every 5 years. The "parent" OCP document was adopted in 1996 and the last major review was in 2002.
- The OCP update will respond to significant new provincial and regional policy directions, such as transit plans, climate change policies, housing action plans, and proposals in Metro Vancouver's *Regional Growth Strategy*, and will incorporate recent initiatives that have been completed since 2002 or that are currently in progress which include:

- Sustainability Charter;
- Transportation Strategic Plan;
- Parks, Recreation & Culture Strategic Plan;
- Plan for the Social Well-Being of Surrey Residents;
- Employment Lands Strategy;
- Economic Development Strategy;
- Crime Reduction Strategy;
- Secondary Land Use Plans (e.g. NCPs);
- Child and Youth Friendly City Strategy (in progress);
- Ecosystem Management Strategy (in progress); and
- Housing Action Plan (in progress).
- Significant planning issues range from accommodating population growth and demographic diversity and housing affordability challenges to a demand for transportation choices, quality, local employment opportunities and the need to consider social, economic and environmental sustainability in all decisions.
- By the year 2036, Surrey is expected to be home to an additional 250,000 residents, a total of over 700,000.
- In flushing out the issues, transportation choices have become a big part given the foreseeable raise in fuel prices. Rapid transit and frequent transit networks will be sought for transit priority areas. TransLink will not commit to investing transit dollars unless the City comes forward with plans to develop along rapid transit routes and define areas where further planning will be (a hard process given that there are already many existing neighbourhoods).
- There are five key draft policy directions:
  - Healthy ecosystems and “green” infrastructure: protect and restore healthy natural ecosystems, encourage green development practices and innovations and build energy efficient, climate-resilient communities;
  - Liveable, sustainable town centres and neighbourhoods: ensure carefully planned and efficient use of urban land, develop transit-oriented, mixed-use urban centres and corridors and develop walkable and green neighbourhoods;
  - Downtown Surrey as a metropolitan centre: develop a vibrant Downtown Surrey with transit and transportation networks focused on downtown;
  - A vibrant, high-quality economy: diversified employment and investment opportunities, sufficient and well-located industrial and mixed employment lands, viable local agriculture, food production and marketing systems and efficient and well-integrated transportation networks; and
  - A safe, healthy and inclusive community.
- The intent through all of this is to create communities that are walkable.
- Some further direction was given from Council at the recent shirtsleeve session on October 25<sup>th</sup>.
- Presently, staff are providing the OCP update presentation to the various advisory committees, stakeholders and external agencies. The Draft Plan preparation will continue through December and a Public Open House is being planned for December 2010 or January 2011. A report to Council will be provided at their December meeting with a Public Hearing anticipated for February 2011 followed by adoption by Council in March 2011.

Concern was expressed with regard to the shortfall of park land for the anticipated population growth. Park land acquisition has been well served, however pressure

for more parks is growing. It was noted that the experience of adding a special levy for transportation safety measures of one percent per annum was implemented without push back from the general tax payer. As such, it was suggested that the introduction of a similar levy could be considered for park land acquisition. Park land is an important environmental need. With the densification that is suggested for City Centre, a sustainable funding source would be very helpful in securing the needed park land.

Further to the discussion of park land acquisition, it was also noted that some decisions will invoke compromise (e.g. on the agricultural side certain policies are being watered down in order to make it viable to move forward). Within the context of park land acquisition, there was discussion about City Centre. As there are no large tracts of land or ravines to purchase in City Centre, smaller, more costly sites will be purchased to serve as plazas and smaller pocket parks. By allowing the developer to densify above the OCP, there may be opportunities to secure additional funds for park land acquisition beyond the boundaries of the City Centre land area. If the City is going the next step of increasing density, there needs to be simultaneous discussion about the rate of people to park land or at least have some sort of funding in place. The reality is, if there are no parks, agricultural land will be at risk of being disturbed more than it currently is. On the environmental side, many of the linear parks that are being created will ultimately be pedestrian and bicycle pathways; with densification, the City has a responsibility to provide larger central parks as well.

## C. OUTSTANDING BUSINESS

### 1. Pesticide Control By-law

File: 5280-23

Owen Croy, Manager of Parks, provided a memo, dated October 25, 2010, to update the Committee on pesticide by-law inquiries. In addition, information on pesticide categories (or schedules), was also provided, on table for the Committee's review. The following was noted:

- On May 3, 2010, By-law 17160 was adopted by Council and brought into force.
- The City provided several means of communication for the public to learn about the new Pesticide regulations, which included newspaper ads, creation of a web-page devoted to the subject, a Pesticide call-in line and an email address for inquiries.
- Public reaction has been fairly limited. Very few comments were received on the pesticide call-in line and email address. Of those spoken to, most operate pest control services and were wondering if the by-law was going to include multi family. There were a few callers that felt the City did not go far enough by not including multi family. Others asked about manufactured home parks, as they are often within single land parcels, and whether they were obliged to follow the by-law or not.
- It would seem, from the little response there has been, that the by-law has been well received.

- It was disappointing that multiple housing units were excluded in the by-law, they should have been included to begin with.
- Any amendments that are to be made to the by-law, such as the inclusion of multi-family units, should provide a substantial notice period (e.g. six months).
- Information sheets have been developed that provide the formula of how to develop a healthy lawn in three years.
- The suggestion of constructing demonstration gardens for the public to view and gain a better understanding of how the City is doing sustainable horticulture is something to consider. In addition, the idea of having an IPM Coordinator would also help as the City moves forward. Other opportunities that were done and are still being considered include offering public courses where instructors are hired to put on programs (as was done through the Nature Centre) and producing brochures for display racks in the various City facilities. Any further educational opportunities will require additional funding.
- As many municipalities in the Region have adopted similar by-laws, it has been extremely helpful to receive the support from retailers by way of them switching their product base. It would be very beneficial to find out what the major retailers' and nurseries' (Rona, Home Depot, Art Knapps, Potters, etc.) current practice in Surrey is with respect to pesticides.

It was

Moved by Councillor Bose

Seconded by B. Campbell

That the Environmental Advisory Committee

request that staff provide an update with regard to the current distribution of pesticides and herbicides by major retailers within the City of Surrey.

Carried

#### **COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:**

It was

Moved by Councillor Bose

Seconded by C. Dragomir

That the Environmental Advisory Committee

recommend that Council amend Pesticide Control By-law No. 17160 to include multiple housing units and that a proposed program to phase in the amendment be implemented, a copy of which to be provided to the Environmental Advisory Committee.

Carried

- Strata counsels can still enact their own rules and/or by-laws to regulate pesticide use on their own properties; they don't need the City by-law to ban pesticides.
- With regard to the suggestion of adopting the provincially regulated schedule in its entirety as Schedule A to the City's by-law, it was noted that would be easier, however it was further noted that the province lags behind in reviewing new materials that come on to the market.

There was some discussion with regard to notice of intended amendments to the by-law and the accreditation process for determining the class of products, etc.

A further update, which will include the information requested in the Committee's motion above, will be provided at the November meeting.

**D. NEW BUSINESS**

**E. ITEMS REFERRED BY COUNCIL**

- 1. Corporate Report R186  
Sustainability Charter Actions Update**  
File: 0512-02

Corporate Report R186, Sustainability Charter Actions Update, was reviewed without comment.

**F. CORRESPONDENCE**

**G. INFORMATION ITEMS**

- 1. Agricultural Advisory Committee (AAC) Update**

An update from the AAC meeting of September 16, 2010 will be provided at the November meeting.

- 2. Development Advisory Committee (DAC) Update**

An update from the DAC meeting of September 23, 2010, was provided as follows:

- A presentation on project management was provided by Ken Robertson, KLR Consulting. The objective of the consulting project is to look at the land development application process, enhance partnership with developers, integration of project management and developer processes and create a customer e-guide for full end to end processes. A sub-group of DAC members will provide input as the strategy develops, following which a project advisory group will finalize for presentation back to the sub group on November 25<sup>th</sup>. Phased implementation/monitoring is anticipated for January 2011.
- Jaime Boan, Manager, Transportation, reviewed the Surrey Road Classification Map that was adopted in January 2010 and provided an update of the process to date (from January 2010 to September 2010) and rationalization of the Collector Road and Arterial Roads classifications. It was noted that the overall impact to development is less than a 1% increase in road dedications and will not apply to all major roads. Concerns were expressed by some DAC members regarding the equity of the new cross-sections and possible means of compensation to developers dedicating additional road. It was suggested that a DAC subcommittee be struck to address the concerns raised, following which a further presentation will be brought back to the DAC for their endorsement.

- The Development Secondary Suites Policy (summary of the larger document) was provided to the DAC. It was noted that the telephone survey indicated support of 63% for secondary suites (one per house). The general consensus was that the dwelling must be owner occupied and that an additional off-street parking space must be provided. Staff have been given authorization from Council to proceed. The process is being mapped out and CD zones may need to be reviewed. Conditions of use, parking issues and the idea of some sort of incentive to register suites, was discussed. It was suggested that a Public Education Program (brochures, website, etc.) could be developed. Further feedback from the DAC will be sought at a future date.

With regard to the new cross-sections reported above (second bullet), it was noted that cross sections also allow greater volumes for trees that can grow to sufficient stature. It is a big win on the tree side.

### 3. **Sustainability Charter Task Force**

The Chair advised that there was a meeting of the Sustainability Charter Task Force on October 21<sup>st</sup>. The next step will be to take the information that has been collected and discussed to Council on November 29<sup>th</sup> for endorsement and incorporation in to the web design. Before roll out of the web design, the task force will review once more for content and accuracy. It is believed that Surrey's Sustainability Charter and its implementation are the best in BC if not all of Canada.

### 4. **Corporate Report R214 City of Surrey Corporate GHG Emissions Action Plan**

File: 0512-02

Copies of Corporate Report R214, City of Surrey Corporate GHG Emissions Action Plan, were provided on table for the Committee's perusal.

## H. **OTHER BUSINESS**

1. **Committee Recommendation to Council  
Regular Council Public Hearing – October 4, 2010**  
Re: Grandview Heights NCP Area #4, Res No. R10-1764

Resolution No. R10-1764 was reviewed without comment.

2. **Committee Recommendation to Council  
Regular Council Public Hearing – October 4, 2010**  
Re: Agricultural Advisory Committee (AAC) Update, Res No. R10-1765

Resolution No. R10-1765 was reviewed without comment.

**3. Delegation Request**

It was suggested that Deb Jack, Surrey Environmental Partners, and John Werring, David Suzuki Foundation, be invited to a future meeting of the Committee to discuss ecological matters.

It was  
invite Deb Jack, Surrey Environmental Partners, and John Werring, David Suzuki Foundation, to a future meeting of the Committee to discuss ecological matters.  
Moved by B. Campbell  
Seconded by G. Sahota  
That the Environmental Advisory Committee  
Carried

**I. NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Environmental Advisory Committee will be held on November 24, 2010 at 6:30 p.m. in the Executive Board Room.

**J. ADJOURNMENT**

It was  
meeting do now adjourn.  
Moved by S. Van Keulen  
Seconded by G. Sahota  
That the Environmental Advisory Committee  
Carried

The Environmental Committee adjourned at 9:56 p.m.

---

Jane Sullivan, City Clerk

---

Al Schulze, Chair  
Surrey Environmental Advisory Committee