

Present:

A. Schulze - Chair
B. Burnside
B. Campbell
C. Dragomir
M. Harcourt
G. Sahota
Councillor Bose

Regrets:

K. Keshvani
J. Purewal
G. Sangha
B. Stewart
S. VanKeulen, Agricultural Advisory
Committee Representative

Staff Present:

C. Baron, Drainage and Environmental
Manager
O. Croy, Manager of Parks
L. Anderson, Legislative Services

Guest Observer:

A. Taylor, Dillon Consulting

A. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

It was

Moved by G. Sahota

Seconded by C. Dragomir

That the minutes of the Environmental

Advisory Committee meeting held on May 25, 2011, be adopted.

Carried

B. DELEGATIONS**C. OUTSTANDING BUSINESS****D. NEW BUSINESS****E. ITEMS REFERRED BY COUNCIL****1. Corporate Report R091 - Surrey Sustainability Charter
- Progress Report for 2009 - 2010**

File: 0512-02

Res.: R11-892

The subject corporate report was reviewed and comments were as follows:

- Although the report does not specifically pertain to the Grandview Heights NCP Area #4 (NCP#4), it is interesting that it notes the introduction of a checklist for development that supports environmentally friendly policies (including walking

and cycling paths, etc.) and the recently completed EMS, however the list is weak with regard to the EMS and accordingly, it is important for the Committee to speak with Council.

- Regarding the Committee's request for a delegation with Council, it seemed that Council was not taking into account that the Committee was already informed and has already received a number of presentations and has had numerous discussions regarding NCP#4.
- Council's motion to hear the Committee was moved and seconded, but not carried. There were a number of arguments as to why each committee is treated equally (without the need for presentations and updates from the committees) and, if necessary, provide their input to a citizens' advisory committee (CAC) if there is something of substance to address. In addition, that input can be further documented in the Committee's minutes together with any recommendations to Council from the Committee.
- Relative to the Pesticide Control By-law, Council received a delegation from the EAC in that regard. The Committee believes that NCP#4 is equally as important and as such, requires a presentation, which is why the Committee unanimously supported a motion to present to Council.
- A CAC is mostly made up of long term property owners or those that acquired the property for development interest, so there is limited involvement of people without a vested involvement for an outcome.
- The delegation request to present to Council was/is time sensitive.
- It is felt that a CAC generally address the various issues in a "majority feel this way" approach, which makes it difficult if one only has one voice in a group of many.
- In December 2010, the Committee noted that the EMS was not completed and as such would like to recommend that there should not be any development of NCP#4 until the EMS was complete and could be considered in conjunction with the planning for the area.
- In two years the EAC has only provided an update to Council three times for 15 minutes each. Even if every committee had similar time, it would represent less than one hour every two years.
- The primary argument is that the EAC ought to be able to make its point and be plugged into the process as the Committee has something to contribute.
- As shirtsleeve sessions have no minutes taken and they are structured to administer a flow of ideas, could consideration to have such a session with Council be given?
- Perhaps the recommendation could be made that staff have a shirtsleeve session with Council regarding the EMS and how it relates with NCP#4 and that the EAC participate in that session as well?
- In light of Council's previous acceptance of the occasion for the Committee to bring issues forward, and previously hearing on the EMS, Council could be further advised of the concerns of the Committee and request a shirtsleeve session re the EMS and NCP#4 conflict.
- Council struck this committee, and as members, we are doing our job.
- Staff noted the Committee has the unfettered right and obligation to give advice to Council.
- Members noted that when there are recommendations in the EAC minutes, Council is accountable and the public do read the minutes.

- Any individual, group, etc. should have the opportunity to give a presentation to Council, including EAC.
- Members noted they want to stand up and say this is the issue and this why we feel so strongly and want to work with Council to solve the problem.
- In this case, we have a study that dictates the way the City wants to treat land, but when you do the overlays it doesn't fit.
- There has always been discussion about the CACs and how they are made up of stakeholders in each particular area when it should be made up of those outside the area that are impacted in a number of other ways. The CAC should be more reflective of other areas.
- The CAC makes the decision of what will be shown at the open houses.
- The Committee made the decision to request to speak to Council because of the information received through various presentations and delegations to the Committee.
- It may be in order that the EAC Chair and Vice Chair, on behalf of the Committee, write a letter to Council simply noting the Committee's disappointment in not having the opportunity to provide time sensitive information to Council and that Council made a motion to receive a delegation from the EAC that was seconded and that no position was actually taken.

It was

Moved by M. Harcourt

Seconded by B. Campbell

That the Environmental Advisory Committee

Chair and Vice Chair write a letter to Council outlining the concerns about the lack of response to appear as a delegation regarding Grandview Heights NCP Area #4 and the Ecosystem Management Study.

Carried

Note: Sustainability Charter Progress Report 2010 -2011 is available online at www.surrey.ca/3483.aspx

F. CORRESPONDENCE

G. INFORMATION ITEMS

1. **Community Gardens In Surrey**
Parks Division and Community Planning Division
File No.: 6130-03

O. Croy, Manager of Parks, provided a review of his memo, written together with D. Luymes, Manager of Community Planning, dated June 11, 2011, regarding community gardens in Surrey.

The Committee discussed what other municipalities are doing with regard to community gardens noting the discussion held at the June meeting in the context of what the next major initiative for EAC should be. It was the reference made at that time with respect to the number of community garden plots in Vancouver

(4000-5000), a highly developed urban setting, and whether or not Surrey has an adequate number of (or provisions for) community garden plots. Comments were as follows:

- Community gardens have seen a surge in popularity, given recent trends toward urban agriculture, growing local food, sustainability principles and higher housing densities. These trends translate to less outdoor space for gardening. Community gardens are broadly defined as a piece of land gardened collectively by a group of people in order to produce food and flowers for the personal use of society members.
- The benefits of community gardens are multi-faceted:
 - From an economic perspective, community gardens lower family food budgets, allow for independent-living and food security in urban and suburban contexts.
 - With regard to environmental sustainability, community gardens have positive public health impacts concerning nutrition and physical activity.
 - Community gardens also reinforce social sustainability, by enhancing social and community capital, fostering community interaction and aiding in the beautification of city landscapes.
 - Community gardens may also support environmental education programs; youth work programs and site rehabilitation initiatives.
- Community gardens have been introduced slowly over the years (three in three years). Within the 6,500 acres of park land in Surrey, there are many places for community gardens, but the City needs to have a partner that can manage the garden plots. For example, as reported in the memo, the Dunsmuir group said they would do the community garden for which the City will facilitate them with additional mulch compost etc. and do basic construction (not the day to day operations, the City does not have the staff).
- Is the issue people don't have the space, or is it that it is more rewarding to be a part of the community?
 - *Both. Many don't have space and have really become part of a community while others, such as the refugee community, welcome the opportunity to be able to garden for themselves, they have a need. The gardens certainly bring community together in terrific ways.*
- Community gardens will become more important as people get more compacted in high rise buildings. It is interesting that a lot of these are right beside railroads. So you have these garden plots where the plants do okay in spite of the trains, cars, etc.
- At this point the City doesn't have any targets. There are guidelines for suitable sites and criteria for acceptance for a group to take over. There are many sites that will meet the criteria. Each of Surrey's communities has the population to support at least one community garden on City lands, and potentially as many as three gardens. Once there is a group that is ready to actively manage the site, a garden can be set up fairly quickly.
- With Vancouver, it is the benefit of having fresh vegetables into the centre of the city that didn't have to be brought in from a minimum of 25 miles away. Surrey is not in that position and local produce is available. However, with such a large ethnic community, there is a real sense of wanting to grow their own food. In addition, there are many residents downsizing (pensioners, empty nesters, etc.) that miss having their own garden and want to continue to garden.

- This is something that should be talked about in the various NCPs; community gardens are part of urban agriculture.
- How about under the power lines, there are huge tracks of land. Can there be community gardens there?
 - *There are many sites that will meet the criteria once we have the required group(s) ready to actively manage the garden(s).*
- There is such an array of opportunities and considerations that might go into developing a comprehensive program for community gardens. This is really an area where students could even get involved and initiate some kind of conversation with other groups (churches, etc.).
- There are some community gardens on some strata properties. A few churches as well have dabbled with community gardens.
- The key is not to force any gardens on anyone. If the request has not been made to have a community garden in a particular area, then there is every likelihood that the garden will not be maintained. Only those groups that have a real desire to have a garden and make a commitment to maintaining that garden will it be successful. That being said, there needs to be more effort put in to proactively marketing the opportunity for community gardens wherever and whenever possible.
- The social aspect needs to be considered also. Timber Grove, a supportive housing facility operated by Coast Mental Health, was given as an example as a potential location that would likely be a welcome addition.
- For new parks that are being created from NCP funding, the neighbourhoods are canvassed at open houses regarding their “wish list” of what they would like for their park area within that neighbourhood. Community gardens are on the list for consideration.
- Building the gardens is easy, it is getting a committed group to partner with the City that is needed. Those groups are out there, we just need to come up with a plan that brings those groups out (building the community around the garden).
- It might be helpful to develop a resource list of speakers that could be invited to talk about food security, the benefits of community gardens, etc. Inviting the City’s Agricultural, Social Planning and Diversity and Inclusive Committees, to receive a presentation jointly, would also be beneficial.

It was noted that the points made have been instructive and that further discussion will continue at the next meeting. O. Croy suggested that he provide a list of resource people that can contribute to the discussion and/or make a presentation.

2. **Agricultural Advisory Committee (AAC) Update**

An update will be provided at the July meeting.

3. **Development Advisory Committee (DAC) Update**

An update from the DAC meeting of May 26, 2011, was provided as follows:

- Rob Costanzo, Deputy Operations Manager, was in attendance at the meeting to talk about the illegal dumping abatement as it pertains to the construction industry and the bylaw dealing with the separation of waste.

- Products have to be separated, for which the developer is responsible for. If the separation is not done properly, the bins will not be accepted.
- The main thrust will be to make it mandatory that the construction waste presently seen at various sites will have to be contained and separated for proper disposal.
- The challenge right now is that there are not enough facilities to deal with the separated waste.
- The DAC noted their support of the program as they have their own self interest issues regarding their sites which have become prime targets for dumping. However, concern was expressed with regard to the developers' responsibility if they hire a waste removal company that, without the knowledge of the developer, is not responsible.

4. **Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project - Container Capacity Improvement Program**

It was reported that Metro Vancouver has started a 10 year process for a proposed expansion to the Deltaport with the Roberts Bank Terminal 2. Comments were as follows:

- The project is a proposed multi-berth marine container terminal to expand container capacity at Roberts Bank. The Port believes that by 2014, they will not have enough freight handling capacity and that an expansion is needed.
- Although Surrey is not directly influenced, there will be some collateral damage experienced in Surrey.
- Concern that the project will require the installation of double track from the the Port to Langley was expressed, noting the negative effects of trains passing the Panorama Ridge area and the significant amount of coal dust pollution.
- To date, there has been no public input whatsoever.
- A document produced by Port Metro Vancouver entitled "*Container Capacity Improvement Program - Proposed Roberts Bank Terminal 2 Project - Pre-Consultation Discussion Guide and Feedback Form*" can be found at portmetrovancover.com/CCIP.
- This matter is of such urgency Council should be briefed by Port Metro Vancouver.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

It was

Moved by C. Dragomir
Seconded by B. Campbell
That the Environmental Advisory Committee
recommend that Council invite Port Metro Vancouver to provide a thorough
briefing of the Roberts Bank Terminal 2 expansion project.

Carried

H. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. Committee Recommendation to Council
Regular Council Public Hearing – May 30, 2011
EAC Delegation Request
Res No. R11-944**

Comments regarding this item are noted earlier under item E.1.

- 2. EAC 2011 Priority Items and Work Plan**

The 2011 Priority Items and Work Plan was updated to reflect the September EAC meeting to be held at the Nature Centre.

I. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Environmental Advisory Committee will be held on July 27, 2011, at 6:30 p.m. in the Executive Board Room.

J. ADJOURNMENT

It was

meeting do now adjourn.

Moved by Councillor Bose
Seconded by B. Campbell
That the Environmental Advisory Committee

Carried

The Environmental Committee adjourned at 9:03 p.m.

Jane Sullivan, City Clerk

Al Schulze, Chair
Surrey Environmental Advisory Committee