Proposal: Rezone a portion of the site from RF to RF-O to permit subdivision into 4 single family lots.

Recommendation: Approval to Proceed

Location: 2215 - 123 Street
Zoning: RF
OCP Designation: Urban
LAP Designation: Urban Res.
Owner: Ocean Bluff Developments Ltd.
PROJECT TIMELINE

Completed Application Submission Date: May 29, 2006
Planning Report Date: September 11, 2006

PROPOSAL

The applicant is proposing:

- a rezoning from RF to RF-O on a portion of the site

in order to permit subdivision into 4 single family lots.

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning & Development Department recommends that:

1. a By-law be introduced to rezone Block A, shown on Appendix V attached, from "Single Family Residential Zone (RF)" (By-law No. 12000) to "Single Family Residential Oceanfront Zone (RF-O)" (By-law No. 12000) and a date be set for Public Hearing.

2. Council instruct staff to resolve the following issue final adoption: prior to final adoption:

   (a) ensure that all engineering requirements and issues including restrictive covenants, and rights-of-way where necessary, are addressed to the satisfaction of the General Manager, Engineering;

   (b) submission of a subdivision layout to the satisfaction of the Approving Officer;

   (c) submission of a finalized tree survey and a statement regarding tree preservation to the satisfaction of the City Landscape Architect;

   (d) registration of a Section 219 Restrictive Covenant to ensure future house construction is in accordance with the recommendations in the approved geotechnical report;

   (e) registration of a shared access easement and Section 219 Restrictive Covenant over the panhandle portion of Lots 2 and 3 to allow shared access driveway and landscaping entry for all 4 lots;

   (f) completion of an archival record of the Christopherson house in accordance with the recommendations of the Heritage Advisory Commission;

   (g) registration of a Section 219 Restrictive Covenant to restrict the building envelopes on proposed Lots 1 and 4 for the purpose of tree retention; and
(h) registration of a Section 219 Restrictive Covenant to prohibit access to proposed Lots 1 and 4 from 123 Street.

REFERRALS

Engineering: The Engineering Department has no objection to the project subject to the completion of Engineering servicing requirements as identified in the attached (Appendix IV).

Parks: No concerns (Appendix VI).

School District: School Impacts:

Projected number of students from this development:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1 student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>0 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total new</td>
<td>1 student</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School Catchment Area/Current Enrollment/School Capacity:

Ocean Cliff Elementary School = 269 enrolled/380 capacity
Elgin Park Secondary School = 1,212 enrolled/1,200 capacity

Projected number of students from development approvals in the last 12 months (not including subject project) in the subject school catchment areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>0 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>9 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total new</td>
<td>9 students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved Capacity Projects and Future Space Considerations

There are no new capital projects proposed at the elementary school and no new capita projects identified for the secondary school.

(Appendix VII)

Heritage Advisory Commission (HAC): This application was reviewed by the Heritage Advisory Commission on May 31, 2006 and a motion was passed that the owners photo document the existing house prior to demolition (Appendix X).

Building Division: Building Division staff reviewed the geotechnical information and have found it satisfactory.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS

- **Existing Land Use**
  The site contains the Christopherson family house, which was built in 1912. The house has been altered over the years such that its heritage value is now negligible. The Christopherson House is not on Surrey's Heritage Inventory and is proposed to be demolished.

- **Significant Site Attributes**
  Mature trees on the site, many of which will be retained.

- **East:**
  Across 123 Street, single family residential, zoned RF, designated Urban in the OCP.

- **South:**
  Single family residential, zoned RF, designated Urban in the OCP.

- **West:**
  Burlington Northern Railway right-of-way, zoned RF, designated Urban in the OCP.

- **North:**
  The Rockcrest Estates property, which comprises older, single family residential dwellings within a strata development, under Land Use Contract No. 126, designated Urban in the OCP.

PLAN AND POLICY COMPLIANCE


LAP Designation: Complies

DEVELOPMENT CONSIDERATIONS

Background

- The subject site is located at 2215 – 123 Street, along the ocean bluff in South Surrey. It is designated Urban in the OCP.

- The applicant is proposing to rezone the westerly portion of the site along the bluff from Single Family Residential Zone (RF) to Single Family Residential Oceanfront Zone (RF-O) in order to subdivide the subject site into four lots. Two of the proposed lots, fronting 123 Street, are proposed to remain RF.

- The subject site is located within an established neighbourhood characterized by RF lots and also larger lots along the bluff. The proposed subdivision is in keeping with the character of the neighbourhood.
Proposed RF Lots

- The two proposed RF lots fronting 123 Street comply with the Infill Policy, as the proposed lot widths of 22.4 metres (73 feet) and 24.5 metres (80 feet) are substantially above the minimum 16.5 metre (54 feet) lot width indicated by the Infill Policy. The proposed RF lots range in area from 853 sq.m. (9,180 sq.ft.) to 893 sq.m. (9,610 sq.ft.), substantially exceeding the requirements of the RF Zone. The proposed RF lots are generally in keeping with the range of lot sizes in the surrounding area.

- The two proposed RF lots, Lots 1 and 4, are proposed to share access with Lots 2 and 3 in a shared driveway arrangement through the panhandle portions of Lots 2 and 3 (Appendix XIII). A restrictive covenant prohibiting access from 123 Street for Lots 1 and 4 will be registered on title.

- A partial cul-de-sac road dedication is proposed at the north end of 123 Street to provide for a future turn-around. This cul-de-sac portion will not be constructed at this time, in order to protect an existing tree in the front yard. The developer will be providing cash-in-lieu for future construction, to be utilized in the future when the need arises.

Proposed RF-O Lots

- In June 2004 Council adopted the new Single Family Residential Oceanfront Zone (RF-O). This zone is intended to accommodate and regulate construction of large single family dwellings on large ocean bluff lots in South Surrey.

- The current proposed RF-O lots comply with the criteria of the RF-O Zone as:
  - The property is located such that no residential lots exist between the subject site and the ocean water front (including the Burlington Northern Railway property); and
  - The proposed RF-O lots satisfy the minimum lot area, depth and width criterion of the RF-O zone.

- The two proposed RF-O lots are panhandle lots with their frontage on 123 Street. In order to ensure a coordinated access and frontage for these lots, a shared single driveway is proposed for both lots. An access easement and Section 219 restrictive covenant is required to be registered on title.

- The proposed RF-O lots also comply with the Panhandle Policy as follows (Appendix XI):
  - The lot is constrained by the ocean bluff on the west side such that a panhandle is the optimal means of providing access and legal frontage.
  - Staff examined the option of constructing a cul-de-sac to provide access to the proposed lots, but this resulted in a greater amount of paving to serve the same number of lots. In addition, a shared access driveway allows for a single access for all lots and a much more attractive streetscape along 123 Street (Appendix XIV).
The use of panhandle lots is intended for Suburban zones, but can be considered in Urban subdivisions where proposed lot sizes are substantially in excess of the required lot minimums. The proposed development is not designated Urban, but it is very close to Suburban density, given that the panhandle lots are close to full half-acre size. The Suburban density is 5.0 units per hectare (2.0 units per acre) and the proposed density for this development is 5.6 units per hectare (2.3 units per acre).

Heritage Advisory Commission

- The existing house was the residence for many years of the Christopherson family, a prominent local family during the early years of Surrey’s development. However, the house has been much altered over time and as such has no heritage value.

- The application was considered by the Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission (SHAC) on May 31, 2006 (Appendix X). The SHAC agreed that the existing dwelling has little or no remaining heritage value, and can be demolished. However, the SHAC has requested that the house be photo documented before demolition. Staff have also asked that the applicant provide a heritage storyboard to document the Christopherson house and family history. The applicant has agreed to complete these requirements prior to the rezoning receiving final approval.

Building Design Guidelines

- In order to ensure a high quality development, Building Design Guidelines will be required to be registered to control the design of new dwellings.

- The applicant has retained Gord Klassen of Sitelines Architecture as the Design Consultant for the proposed development. In order to reflect the established character of the newer homes within the neighbourhood, the design consultant recommends that three specific styles of homes be permitted, namely "Craftsman", "West Coast Contemporary", or "Neo-Heritage" (Appendix VII).

- No basement entry homes are permitted for this development.

- The new dwellings are proposed to have a high level of design detail appropriate to the specific style. For example, each single family dwelling using "Neo-Traditional" styling is to include prominent cross gables, roof dormers, tall narrow windows, clerestory glazing, decorative wood under box-outs, wood shingles, muntin bars in windows and other elements common to the "Neo-Traditional" form. The "Craftsman" and "West Coast Contemporary" style dwellings are proposed to have a similar high level of detailing.

- Exterior building materials include wood siding, cement board siding, brick veneer stone veneer or stucco. These materials are only permitted to be a maximum of 50% of wall area and may only be used in combination with cedar feature panels or brick or stone. The permitted roofing materials are cedar shakes, cedar shingles or shake profile concrete roof tiles.

- The Building Scheme prohibits secondary suites and includes restrictions on secondary food preparation areas, internal main floor configuration and basement access, in order to limit the potential for secondary suites.
Geotechnical Assessment

- As is the case for all development proposals on properties adjacent to or on the bluff, the applicant is required to undertake a geotechnical assessment with respect to slope stability.

- A geotechnical report and a subsequent addendum to evaluate slope stability were prepared by Horizon Engineering Inc. In addition, a second geotechnical opinion was provided by GeoPacific Consultants Ltd. (Appendix VII).

- The geo-technical assessment of the site specifies that the footings of the proposed single family dwellings must be constructed behind the 2 Horizontal to 1 Vertical line extending from the base of the slope to the underside of the footings. The geotechnical information will be registered on title under a Section 219 Restrictive Covenant to ensure future house construction complies with the report recommendations.

- In 2006, the Associate of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of BC (APEGBC) prepared the *Guidelines for Legislated Landslide Assessments for Proposed Residential Development in British Columbia*. The geotechnical assessment has been prepared in accordance with these guidelines.

- Staff have reviewed the geotechnical information and have found it satisfactory. At building permit stage, the Building Division will require Letters of Assurance from a geotechnical engineer to confirm compliance with the accepted geotechnical report.

Lot Grading and Tree Preservation

- A lot grading plan was prepared for the site and shows approximately 0.8 metres (2.6 feet) of fill adjacent to 123 Street, including the front panhandle portions of Lots 2 and 3 and the front portions of Lots 1 and 4. No fill is proposed for the panhandle lots (Lots 2 and 3), except for the front portion of the panhandle portions. The lot grading plan has been reviewed by staff and has been found sufficient to proceed.

- An Arborist Report prepared by C. Kavolinas & Associates Inc. indicates that there are eighty-two (82) mature trees on the subject site. Forty-five (45) of the trees on the site are deciduous trees, primarily alder, and have no retentive value and are proposed to be removed. There are thirty-seven (37) mature trees on the site that have a higher retentive value and these are primarily Douglas Firs or Cedars, with two Walnut trees and one Balsam Fir. Of these thirty-seven (37) trees, thirty (32) are proposed to be retained and five (5) are proposed to be removed. The applicant is proposing to plant six (6) additional replacement trees on the site (Appendix VIII). A Restrictive Covenant is required to be registered to ensure that the building envelopes on Lots 1 and 4 be adjusted to accommodate the tree retention.
PRE-NOTIFICATION

Pre-notification letters were sent on February 16, 2006 and a development proposal sign was erected on the property to notify residents of the development application. Staff received (6) phone calls from area residents in response to the pre-notification.

- Some residents didn’t express concerns but requested information about the proposed development. Several residents expressed concerns about adding three (3) lots to the neighbourhood, slope stability, increased traffic and allowing panhandle lots to be developed.

  (Staff explained the nature of the application and also the development process to callers. To those residents who were concerned about the increase in the number of lots in the neighbourhood, staff pointed out that the proposed lots are very large and that the applicant is proposing a low density development, nearly Suburban density. The proposed density for this development is 5.6 units per hectare (2.3 units per acre) and the Suburban density is 5.0 units per hectare (2.0 units per acre). The property has the potential to be much more densely developed, but the applicant is agreeable to developing large lots in order to respect the established character of the surrounding area).

- Staff received a petition on June 28, 2006 against the proposed development signed by fifteen (15) area residents. The petition objected to panhandle lots, claiming that these lots are not beneficial to neighbourhood social interaction and are visually unattractive from the street. The petition recommended that the property be maintained as a 1.75 acre parcel or be subdivided into two RF-O lots.

Public Information Meeting

- In order to provide information to residents and address the concerns raised in the petition, staff directed the applicant to hold a Public Information Meeting (PIM). The PIM was held on August 22, 2006 at the Ocean Park Library, from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. Area residents were invited through a direct mailing of the invitation to a notification list provided by the Planning & Development Department. Twenty (20) individuals from fifteen (15) homes attended the meeting. The majority of the attendees were from the Rockcrest Estates property to the north, which is an older strata development which contains individual single family dwellings. The property owners and their consultant were present to meet residents and answer any questions. A representative from the Planning Department was also present.

  Ten (10) "Comment Sheets" were completed by attendees. Overall concerns were expressed on the following issues, and the applicant's and staff response is provided below:

  o Drainage from the property to the site to the north:

    *The applicant is proposing to drain the site towards 123 Street and away from the bluff area.*
Views across the site being impeded:

The site is currently heavily treed with a mixture of coniferous and scrub deciduous trees and this currently impedes the views of properties from the north and east. The proposed development will remove the scrub deciduous trees which may enhance the views for surrounding residents, but the proposed new homes will also block some of the newly created views.

The proposed houses will not impact the view of neighbouring homes that are currently set closer to the bluff as the proposed houses must be situated behind the 2 Horizontal to 1 Vertical line. This ensures that the proposed houses are set back approximately 30 to 35 metres (100 to 115 feet) from the top of the bluff, which is farther back than some of the existing neighbouring homes.

Geotechnical stability of development on the bluff:

Two geotechnical engineers have provided comment on the slope stability and the staff have found the geotechnical information satisfactory. The proposed dwellings are to be constructed behind the 2 Horizontal to 1 Vertical line extending from the base of the slope to the underside of the footings (Appendix VII).

Tree preservation and maintenance of trees:

The Arborist has identified some pruning recommendations for the retained trees and the applicant has said they would follow the recommendations. The applicant has worked with staff to save a large majority of conifers on the site.

Swimming pool construction:

The applicant is not proposing to construct a swimming pool on the site.

Impact and noise during house construction:

The Building Design Guidelines to be registered on title restrict various activities during construction. In addition, the City has by-laws in place that govern hours of operation (7 a.m. to 10 p.m., Monday to Saturday) for construction sites.

- Of the ten (10) respondees, six (6) indicated support for the development, two (2) did not indicate support or non-support and two (2) indicated that they felt more information was needed before deciding. No respondees indicated that they were against the proposed development.

INFORMATION ATTACHED TO THIS REPORT

The following information is attached to this Report:

Appendix I. Lot Owners, Action Summary and Project Data Sheets
Appendix II. Contour Map
Appendix III. Proposed Subdivision Layout
Appendix IV. Engineering Summary
Appendix V. Zoning Block Plan
Appendix VI. Parks Comments
Appendix VII. School District Comments
Appendix VIII. Summary of Tree Survey and Tree Preservation
Appendix IX. Building Design Guidelines Summary
Appendix X. Heritage Advisory Commission Minutes of May 31, 2006
Appendix XI. City Policy No. 0-15 (Panhandle Lots)
Appendix XII. Geotechnical Assessment Report
Appendix XIII. Panhandle Landscaping and Joint Access Plan
Appendix XIV. 123 Street Streetscape

INFORMATION AVAILABLE ON FILE

- Building Scheme dated June 30, 2006.
- Neighbourhood Character Study dated March 1, 2006.
- Geotechnical Studies prepared by Horizon Engineering Inc. and GeoPacific Consultants Ltd. dated October 18, 2005, August 22, 2006 and September 1, 2006.

How Yin Leung
Acting General Manager
Planning and Development
Information for City Clerk

Legal Description and Owners of all lots that form part of the application:

1. (a) Agent: Name: Clarence Arychuk, Hunter Laird Engineering Ltd.
   Address: #300 - 65 Richmond Street
   New Westminster, B.C.
   V3L 5P5
   Tel: 604-525-4651

2. Properties involved in the Application

   (a) Civic Address: 2215 - 123 Street

   (b) Civic Address: 2215 - 123 Street
       Owner: Ocean Bluff Developments Ltd.
       PID: 009-315-977
       Lot 18 Section 18 Township 1 New Westminster District Plan

3. Summary

   (a) Introduce a By-law to rezone a portion of the property.
**SUBDIVISION DATA SHEET**

Proposed Zoning: RF-O/RF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requires Project Data</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GROSS SITE AREA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>1.75 ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hectares</td>
<td>.7081 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NUMBER OF LOTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SIZE OF LOTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of lot widths (metres)</td>
<td>22.4 to 26.8 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of lot areas (square metres)</td>
<td>853 to 2,689 sq.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DENSITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lots/Hectare &amp; Lots/Acre (Gross)</td>
<td>5.6 uph/2.28 upa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lots/Hectare &amp; Lots/Acre (Net)</td>
<td>5.6 uph/2.28 upa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SITE COVERAGE (in % of gross site area)</strong></td>
<td>RF-O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Coverage of Principal &amp; Accessory Building</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Road, Lane &amp; Driveway Coverage</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Site Coverage</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PARKLAND</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area (square metres)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Gross Site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% money in lieu</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TREE SURVEY/ASSESSMENT</strong></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL BUILDING SCHEME</strong></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HERITAGE SITE Retention</strong></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BOUNDARY HEALTH Approval</strong></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEV. VARIANCE PERMIT required</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Length/Standards</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works and Services</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Retention</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX II

CONTOUR MAP FOR SUBJECT SITE