

## Meeting Notes



**Stantec**

### **Citizen's Advisory Committee Meeting 6**

---

Date/Time: Wednesday, January 12, 5:30 pm - 7:30 pm  
Place: Pondside Meeting Room, Surrey Municipal Offices  
Next Meeting:  
Attendees: Anthony Hepworth, CAC Member  
Avtar Johl, CAC Member  
Brad Lambert, CAC Member  
Cindy Lightheart, CAC Member  
Nadine Adams, CAC Member  
Norm Porter, CAC Member  
Prit Pal Sandhu, CAC Member  
Vena Sandhu, CAC Member  
Amie Johnson, Youth Planner  
Daniel Franz, Youth Planner  
Mirela Skrijelj, Youth Planner  
Bhargav Parghi, City of Surrey  
David Sadler, City of Surrey  
Don Luymes, City of Surrey  
Fay Wong, City of Surrey  
Ileana Kosa, City of Surrey  
Mira Petrovic, City of Surrey  
Stephen Godwin, City of Surrey  
John Steil, Stantec  
Siobhan Murphy, Stantec

Absentees: Arnold Fenrick, CAC Member  
Chuck Brook, CAC Member  
Delmar Robertson, CAC Member  
Eric Chen, CAC Member  
Mike Proskow, CAC Member  
Paul Fenske, CAC Member  
Cynthia Bhourji, Youth Planner

Distribution: All in attendance + absentees

---

**Welcome:** John Steil welcomed the CAC members to the 6th CAC meeting.

**Agenda:** The agenda for the meeting was reviewed.

**Meeting Notes:** The CAC #5 meeting notes were circulated. No concerns were raised with the minutes.

**Binder:** Fay Wong noted that an e-mail was sent to the CAC with a link to the most recently approved Corporate Report (R263) from December 2010, and that CAC members should contact her if they would like a hard copy of the Corporate Report.

**Youth Planners Presentation:** David Sadler, a Child & Youth Engagement Coordinator for the City of Surrey, introduced a project that the City of Surrey has been working on, where young students have been working with Surrey staff to develop criteria for community engagement, with a focus on working with youth to get their input on planning issues. This is a pilot project that will be integrated with Grandview Heights NCP #4, to get feedback on the Neighborhood Concept Plan. Youth Planners were tasked to develop criteria for engagement, particularly for Grandview Heights NCP #4. They developed consultation activities for youth feedback on the Neighborhood Concept Plan.

David explained how he and the young planners worked with Bhargav Parghi, who created understanding about the NCP planning process, to understand the context, etc. Their activities were parallel to our process: i.e. Vision, planning principles, etc.

Amie Johnson described how they researched other documents on housing, transportation, land use, and density. Mirella Skrijelj outlined how they developed a toolkit for youth and kids that will be online ([www.surrey.ca/youth](http://www.surrey.ca/youth)), saying that the activities are user-friendly such as checklists, keywords, universal prompts for the visioning phase. Daniel Franz talked about testing the methodologies: Planning concepts are very hard to understand and to communicate well; a pilot in each North and South Surrey, got feedback, then revised. Three hundred 12-year-olds came out, talked about planning in conjunction with a youth dance.

The young planners have four activities that will be rolled out at the Open House. Dave explained that there is a youth website, with information about this project. This project also will rely heavily on Facebook.

**Activity 1:** Design Your Neighbourhood – Using Values Important to Youth

- E.g. people around, amenities, open space, natural areas, transit, housing mix
- Then they will be asked to rank their values in order of importance
- This activity will try to communicate the tradeoffs of more density versus less

Activity 2: Discussing the Core of the Community, the “Community Heart”

- 3 simplified maps on 3 poster boards
- Participants get a card identifying key concepts such as location
- They will be asked to pick one location and then talk about why they chose it

Activity 3: Parks and Natural Spaces

- Will get the road networks overlaid with greenways, then have fabric pieces for parks and natural areas that they can place on the maps
- There will also be an information piece, educate the youth about what a park is and what an open space is
- The participants will get a limited number of park and natural open space fabric pieces, so they will have to make decisions on where they want to locate the parks and open spaces, not just everywhere

Activity 4: Roads and Block Sizes

- Big issue. They have tried to break it down to specific topics to make it easier for the youth to understand. E.g. road width, connections to highways, etc.
- Questions/discussion will relate to everyday activities like walkability, safety and security, and there will be discussion of options

Question from the CAC: How are you going to get people to come out?

Answer: Through Facebook because personal connections work really well. Personal invitations are really effective. Don Luymes noted the City’s interest in piloting this, and would like to make it part of the planning process in the future NCPs.

Question from CAC: What happened at the dances?

Answer: Pre-teen dances were quite successful, although they had to work hard to control the line-ups. There was a graffiti wall, a rating game and other activities, and the Youth Planners asked questions. A lot of patience was needed.

Key themes from the feedback at the dances:

- Getting around safely is very important, particularly on foot
- The commercial heart/school core – youth want to see people, and have fun
- Housing was also rated very high: their neighbours were very important to them
- Cycling routes: concerned about routes being dark or too busy

Question from CAC: What was the most surprising part of this project?

Answer: Daniel said most youth are used to getting questions and responding about the types of services the youth would like to have e.g. skateboard park, and so it was challenging to start thinking about physical attributes of a place or neighbourhood. All of them were amazed to learn about the interconnectedness of everything and impact of a decision about one physical aspect on another.

Avtar Johal praised the young planners for their great presentation skills and grasp of planning concepts. Ileana Kosa remarked how the web of communication could get bigger with young people going home, talking to their parents, and then both generations could come to the open house. Norm Porter agreed with Ileana, commenting that young people seem to be a good addition to the planning process—this was the general consensus of CAC.

**Environmental Review /Process/ Next Steps:** Don Luymes explained the history of Grandview Heights NCP #4's history to date: After the last meeting, the plan was to go to a Public Open House, but it was not practical before Christmas. The second Open House was planned for January 17, but has been delayed until the environmental situation could be sorted out.

There had been a great deal of comments on the environmental aspects of the plan particularly from Council's EAC (Environmental Advisory Committee). Therefore, Madrone Environmental, which had done a general environmental assessment of the area, was retained to do further analysis of the area, based on the concerns about the impact on the high ecological values which are attributed to this area and the need to have additional information. Madrone was asked to review the three draft land use options and provide commentary as well as answers to specific questions, such as the desirable width of corridors, etc.

As part of their review, Madrone walked the area and during fieldwork they identified the possible presence of additional watercourses. The City met with four of the five most affected land-owners to discuss the new information. The land-owners include Avtar Johal, Tony Hepworth, Bernie Scholz, the Carlsons, and Science of the Soul. Science of the Soul should have this information and may be aware of what is there when they applied to the City for rezoning to construct their building. Jas Sandhu (Colliers) acts for them and he should be contacted.

The key point is that the City needs confirmation before proceeding, as it may affect the Land Use Options. Don emphasized that there are already a lot of green corridors on these properties, and this may change due to any new information. Tony supported Don's comments saying that he thinks they have got all of the up-to-date information but he will make sure.

Stephen Godwin reviewed the types of streams and how they are defined, and explained the Riparian Areas Regulation (RAR) and the role of Registered

Professional Biologists (RPBio) and other professionals and the responsibilities that go with these. A person must be a P. Ag (Professional Agrologist), RPBio, or P. Eng (Professional Engineer) to do RAR. They have to be able to demonstrate their due diligence for riparian assessments. This requires a combination of courses and experience, etc.

He explained that for some streams that are close to head waters, the classification of streams can get more interpretive, for instance gravel bands at surface. They could be from sheet flow, but as you go farther up, they become more ephemeral. According to the Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO): whether they have fish present or not, the setbacks are the same for Class A streams (coded "Red" - streams that contain fish & fish habitat), Class AO (coded "Red-Dashed" - streams that contain fish seasonally), or Class B (coded "Yellow" - streams that do not contain fish but they provide food and nutrients to fish-bearing streams). If there is evidence of scour, absence of trees, certain types of vegetation (skunk cabbage for instance), etc. it could indicate the presence of a stream. When the water dissipates, however, it gets more challenging to interpret, but an RPBio will be able to recognize fairly well where the water courses are.

Don Luymes asked what the implications were about a food and nutrient-carrying stream. Stephen replied that if a food/nutrient stream goes into a fish-bearing stream, it can increase the quality of the stream. Class B stream is non-fish bearing but contributes nutrients. You can re-locate a Class B stream, and do anything with Class C stream, but it is hard to re-locate a Class A stream. In reply to the question about ditches that may have nutrients, Stephen said if nutrients are present in them, the ditches can be classified as fish-bearing or nutrient-carrying.

DFO has to be satisfied with the setbacks for creeks. The City of Surrey has to comply with this. The City follows the DFO Land Development Guidelines with 15 or 30 m setbacks. If a variance is asked for then it goes to the Environmental Review Committee (ERC), which DFO sits on. DFO wants to ensure there is no harmful disruption to fish habitat under the Fisheries Act.

The City of Surrey needs to be satisfied that its Fish Classification layer is up to date. Stephen Godwin expanded on this point, saying that the City needs to have all watercourses inventoried but that it is challenging for watercourses on private lands. The City has to do a best guess. The information the City has is good, but being updated all the time. The City needs the information for the operations program, but it is the responsibility of the landowner, or who is developing on it, to ensure they are not committing any infraction under the Fisheries Act, or other acts, etc.

Don Luymes added to Stephen's discussion, saying that this new information needs to be confirmed. The landowners need to hire the professionals and get their information confirmed. Then it must be confirmed by the City. It could

probably be completed within the month when there are good weather conditions again. If all goes well, the work could be done and confirmed through discussions. John can do any revisions to the draft land use options that are necessary based on that information. Then, we can have another CAC meeting, followed by the Open House, probably in April. So the delay would be a couple of months and Stage One could be completed by the summer.

Tony Hepworth asked when it would be a good time to test. Stephen Godwin said the best way is the boot scratch test. 48 to 72 hours after a significant rain event is enough, then do the Boot Scratch test. Then see if it picks up ground water.

John Steil told the CAC that after the additional information is available, we will let everyone know when we are ready to go and what the schedule is. John Steil said that the next meeting is yet to be determined. We will let the CAC know as soon as possible.

Norm Porter asked for clarification, about the status of the Land Use Options. Don Luymes said that likely most of the Options will be the same, but there will be some adjustments. The public open house panels will have to be fairly educational.

Tony Hepworth said he still thinks there is still too much green space on the properties—and that there are folks out there who are really upset with the green space allocation. John said this is why these questions needed to be asked and get confirmed by better information. We will get to a preferred option that works through those issues. Don reminded the CAC that some things are where they are. Everything will not likely be equal. For example, densities are not going to be the same near the ALR.

Tony gave an example of a 10 acre lot he has with nothing on it. He could sell it, but on some of his other ones, the amount of green space is very high. Don noted that the fragmented land ownership is challenging.

John said that, when we answer the basic questions, we can focus on resolving issues within the framework of developing one preferred option.

Brad said he knew the Carlson property and that there was a brook there. Tony Hepworth responded by saying that there is greenspace over and above the brook. Don noted there are opportunities to mitigate some things. Norm Porter added that standards say detention ponds cannot be green space, but with increasing development, they could now be an amenity. Don noted all greenspace cannot be detention ponds; they can be protecting an important stand of trees, such as Douglas firs.

## **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 7:30 PM.

The foregoing is considered to be a true and accurate record of all items discussed. If any discrepancies or inconsistencies are noted, please contact the writer immediately.

**STANTEC CONSULTING LTD.**

Siobhan Murphy  
Planner  
[Siobhan.Murphy@stantec.com](mailto:Siobhan.Murphy@stantec.com)