



Corporate NO: R046

Report COUNCIL DATE: February 28, 2000_

REGULAR COUNCIL

TO: Mayor & Council DATE: **February 24, 2000**

FROM: General Manager, Planning & Development FILE: **2350-004/1**

Manager, Land Development & Transportation

Engineering Department

SUBJECT: Regular Council Land Use - January 24, 2000, Item G.3Background Information Related to DelegationJohn Cusano, Cameron Gair, Mike McLennan & Gordon BantaEast Clayton Neighbourhood Concept Plan

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning & Development Department recommends that City Council receive this report as information; and

That a copy of this report be forwarded to the delegation who appeared before Council.

INTENT

The intent of this report is to respond to the concerns expressed by a 4-person delegation from East Clayton who appeared before Regular Council - Land Use on January 24, 2000. The delegation's concerns were also communicated to Council in writing (copy attached in Appendix A).

BACKGROUND

The delegation comprised of four members (out of a total of 25) from the East Clayton Citizen Advisory Committee. These four members, due to isolated concerns regarding the development concept, appeared before Council independent of the Committee to directly relay their concerns.

It is noted that at its last meeting on October 19, 1999, the East Clayton Citizen Advisory Committee as a whole endorsed the development concept for East Clayton, and therefore the first stage of the plan proceeded to Council. The

delegation made their outstanding concerns known to the Committee on many occasions and upon hearing these concerns, the Committee elected to endorse the plan which was subsequently approved by Council. The four individuals of the delegation were opposed or abstained on the Committee's motion to endorse the development concept component of the East Clayton Neighbourhood Concept Plan.

DISCUSSION

Current Status of the East Clayton Neighbourhood Concept Plan

The Development Concept Component (land use/density) of the East Clayton Neighbourhood Concept Plan was approved in principle by Council on November 22, 1999. City staff and consultants are preparing an implementation and financing strategy to support the approved development concept. The implementation plan will include such items as construction, operation and maintenance costs of the green infrastructure, Development Cost Charge implications, stormwater infiltration controls, small lot and speciality housing policy and zoning mechanisms, urban design guidelines, and amenity and infrastructure funding strategies.

The final phase of the Neighbourhood Concept Plan is expected to be submitted to City Council within the next two months.

Concerns of the Delegation

The delegation has essentially expressed two main concerns, as thoroughly documented in their letter (see Appendix A) and as described in their verbal presentation to Council. These concerns are:

1. the classification of 196 Street (adjacent to two of the delegation members' properties) and its perceived designation as a truck route and/or hazardous goods route; and
2. the effect of planning East Clayton as a "complete" community and the grid street pattern on development yields and development costs.

City staff, with assistance from engineering consultants and sustainable development experts, have reviewed these concerns in depth as part of the planning process associated with the East Clayton Neighbourhood Concept Plan (development concept). More recently, staff have undertaken a comparative evaluation of the lot yield and development cost analysis of typical blocks at the various densities presented in the East Clayton NCP.

The concerns expressed by the delegation are detailed and addressed as follows:

1. Transportation Issues

- (a) *196 Street as an Arterial Road*

Corporate Report C437 approved by Council on November 8, 1999 (copy attached as Appendix B) described why 196 Street is designated as an ultimate 4-lane arterial road. A separate technical report was completed to address the East Clayton Citizen Advisory Committee's concerns about the designation. Based on predictions of growth to 2021 and the associated traffic demand, the study concluded that a certain lane capacity for both east-west and north-south directions is needed to provide an adequate level of service. The report recommended 196 Street be constructed as a 2-lane arterial road initially, with sufficient right-of-way protected

to expand to a 4-lane arterial road for anticipated traffic demand from growth beyond 2021. This option for north-south lane capacity was recommended because it produces the least overall vehicle-kilometres of travel on Clayton roads and has the lowest construction/property costs. Further details are provided on Pages 7 and 8 of Corporate Report C437 (Appendix B).

(b) *196 Street as a Truck Route and Hazardous Goods Route*

Members of the delegation voiced concern that, through Council's adoption of the Surrey Transportation Plan, 196 Street had been designated as a truck route and a hazardous goods transportation route; contrary to assurances by staff to the Citizen Advisory Committee. As staff previously stated, 196 Street is not currently designated as a truck route nor hazardous goods route and this is not proposed to change in the future. The delegation's misconception arose due to an oversight during the process of revisions and finalization of one of the illustrations in the recently adopted Master Transportation Plan. On this figure, contained in the Transportation Plan report which was submitted to Council, 196 Street adjacent to East Clayton was shown in error as a possible future truck route. A correct version of Transportation Plan Figure 17, "Truck Route Network" is attached in Appendix C. This correct version is included in the final printing of the Transportation Plan, which is to be made available for broad distribution.

2. *Development Yields and Development Costs*

The delegation cited several concerns related to the effect of the "grid" road system on costs and achievable densities in East Clayton. A summary of these concerns along with City staff's comments (following each concern) is presented below:

(a) *Small lots or "traditional" forms of housing, although successful and high yielding today, may not be here to stay.*

- East Clayton will accommodate the largest variety and mix of housing of any NCP prepared to date, however there are about 90 acres designated for regular single family lots
- there is flexibility within the density ranges to provide for changes in the market
- a new NCP amendment process is in place to accommodate adjustments and to respond to market fluctuations.

(b) *The lot layouts and road patterns in East Clayton are set and preclude any other type of development pattern; there should be flexibility.*

- the grid system in the Clayton area has evolved over time and has been carried through to the NCP
- in the original visioning exercise, a vast majority of the property owners wished to retain a grid system in Clayton
- the grid system provides for efficient dispersion of local traffic thereby minimizing the concentration of traffic volumes on any particular East Clayton street
- the grid system enables more equity in the distribution of roadways as it can more easily follow property lines (this aspect was considered to be very important to the Citizen Advisory Committee who want the opportunity to develop small parcels independently of large developers)

- flexibility is available as long as the "connectivity" of roads and pedestrian routes is maintained
- it is noted that the grid may be modified as properties are assembled (i.e., comprehensive developments will more easily have opportunities for flexibility).

(c) *The grid road system negatively affects lot yield because there are too many roads (e.g., in a multi-family site there are four roads and a lane).*

- there would not necessarily be exclusively municipal roads surrounding a multi-family site; in a strata situation the roads and lanes can be private as long as the "connectivity" principle in the plan is maintained
- the delegation has not taken into account that all multi-family developments need internal roads and parking; road requirements will not necessarily be higher, especially given the equity of the distribution of roads
- there will not be more hard surfaces than in other neighbourhoods because site coverages will be limited, permeable surfaces will be regulated, and the infrastructure is designed to allow water to permeate into the ground rather than force it swiftly into storm water pipes to streams.

(d) *The servicing costs will be higher than in other neighbourhoods (e.g., the costs of constructing roads in East Clayton could be as much as 40% higher than in other neighbourhoods).*

- the delegation is assuming that the roads will be "standard"; the road designs include swales rather than curbs and gutters; natural infiltration (perforated pipes in rock trenches) will not cost more than conventional drainage systems (apart from the original detailed design work for the first project)
- costs to developers for local services will not increase; costs for trunk services (e.g., for stormwater facilities) will substantially decrease.

(e) *The proposed densities are unachievable.*

- the delegation is assuming that 15-25 units per acre (a residential land use designation in the East Clayton NCP) is multi-family when it actually refers to small lots or regular lots with accessory dwellings (e.g., coach houses)
- an analysis by City staff shows that with 9-metre (30-foot) frontages (i.e., the proposed new RF- 9 Zone), 15 lots per acre can be achieved; the density would increase as ancillary or attached dwelling units are added up to a maximum of 25 units per acre
- one of the principles of the East Clayton NCP is to provide a variety of fee simple housing types on the various blocks, so it is conceivable that even a few duplexes or row houses could be incorporated on the blocks thus boosting the density even higher
- all of the residential designations are able to accommodate the proposed densities (i.e., townhouse densities and higher) and are achievable based on a single family fee-simple lot ownership arrangement.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the delegation raised several points and concerns that have been the subject of research and discussion by the many stakeholders in the East Clayton planning process. The arterial classification (protected for eventual 4-lane) of 196 Street has been confirmed through various technical analyses and property owner meetings. Because certain aspects of the East Clayton NCP such as the natural infrastructure and higher densities, are new to Surrey, it is understandable that there is trepidation among some participants. However, through a rigorous participatory educational process, a positive majority opinion within the community and amongst the technical teams/agencies has been attained and the East Clayton plan went forward for approval by City Council on this basis.

Development projects in East Clayton are expected to be submitted to the City for review in the near future. City staff are seeking external funding to assist with securing expert consulting advice about the fine details of the infrastructure. In addition there will be the opportunity to further explore many of the delegation's concerns in conjunction with implementation of the plan (i.e., at the actual infrastructure and subdivision design stage).

Jamie Umpleby, P. Eng. Murray D. Dinwoodie
Manager, Land Development & Transportation General Manager
Engineering Department Planning & Development Department

WW/bea

c.c. - General Manager, Engineering

Attachments

Appendix A: Letter from Delegation (Dated November 28, 1999)

Appendix B: Corporate Report C437 - East Clayton Neighbourhood Concept Plan

Appendix C: Figure 17, "Truck Route Network" - as revised

v:\wp-docs\planning\00data\jan-mar\02091021.wv

BA 03/28/00 14:58 PM