



# Corporate Report

2003

NO: C013

COUNCIL DATE: December 8,

---

## COUNCIL-IN-COMMITTEE

TO: Mayor & Council                      DATE: December 4,  
2003

FROM: General Manager,  
Planning and                      FILE: 6520-20  
Development                      (Highway 99  
Corridor)

SUBJECT: Highway 99 Corridor Local Area Plan – Stage I

---

## RECOMMENDATION

The Planning and Development Department recommends that Council:

1. Approve the proposed Land Use Concept Plan for the Highway 99 Corridor Plan Area as illustrated on Appendix I;
2. Instruct staff to proceed to finalize the Stage II component of the Highway 99 Corridor Plan including design guidelines, habitat preservation guidelines and engineering servicing and financial strategies based on the following:
  - (a) A new highway interchange at 24 Avenue and Highway 99 will not be included as a component of the transportation system improvements associated with the development of the Highway 99 Corridor;
  - (b) 24 Avenue is not a truck route and its designation as a truck route is not necessary in relation to the development of the Corridor lands;
  - (c) The Habitat Management Strategy described in this report will form the basis for the environmental strategy in the Stage II component of the Plan;
  - (d) A cap of 3.0 parking spaces for every 100 square metres of gross floor area will be placed on the amount of surface parking that will be permitted in relation to commercial development in the Corridor, with any additional parking to be provided underground or in structures;
  - (e) Design guidelines for the Corridor, which incorporate sustainability principles will be finalized; and
  - (f) The detailed servicing strategy will be based on Council's on-going policy of development-pay for the servicing required in support of new development.
3. Endorse the implementation strategy for the Plan, as outlined in this report, which includes bringing forward any required designation amendment to the Official Community Plan (the "OCP) concurrently with the related rezoning application on a site-by-site basis; and
4. Instruct staff to take such actions, as necessary, to designate the entire Highway 99 Corridor plan area as a Development Permit Area.

## **INTENT**

The purpose of this report is to:

- Advise Council of the public input received through the public open house meetings held November 18 and 19, 2003 regarding the final draft Highway 99 Corridor Local Area Plan, including related development policies, design guidelines, the proposed transportation system and other engineering servicing and financing strategies;
- Advise Council of adjustments to the plan and related policies and strategies that have been developed to address concerns identified through the public open houses and associated correspondence;
- Obtain Council approval for the final land use concept and related development policies for the Highway 99 Local Area Plan;
- Obtain Council approval for a process relative to any necessary OCP amendments required to implement the Plan; and
- Obtain Council authorization to proceed with finalizing the Stage II component of development of the Plan.

This report also provides an overview of the overall plan preparation process including a summary of the planning and public consultation process.

A report under separate cover, from the Engineering Department, describes the servicing and infrastructure funding arrangements associated with the land use concept described in this report.

## **BACKGROUND**

On October 27, 2003, Council considered Corporate Report No. C010 entitled "Highway 99 Corridor Plan – Summary Report on Public Consultation and Recommended Next Steps" and approved the recommendations of the report. Council authorized staff to proceed to public open houses in November to present a modified land use concept plan for the Highway 99 Corridor that was contained within that report. A summary of the recommendations contained within Corporate Report No. C010 is attached as Appendix II.

In accordance with Council's instructions, open houses were held on November 18 and 19, 2003 at the Aston Pacific Inn located at 1160 King George Highway. These open houses were the fourth in a series of public open houses related to the preparation of a plan for the Highway 99 Corridor and were attended by approximately 900 people, with many people attending both evenings. An overview of the overall plan preparation and public consultation process and a summary of the public input received from the November 2003 open houses is provided in the following sections of the report. This report also documents adjustments, which have been made to the land use plan and policies to address concerns identified through the November 2003 open houses.

## **DISCUSSION**

### **The Plan Area**

The Highway 99 Corridor plan area includes the lands generally bounded by Highway 99 to the west, the B.C. Hydro right-of-way and 164 Street to the east, 8 Avenue to the south and the southerly extent of the Rosemary Heights Business Park to the north. A proposed commercial node at 24 Avenue extends approximately 300 metres to the east of the Hydro right of way. The Plan area that covers approximately 158 hectares (390 acres) is shown in Appendix III.

### **Plan Preparation Process**

On January 31, 2002, Council authorized staff to prepare a local area plan for the Highway 99 Corridor and approved the Terms of Reference for the preparation of this plan. The plan preparation process has included extensive public consultation including four open houses held on March 14, 2002; May 2, 2002; April 24, 2003; and most recently, November 18 and 19, 2003. In addition, City staff met with six

stakeholder groups this September and held a community workshop on October 27, 2003. The land use concept plan presented in this report has evolved from three land use options presented at the May 2, 2002 open house, a Preferred Land Use Plan option presented at the April 24, 2003 open house to a final draft Land Use Plan presented at the November 18 and 19 open houses. Council has received four Corporate Reports through the plan preparation process. These reports have described various issues and concerns and sought Council direction on various facets of the land use concept plan and plan preparation process. A detailed summary of the plan preparation process is presented in Appendix IV of this report.

### **Summary of Comments Received at and Following the November 18 and 19, 2003 Public Open Houses**

The Land Use Plan presented at open houses held in November was a modified version of the preferred land use plan presented to the public at an open house held on April 24, 2003. The modifications were based on community input received at or following the April 24, 2003 open house as well as further community input garnered through a series of small group/stakeholder meetings held on various dates in September, 2003 and a community workshop held on October 7, 2003.

Attendees at the November Open Houses were requested to complete a comment sheet that would be used by staff to assist in gauging public opinion on different aspects of the information presented at the Open Houses (Appendix V). As of December 4, 2003, the Planning and Development Department had received 689 completed comment sheets representing 437 properties (16 completed comment sheets did not list addresses). Of the 689 completed comment sheets received by the Planning Department, there were three sets of "form" comment sheets included in the submissions. Each of these "form" comment sheets contained exactly the same comments on them and represented 339, 67, and 10 submissions each. In addition, the Planning and Development Department received copies of 451 form letters addressed to Mayor and Council. These 451 form letters represent 278 Surrey properties. The signatories to many of these letters had previously submitted comment sheets to the City. Staff has also received numerous letters and e-mail messages on the proposals presented at the November Open Houses. A total of 514 properties have submitted comments in one form or another as illustrated in Appendix VI on the material presented at the November Open Houses.

#### ***Comment Sheet Responses: Overview***

The following provides a summary of comments (paraphrased) that were noted by more than five respondents to each question on the comment sheets that were received after the most recent open houses. The responses from the comment sheets are not intended to provide "scientific" statistically significant data, but rather they provide some indication of the community's views on the material presented at the Open Houses. Detailed Comment Sheet responses are attached to this report as Appendix VII.

##### *1. General comments on the Plan.*

The major themes that drew the most responses to this question fall under the categories of general comments, land use, environment, transportation and design guidelines. Under general comments, 236 responses were given in favour of the plan with comments including approval of the plan, the plan being an asset and good for economic development, requests to proceed with the plan and that the commercial development is necessary for the South Surrey area. There were 94 comments in opposition to the plan including, general opposition, the plan will ruin the existing character of the area and lifestyle enjoyed by area residents, the plan is developer-driven and residents have not been heard, the proposal is not suitable for the area and it is not needed and people moved here for the rural lifestyle to get away from congestion. Other comments were that the process should be slowed down and a residential plan is needed for the area east of the commercial node on 24 Avenue. There were 35 respondents that did not include a response to this question.

Within the land use category the major responses were that the expansion of the 24 Avenue commercial node beyond the Hydro right-of-way is not acceptable (367 responses) and big box development should not be approved.

With regard to environment, there were five responses expressing concern over the loss of habitat and green space.

Under transportation, the major concern was the potential impact of new traffic in the area followed by opposition to

an interchange at 24 Avenue at Highway 99, requests that the 32 Avenue interchange on Highway 99 be completed, opposition to 24 Avenue being classified as a truck route as well as opposition to additional traffic lanes on 24 Avenue.

The major concern with the design guidelines was that big box developments are unattractive.

2. *Comments on the proposed habitat management strategy.*

The major concern was that habitat areas east of the Hydro right-of-way have not been studied (35 responses). There were 145 responses that indicated approval of the strategy. Other comments (37 responses) noted a concern that development in the Corridor will destroy habitat and that the strategy was not adequate to protect the habitat. There was also concern with pollution due to vehicles, as well as run-off into creeks. A few responses also requested that the area be kept as it is as opposed to habitat destruction. It was also stated that implementation and monitoring of the strategy are key to its success. Further comments expressed that additional study was needed and that the proposed strategy was "token work". There were 84 comment sheets submitted that included no comments under this question.

3. *Comments on the proposed transportation system and the proposed funding mechanism.*

There was general approval of the transportation system from 118 responses. A significant number of responses (381) indicated that funding for the transportation improvements should come from developers only and not taxpayer's money. An additional 10 responses opposed the levy for properties adjacent to 16 Avenue with six responses indicating support for the levy and funding mechanisms, as presented. With regard to the 24 Avenue interchange on Highway 99, there were a large number of requests that the interchange at 32 Avenue be completed (374 responses), opposition to the 24 Avenue interchange (374 responses), some in favour of the 24 Avenue interchange (7 responses) and a few in favour of an interchange at 16 Avenue (7 responses). A number of respondents also opposed the addition of lanes to 24 Avenue (12 responses). A large number of respondents opposed 24 Avenue as a truck route (76 responses) with additional comments opposing truck routes in residential areas in general (8 responses), and six comments in support of a truck route on 32 Avenue. Other comments included the need to address public transportation in the Corridor (10 responses), concern with traffic increases (7 responses) and the need to address the internal road network outside of the Corridor (5 responses). There were 55 comment sheet respondents that provided no comment under this question.

4. *Comments on the proposed design guidelines.*

There were 361 responses (form letter responses) indicating that big box development is in violation of the Future Surrey Vision. There were 132 responses commenting in favour of the guidelines. There were 13 responses in opposition to big box development and an additional 13 responses in general opposition to the Plan. A concern in relation to the design of development in the area is the fear that buildings will be unattractive and insensitive to the surrounding area (8 responses). Some noted that high quality design and landscaping is essential in the Corridor (7 responses) and that the area should be well landscaped and screened (6 responses). It was also noted by some (10 responses) that commercial uses should be kept within the original boundaries of the plan area (i.e., between Highway 99 and the Hydro Corridor). There were 75 respondents that provided no comments under this question.

5. *Other comments*

Responses from this section of the comment sheets can be separated into the following categories: general comments, land use, environment, transportation and design guidelines. There were 100 responses in opposition to the plan, including general opposition, concern that the plan is developer-driven, the character of the area is being destroyed, the existing character is what attracted people here, the plan is being driven by money and the plan should be located elsewhere. There were 36 responses in

favour, including general support and requests to proceed with the plan. There were some concerns with the effects on existing businesses (90 responses) as well as with format of the open houses and the material presented at the open houses.

Issues with land use included opposition to big box development and opposition to more commercial development in the area.

The major environmental concern was with pollution and run-off into creeks.

Opposition to 24 Avenue as a truck route was the major transportation concern (39 responses) followed by opposition to additional traffic in the area and an interchange at 24 Avenue at Highway 99.

With regard to the design guidelines, comments focussed on concern with unattractive big box stores and opposition to living near big box developments.

There were 55 respondents that did not include comments under this section of the comment sheet.

### ***Form Letter Responses: Overview***

Two sets of form letters were received in response to the Open Houses of November 18 and 19, 2003. There were 459 letters submitted that raised specific concerns with regard to key aspects of the proposed Highway 99 Corridor Plan as presented at the Open Houses. The major concerns expressed in the letters include the following:

- If the interchange at 24 Avenue is not required as part of the Corridor Plan it should be deleted from the plan;
- If an interchange at 24 Avenue is constructed, there was objection to the City of Surrey funding the ramps;
- Support the completion of the interchange at 32 Avenue/152 Street and Highway 99;
- Object to the designation of 24 Avenue as a truck route;
- Object to the extension of the Corridor Plan east of the B.C. Hydro right-of-way; and
- Object to the design guidelines allowing the construction of big box development in violation of the Future Surrey Vision adopted by Council in 1998.

The second set of form letters consisted of 30 letters expressing concerns regarding 20 Avenue access to the proposed commercial node. The letters objected to 20 Avenue having direct access to the commercial node and with left turn lanes into the proposed four lane internal road. The letters requested that 20 Avenue be discontinued from the Corridor internal road network to ensure that commercial/business traffic does not filter through the residential neighbourhoods on 20 Avenue and nearby residents, as shown in previous plans, in compliance with and one of the plan objectives, which was to not mix new traffic from the plan area with the existing residential traffic on the existing road network to the east of the Corridor.

### ***Primary Issues and Concerns***

Based on the comment sheets and other correspondence received since the public open houses in November, there appear to be a number of primary concerns. These are listed and discussed in the following paragraphs.

#### ***1. Size and Scale of the 24 Avenue Commercial Node***

There is significant community concern over the size and scale of the proposed 24 Avenue commercial node. Those in opposition to the final draft land use plan point out that the initial plan options presented at an open house held in March, 2002 showed the proposed 24 Avenue commercial node to be bounded on the east by the B.C. Hydro right of-way. They further point out that large format retail development runs contrary to the "urban village" concept contained within the Surrey Future Vision adopted by Council in 1996 and that this type of large format retail will result in development characterized by big-box buildings with large expanses of blank walls surrounded by large surface parking lots.

The commercial developer group has advised that the expanded 24 Avenue commercial node is appropriate based on the following:

- The commercial development area must be large enough to support the upfront infrastructure costs;
- The Hydro transmission right-of-way running diagonally through the commercial node prohibits any buildings or tall vegetation within the Hydro right-of-way making it very difficult to situate several large anchor retailers on the residual lands to the east of the Hydro Corridor and to allow a balance of small and mid-sized tenants necessary for a viable retail development (+/- 20 acres of land are encumbered by Hydro right-of-way);
- The expanded commercial node permits a buffer between the adjacent land uses to the north and east;
- Shifting the commercial land use boundary to the north will improve vehicular access to the future developments by placing driveways in safer locations along the public roads; and
- The development area on the northeast corner of 160 Street and 24 Avenue is of sufficient size so that the site can be designed in a manner that functions well and is visually appealing, to provide a reasonable transition from the large format retailers on the other three corners and to meet the future neighbourhood level shopping needs of future residential areas to the north and east;
- The proposal is consistent with the major elements of the Future Surrey Vision, which speaks to a balance of industrial and commercial growth, stabilized economic growth and community and village driven zoning.

### Staff Comments

The initial land use options for the Corridor presented at an open house held in March 2002 showed a commercial node at 24 Avenue and Highway 99 with its easterly edge at the B.C. Hydro right-of-way. However, the commercial node on 24 Avenue was modified to extend to the east of the Hydro Corridor in the Preferred Land Use Plan option presented at the April, 2003 open house. The 24 Avenue commercial node encompassed approximately 66 acres at that time. The final draft land use concept plan presented to the public at the November 18 and 19 open houses, showed a further eastward and northward expansion of the 24 Avenue commercial node to include approximately 91 acres. This expansion was based primarily on feedback received from the commercial development sector regarding their expressed need for a larger area of commercial development to support the infrastructure investment that would be required to open the lands for development and in relation to the potential market demand in South Surrey. This expanded commercial node has generated public opposition, particularly from the residents of the Grandview Heights area east of 164 Street. This group would like to see the B.C. Hydro right-of-way as the easterly limit of the commercial node, as shown in the initial land use options.

The size and scale of the 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue commercial node needs to strike a balance between the City's business development objectives and policies, market needs, the physical constraints of the area such as the B.C. Hydro right-of-way and the concerns of the public identified through the public consultation process. The type and scale of retail development is another key variable. Fundamental to properly managing this node are elements related to design, buffers, traffic and transportation management and other transitional elements.

Council, on October 27, 2003 approved a Terms of Reference for the preparation of a General Land Use (Area Structure) Plan for the larger Grandview Heights area to the east of the Highway 99 Corridor. The transition between the Corridor and the remainder of Grandview Heights area is a key issue, which will be addressed in the planning process for the larger Grandview Heights area. It is anticipated that a Neighbourhood Concept Plan with a range of residential land uses will be prepared for the lands immediately to the east of the Corridor in the near future since the property owners in this area have requested that an NCP be prepared for this area as soon as possible and the Council approved terms of reference for the general structure plan for the Grandview area include a recognition that an NCP process will commence once reasonable neighbourhood boundaries have been defined. The planning process for these lands will need to address not only the interface between the commercial node and the development within the boundaries of this NCP, but also the interface and land use transition between the first NCP and the Grandview Heights area east of 164 Street (Appendix VIII).

In view of the above, the Planning & Development Department recommends that the 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue commercial node, as presented at the November 18 and 19 open houses, be reduced in size from 92 acres to approximately 85 acres, as shown in Appendix I. The revised node:

- addresses Council's business development objectives and policies generally, and more specifically, addresses Council specific objective to develop and formulate land use, economic and other development policies, with a business development focus, to guide business development proposals for the (Highway 99 Corridor) area;

- acknowledges community concerns raised through the public consultation process;
- strives to keep in Surrey, retail dollars currently spent by South Surrey residents in Langley and other municipalities;
- recognizes development constraints posed by the B.C. Hydro right-of-way;
- acknowledges that commercial area must be large enough to support the installation of expensive infrastructure;
- is based on the larger context of future land uses east of the Corridor and that issues related to land use transitions and buffering will need to be addressed in part through the upcoming planning process for the larger Grandview Heights area, and the anticipated commencement of an NCP process for the lands directly east of the Corridor in the relatively near future.
- will be planned and designed such that the north-east quadrant of this commercial node (i.e., to the north of 24 Avenue and to the east of 160 Street) will provide a transition between the large format retailers on the other three quadrants and the future residential area to the north and east. A cap will be placed on the floor area of each individual retailer in this quadrant so as to focus the development in this quadrant on neighbourhood commercial level uses to service the residential area to the north and east.

Appendix IX provides a comparison between the proposed 24 Avenue commercial node and other existing Surrey shopping centres.

## 2. Improvements to 24 Avenue and a new Highway 99 interchange at 24 Avenue

There is significant public concern with and opposition to a new Highway 99 interchange at 24 Avenue. Over 56 % of the groups and individuals, submitting written comments (comment sheets, form letters, individual letters and e-mails) do not support a new interchange at this location.

### Staff Comments

Although there are potential benefits to the Corridor that could result from an interchange on Highway 99 at 24 Avenue, it is not specifically required for the development of the Corridor lands and proposed uses within the Highway 99 Corridor. On this basis the final Plan will not include the construction of an interchange on Highway 99 at 24 Avenue. However, the bridge structure will be constructed in such a manner so as to facilitate the construction of possible future interchange ramps at this location if necessary in the future.

## 3. The possibility of 24 Avenue becoming a truck route.

There is significant community concern and opposition to the possibility of 24 Avenue becoming a truck route. Over 57 % of groups and individuals, submitting written comments (Comment Sheets, form letters, individual letters and e-mails) oppose 24 Avenue becoming a truck route.

### Staff Comments

On October 27, 2003, Council adopted a resolution that staff study and report to Council on options for the movement of truck traffic south of Highway 10. The truck route issue is fundamentally not related to the development of the Highway 99 Corridor, as the successful development of the Corridor does not rely on 24 Avenue being classified as a truck route. Despite this, City staff has retained a Transportation consultant to evaluate the distribution of truck traffic south of Highway No. 10 with a view to responding to Council's direction with recommendations.

## 4. Maintain 20 Avenue as a local road and do not connect it through to the Corridor lands.

A significant number of residents owning properties on 20 Avenue east of the Corridor Plan area, have expressed concerns over 20 Avenue having direct access from the Plan Area into the existing residential area to the east and the potential impacts this will have on the traffic patterns and volumes for this local road. These residents point out that 20 Avenue is a residential, semi-rural road that mainly serves the residents of the Grandview Heights/Hazelmere Valley neighbourhoods. They advise that orienting business traffic from the Corridor area to 20 Avenue to the east is contrary to the planning objective of developing an internal road network for the Corridor that does not mix new traffic from the Plan Area with local traffic

related to the adjacent existing residential road network.

### Staff Comments

The Engineering Department advises that 20 Avenue is a designated major collector road on the City's Major Road Plan known as the R-91 Plan that has been approved by Council. While 20 Avenue may not be initially connected to the Commercial node at 24 Avenue, it is important that ultimately it be connected. The Traffic consultant through traffic modelling work and experience noted that 20 Avenue and 28 Avenue, as Major Collector Road connections were important to disperse traffic to and from the Corridor.

Major Collector roads allow drivers to access other collector roads or arterial roads from residential streets and also provide some relief for arterial road congestion. Both 24 Avenue and 16 Avenue will carry high volumes of traffic in this area in the future. If 20 Avenue is not connected, all of the residents between 24 Avenue and 16 Avenue east of the corridor will be forced to go to the arterial roads to access the Corridor. This would unnecessarily increase the traffic load on the arterial road system. In the future, there may be a considerable local population that will utilize this route if the Grandview Heights area develops to an urban density. If necessary, traffic calming measures could be investigated to limit external traffic utilizing this route in the near to mid-term.

### 5. Quality of Development

Concerns have been expressed that the future development of the 24 Avenue commercial node will be "big box" buildings with large expanses of blank walls surrounded by vast expanses of surface parking and that such development will lead to urban sprawl with little or no recognition given to planning and design initiatives focussed on sustainable design and green buildings.

### Staff Comments

#### (a) Design Guidelines

To address concerns over the quality of development in the Corridor, design guidelines will be finalized as part of the Stage 2 component of the Highway 99 Corridor Plan. These design guidelines together with the Development Permit Area Guidelines in the Official Community Plan will guide and control the quality of the built environment within the Plan Area. The primary intent of these guidelines is to promote high quality, visually attractive and environmentally sensitive development with a high quality of urban design and architecture.

The design guidelines are based on the following objectives:

- To incorporate sustainability principles in land development, site planning and building design;
- To encourage high quality development incorporating a high level of visual identity, particularly along public streets;
- To integrate urban design and environmental protection in the development process;
- To promote coordinated architectural expression among buildings, landscaping and site features; and
- To promote safe and attractive pedestrian-friendly spaces.

The guidelines include specific policies as to how new development is to be designed including sustainable development principles in the site planning and building design. New development is encouraged to meet LEED (***Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design***) or similar standards in the areas of site development; water and energy conservation; material selection; and indoor environmental quality.

The guidelines also address concerns over large surface parking areas through policies to create strong architectural edges along major streets by locating principal buildings close to the street; locating buildings to anchor the corners when they are located on a corner site; locating parking areas in the side and rear yards and limiting the amount of surface parking that is permitted on any site; requiring substantial and high quality landscaping within parking areas visible from public streets; and other similar guidelines.

With respect to building design, the guidelines require that building facades along public streets be of high quality, attractive materials with generous amounts of glass. Blank walls facing streets are discouraged. Buildings will require a high degree of articulation and loading bays and overhead garage doors will not be permitted to face a public street. Commercial buildings must have their primary facades oriented towards the street and buildings on corner sites must have active frontages and facades on both fronting streets.

These guidelines will be applied to each development proposal within the Highway 99 Corridor Plan Area since the entire Plan area will be designated a Development Permit area. This means that every development will need to proceed through a thorough design form and character design review and be approved by City Council.

#### (b) Proposed Cap On Surface Parking

To further address the concerns over large surface parking areas, it is proposed that there be a cap on the maximum amount of surface parking on any site. While Surrey's Zoning By-law typically requires a minimum of 3.0 parking spaces per 100 square metres of gross floor area for commercial developments, most large scale commercial projects provide in excess of 5.0 parking spaces per 100 square metres of gross floor (many large format retail stores provide 5.5 parking spaces per 100 square metres of gross floor area). To address public concerns over large surface parking lots, it is proposed that surface parking for commercial developments within the Highway 99 Corridor be limited to a maximum of 3.0 surface parking spaces for every 100 square metres of gross floor area. Any parking over this proposed cap would need to be provided below buildings or in structures.

This cap on surface parking together with the design guidelines on building siting and design, parking lot landscaping and siting, and other guidelines, in combination with the design review process required through the evaluation and approval of Development Permit applications will ensure high quality development in the Corridor.

#### 6. *Develop a comprehensive master plan for all of Grandview Heights*

Concerns have been expressed that a plan is needed for the transitional area adjacent to the proposed 24 Avenue commercial node.

#### Staff Comments

Council on October 27, 2003 approved a Terms of Reference for the preparation of a general land use (area structure) plan for the larger Grandview Heights area located to the east of the Highway 99 Corridor Plan Area. It is anticipated that a Neighbourhood Concept Plan for the lands immediately to the east of the Corridor will be prepared in the near future and will take into account the need for appropriate interface design.

#### 7. **Environmental Concerns**

While many positive comments were received on the proposed habitat management plan, there continue to be some concerns that the protected area is too small to adequately protect fish and wildlife habitat; the potential destruction of habitat and wildlife; pollution of creeks from development run-off; and related to the implementation and monitoring of the habitat management plan. Also, there were a large number of concerns expressed that habitat areas east of the Hydro right-of-way were not assessed.

### Staff Comments

City staff retained the services of a well-respected environmental consultant to undertake a thorough study of the Corridor lands from the perspective of its important environmental features and to prepare a habitat management plan that would be implemented in conjunction with development of the Corridor lands. As is the case with all land development, it is impossible to develop land without negatively impacting some elements of the natural environment. However, the habitat management plan for the Corridor will act to protect the significant environmental features within the Corridor and at the same time will allow efficient development of the Corridor lands. The habitat management plan is discussed in more detail later in this report.

With regard to concerns about environmental areas east of the Hydro right-of-way, this work will be undertaken as part of the plan preparation process for the Grandview Heights Structure Plan.

## **8 Concerns over loss of community character and rural/suburban lifestyle**

Some concerns were expressed that the plan is developer-driven and that decisions have already been made.

### Staff Comments

The plan preparation process has included four public open houses plus stakeholder group meetings and a community workshop. The land use concept plan presented in this report strives to balance varying goals and objectives including business development, environmental preservation, social and community well being, and the like.

### **Habitat Management Strategy**

The land base contained within the Corridor plan area is heavily impacted by watercourses and associated setback requirements. This combined with irregular lot sizes and configurations makes it difficult to create large contiguous areas to develop.

Recent meetings with authorities from Fisheries and Oceans Canada and local environmental protection groups have indicated that there would be great benefit in consolidating most of the enhancement efforts related to watercourses and their associated riparian setback areas into one comprehensive area within the Corridor. A key component in implementing this consolidation strategy is to find a way to allow the development of lower value habitat while preserving and enhancing higher value areas.

Based on the Fisheries Act, this approach equates to developers mitigating the impacts of development on a particular site by creating, protecting and/or enhancing environmental features on another site. This concept has been applied quite frequently throughout the Lower Mainland including in other areas of Surrey.

The Highway 99 Corridor includes a variety of habitat. The Plan Area includes over 40 hectares (100 acres) of

habitat area that is of high value that will be preserved, enhanced and protected.

The general principles of the Habitat Management Strategy that has been developed for the Corridor lands are as follows:

- adhere to the guiding principles of the City of Surrey's Official Community Plan with respect to the protection of natural areas;
- adhere to the habitat management policy of Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) and, in particular, address DFO's guiding principle of "No Net Loss of Habitat Productivity" and other requirements of the Federal *Fisheries Act*;
- acknowledge and address the confirmed or potential occurrence of wildlife in accordance with the Federal *Species at Risk Act*; and
- ensure that wildlife, in particular birds, are considered with respect to non disturbance periods, as required in accordance with both the Provincial *Wildlife Act* and the Federal *Migratory Bird Act*.

### ***Fish Habitat***

The most significant fish habitat feature within the Corridor is Fergus Creek. All main stem sections of Fergus Creek and several other tributary sections have been designated as Class A habitat in accordance with the City of Surrey's watercourse classification system. These watercourses are inhabited by fish species such as coho salmon and cutthroat trout. Class A habitats must be protected by a minimum setback area of 30 metres in accordance with DFO guidelines.

A network of Class B watercourses also drains the Highway 99 corridor. Fish do not inhabit these watercourses; however, they do contribute ecologically to the Class A watercourses located downstream. In the past, Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) has not objected to the principle of developers eliminating Class B habitats on the condition that approved replacement habitat is provided within the same area. Recent discussions with DFO has indicated that they will apply the same principle to the Corridor provided the majority of the enhancement efforts occur within the environmental preservation areas identified on the final draft Land Use Plan. Replacement habitat must be of similar or increased functional value within the Corridor plan area.

### ***Wildlife Habitat***

The corridor contains six general habitat types that include mature riparian forest, mature deciduous forest, alder pole/sapling forest, field, rural/suburban developed, and golf course. These habitats reflect varying degrees of development encroachment but to some degree each supports wildlife communities. A broad range of wildlife species, including small mammals, large mammals, reptiles, amphibians, raptors and songbirds, currently utilizes the Corridor area.

The habitat management strategy includes to preserve representative habitat types in the Corridor through the development process and to preserve wildlife species currently utilizing the Corridor area and, in particular, preservation of habitat for the Pacific water shrew, a species considered to be at risk of extinction.

### ***Environmental Preservation Areas***

To meet the objectives of the habitat management strategy three general habitat features of the Corridor are recommended to be preserved or established as summarized below and shown in Appendix X:

1. A linear habitat feature adjacent to Highway 99, extending approximately between the 12 Avenue and 23 Avenue right-of-ways including the upper section of Fergus Creek is to be preserved;
2. Two sections of proposed "food and nutrient" features are to be developed within the BC Hydro right-of-way; and
3. A large "block" of habitat comprising the Fergus Creek ravine and most of the critical wildlife habitat located generally south of 16th Avenue is to be preserved.

The lands associated with the significant environmental features will be acquired in conjunction with development as

landowners/developers dedicate existing areas as fish habitat and additionally some areas will be purchased by the City as part of the City's on-going park acquisition program.

The habitat management approach outlined in this report will improve the development potential of the Corridor lands while providing enhanced natural reserves that will meet the City's habitat protection objectives. It provides a basis of planning that can be built upon in the future Grandview Corridor Structure Plan exercise.

### **Planning Goals and Objectives**

The objectives of the Highway 99 Corridor Local Area Plan, as developed with public input and endorsed by Council are as follows:

1. To develop and formulate land use, economic and other development policies, with a business development focus, to guide development proposals for the Highway 99 Corridor;
2. To protect, preserve and enhance significant habitat values (both fish and wildlife) and other natural features within the Corridor and to integrate, where possible, such features into the planning and design of new development;
3. To employ sustainable development principles in the planning and design of new development;
4. To achieve new development with a high quality of urban design, architecture and landscaping;
5. To ensure that the development of the Corridor does not significantly compromise the viability of other existing and planned businesses in the larger South Surrey area;
6. To ensure that the lands adjacent to the Corridor are planned so as to have an appropriate land use interface and transition;
7. To prepare a parallel servicing strategy that provides for the location, staging and standards of services, including sanitary sewer, water, drainage, roads and other utilities and methods of implementation by rezoning, subdivision, or other mechanisms;
8. To provide a road network to effectively handle the new traffic generated by development and does not mix new traffic from the Plan Area with the existing residential road network; and
9. To undertake a financial analysis that will demonstrate adequate funding for the implementation of the servicing and transportation plan.

### **The Land Use Concept Plan**

The land use concept plan for the Highway 99 Corridor supports Council's business development objectives and policies and will accommodate a variety of Commercial, Business Park and high-end Light Impact Industrial uses. The Plan Area comprises approximately 158 hectares (390 acres) of land. The developable land within the Corridor is classified into three land use categories as described in the following sections.

#### ***Commercial***

The Commercial designation provides for a variety of commercial land uses including large format retail, restaurants including drive-thrus, service commercial and other retail uses. The Commercial designation also allows for office uses. Commercial uses may be contained in a multi-tenant complex or in a freestanding building occupied by a single tenant.

#### ***Business Park***

The Business Park designation provides for business parks consisting of office uses and service uses, warehouse and distribution that are comprehensively designed with extensive landscaping and high quality urban design. The business park development may include multi-tenant complexes or freestanding single tenant buildings established in an attractive, clean and quiet campus setting.

### ***Commercial/Business Park***

The Commercial/Business Park designation provides for a combination of commercial and business park uses including retail, office and warehouse/distribution uses.

### ***Business Park/Light Industrial***

The Business Park/Light Industrial designation provides opportunities for a variety of business park and "high end" light impact industrial uses including office and service uses and wholesale, warehousing and light manufacturing uses that are completely enclosed within a building. Outdoor storage and display is not allowed under this designation. Both single tenant and multi-tenant buildings could be located on these lands.

### ***Road Circulation System***

North of 24 Avenue, the internal road system for the Plan Area extends Croydon Drive to facilitate a continuous frontage road between 32 Avenue and 26 Avenue. This extension then turns east to a new intersection with 160 Street.

South of 24 Avenue, a frontage road system is proposed along Highway 99 through the extension of 160 Street/Croydon Drive southward to 18 Avenue, which then continues east to intersect with a new road paralleling the western edge of the B.C. Hydro corridor. This road then runs south to 16 Avenue.

### ***Land Use***

The land use concept plan identifies a number of sub-areas within the Corridor. These sub-areas are described in the following sections.

#### ***26 Avenue to 28 Avenue***

The area generally located between 26 Avenue and 28 Avenue is proposed for Business Park/Light Industrial uses. This area comprises approximately 22 acres of land. Some of the properties in this area have narrow frontages and are encumbered by the B.C. Hydro right-of-way. These characteristics pose some significant development constraints.

#### ***24 Avenue/160 Street Commercial Node***

A major commercial node is located at 24 Avenue and 160 Street. Comprising approximately 85 acres of land, the northwest, southwest and south-east quadrants of this node are proposed for a variety of retail commercial uses including large format retail development. The northeast quadrant of this node is envisioned for retail uses that can provide an appropriate transition between the potential large format retail uses in the other three quadrants and the existing and future residential uses to the east and north of this node. Large format retail uses in the form of big box buildings will not be permitted within this quadrant. This quadrant is focused on providing neighbourhood scale retail uses for the residential areas to the east.

### ***16 Avenue Commercial/Business Park Node***

A commercial node, which combines commercial and business park uses, is proposed at 16 Avenue. This node takes advantage of its location on an arterial road and includes approximately 32 acres of land. Unlike the 24 Avenue commercial node, large format retail uses are not envisioned at this node.

### ***Central Business Park/Light Industrial and Business Park Area***

The area between the commercial nodes at 16 Avenue and 24 Avenue is proposed for a combination of Business Park/Light Industrial (+/- 56 acres) and Business Park uses (+/- 20 acres).

### ***8 Avenue Gateway Business Park and Commercial/Business Park Area***

The area between 8 Avenue and the southerly extent of the Fergus Creek habitat preservation area is proposed for a combination of business park (+/- 20 acres) and business park/commercial uses (+/- 21 acres). A high quality of urban design, architecture and landscaping is especially important at this gateway location into Surrey and Canada.

### ***Land Use Statistics***

A statistical summary of the various land use designations in the Land Use Concept Plan is provided in the following table.

Land Use	Area (+/- acres)
Commercial	85
Commercial/Business Park	53
Business Park	40
Business Park/Light Industrial	79
Habitat Preservation	104
Buffers	41

### **Implementation**

#### ***OCP Amendments***

The area covered by the Highway 99 Corridor Local Area Plan is currently designated Suburban in the Official Community Plan (OCP). The implementation of the Local Area Plan will require changes to the current OCP designation. It is recommended that any necessary changes to the OCP proceed concurrently with site-specific rezoning applications, as has been the practice in other Neighbourhood Concept Plans in the City. The development proponent will need to submit a detailed development proposal clearly spelling out use and density, site planning documentation, building design and landscaping, which will allow Council to evaluate the OCP amendment application in relation to a specific project. As well, the development proponent will need to address engineering servicing requirements concurrently with OCP amendment and rezoning applications for each site.

## **CONCLUSION**

It is recommended that Council:

1. Approve the proposed Land Use Concept Plan for the Highway 99 Corridor Plan Area as illustrated on Appendix I;
2. Instruct staff to proceed to finalize the Stage II component of the Highway 99 Corridor Plan including design guidelines, habitat preservation guidelines and engineering servicing and financial strategies based on the following:
  - (a) A new highway interchange at 24 Avenue and Highway 99 will not be included as a component of the transportation system improvements associated with the development of the Highway 99 Corridor;
  - (b) 24 Avenue is not a truck route and its designation as a truck route is not necessary in relation to the development of the Corridor lands;
  - (c) The Habitat Management Strategy described in this report will form the basis for the environmental strategy in the Stage II component of the Plan;
  - (d) A cap of 3.0 parking spaces for every 100 square metres of gross floor area will be placed on the amount of surface parking that will be permitted in relation to commercial development in the Corridor, with any additional parking to be provided underground or in structures;
  - (e) Design guidelines for the Corridor, which incorporate sustainability principles will be finalized;
  - (f) The detailed servicing strategy will be based on Council's on-going policy of development-pay for the servicing required in support of new development;
  - (g) Endorse the implementation strategy for the Plan, as outlined in this report, which includes bringing forward any required land use designation amendment to the Official Community Plan (the "OCP") concurrently with the related rezoning application on a site by site basis; and
  - (h) Instruct staff to take such actions as necessary, to designate the entire Highway 99 Corridor plan area as a Development Permit Area.

Murray Dinwoodie  
General Manager  
Planning and Development

GF:saw

#### Attachments

Appendix I	Highway 99 Corridor Land Use Concept Plan, December 8, 2003
Appendix II	Corporate Report No. C010 – Summary of Recommendations
Appendix III	Highway 99 Corridor Plan Area Context Plan
Appendix IV	Plan Preparation Flow Chart
Appendix V	Comment Sheet
Appendix VI	Location of Comment Sheet Responses
Appendix VII	Detailed Comment Sheet Responses
Appendix VIII	Grandview Heights General Land Use Plan
Appendix IX	Comparative Commercial Shopping Centre Areas
Appendix X	Habitat Management Strategy Plan



## **CORPORATE REPORT NO. C010 – HIGHWAY 99 CORRIDOR PLAN - SUMMARY REPORT ON PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND RECOMMENDED NEXT STEPS**

1. Receive this report as information; and
2. Authorize staff to proceed to public open houses in November to present the modified land use concept plan for the Highway 99 Corridor (Appendix "A"), incorporating the recommendations contained within this report, as follows:
  - (a) Amend the plan to incorporate the recommendations of the proposed habitat management strategy, described in this report, by focussing land retention and compensation for environmental purposes in and around Fergus Creek and the southern portion of the study area, south of 16 Avenue;
  - (b) Develop a strategy to implement the habitat management strategy, including a compensation strategy to provide for the elimination of yellow-coded creeks, north of 16 Avenue, in exchange for focussing environmental preservation in and around Fergus Creek, south of 16 Avenue and the possible acquisition of land, by the City, as part of the overall parks and open space needs for the larger Grandview Heights area;
  - (c) Amend the plan to reflect a minor expansion of the 24 Avenue commercial node;
  - (d) Amend the plan to reflect minor adjustments to the boundaries of the proposed Business Park/Light Impact Industrial and Commercial designations at the 16 Avenue commercial node;
  - (e) Amend the plan to delete the 16 Avenue crossing as an optional location for a new highway interchange on Highway 99;
  - (f) Develop additional design guidelines to integrate sustainable development principles and to achieve high quality urban design, architecture and landscaping for development within the Corridor;
  - (g) Finalize funding mechanisms for the proposed 24 Avenue/Highway 99 interchange; and
  - (h) Finalize the servicing plan and financing strategy based on the development pay principle.
3. Direct staff to forward, for Council's consideration, a final land use plan and servicing plan and financing strategy for the Highway 99 Corridor, subsequent to the public open houses.











Appendix VII

HIGHWAY 99 CORRIDOR LOCAL AREA PLAN

**COMMENT SHEET RESPONSES  
FROM OPEN HOUSES HELD NOVEMBER 18 AND 19, 2003  
AT THE ASTON PACIFIC INN**

The following provides a detailed summary of comments (paraphrased) that were noted by more than five respondents.

6. *General comments on the Plan.*

- General Feelings on the Plan
  - In favour/support the plan (139 responses);
  - Proceed/move forward with the plan (77 responses);
  - No comment (35 responses);
  - Oppose plan (32 responses);
  - Will ruin area character & lifestyle (21 responses)
  - Developer-driven/residents have not been heard (18 responses);
  - Good for economic enhancement/asset/necessary (12 responses);
  - Commercial needed here/will no longer have to travel far to shop (8 responses);
  - Should locate in more suitable area/not appropriate area for this (9 responses);
  - Not needed (9 responses);
  - Process should be slowed down (5 responses);
  - Residential plan needed for area east of the commercial node (5 responses);
  - Moved here for rural lifestyle/away from congestion (5 responses);

- Land Use
  - Expansion of the commercial node past the Hydro right-of-way is unacceptable (367 responses);
  - Disapprove of big box development (15 responses);
  - Oppose additional expansion of commercial node (use April 2003 version) (11 responses);
  - Enough commercial in area already (5 responses);
  - Support commercial (5 responses);
- Environment
  - Concern with destruction of habitat/loss of green space (5 responses)
- Transportation
  - Traffic concerns (17 responses);
  - Oppose interchange at 24 Avenue (15 responses);
  - Interchange at 32 Avenue/152 Street and Highway 99 should be completed (11 responses);
  - Oppose 24 Avenue as a truck route (8 responses);
  - Oppose additional lanes on 24 Avenue (6 responses);
- Design Guidelines
  - Big box design is unattractive (8 responses);

7. *Comments on the proposed habitat management strategy.*

- Habitat areas east of the Hydro right-of-way have not been studied (351 responses);
- Approve of strategy/acceptable (145 responses);
- No comment (84 responses);
- Development and infrastructure upgrades will destroy habitat/wildlife will disappear (19 responses);
- Strategy not adequate enough to protect habitat/area and scope too limited (18 responses);
- Oppose habitat destruction/leave as it is (17 responses);
- Concern with pollution and run-off into fish and wildlife habitat/effects on residents (12 responses);
- Implementation and monitoring are key (9 responses);
- Further study required/finish study (6 responses);
- Strategy is public relations/token work (5 responses);

8. *Comments on the proposed transportation system and the proposed funding mechanism.*

- Funding for transportation system should come from developers only/user pay/no taxpayer money (381 responses);
- Oppose interchange at 24 Avenue and Highway 99 (374 responses);
- Interchange at 32 Avenue/152 Street and Highway 99 should be completed (374 responses);
- Approve of transportation system presented (118 responses);
- No comment (55 responses);
- Oppose truck route on 24 Avenue (26 responses);
- Oppose additional lanes on 24 Avenue (12 responses);
- Oppose levy for properties adjacent to 16 Avenue as benefiting area is 24 Avenue (10 responses);
- Public transportation has not been addressed/necessary (10 responses);
- Oppose truck routes in residential areas (8 responses);
- Approve of interchange at 24 Avenue and Highway 99 (7 responses);
- Approve of interchange at 16 Avenue and Highway 99 (7 responses);
- Concern with traffic increases (7 responses);
- Truck route should be on 32 Avenue (6 responses);
- Approve of levy changes/support funding mechanisms (6 responses);
- Internal road system outside of the Corridor should be addressed (5 responses);

9. *Comments on the proposed design guidelines.*

- Big box development is in violation of *Future Surrey Vision* (361 responses)
- Proposed guidelines are acceptable/approve (132 responses);
- No comment (75 responses);
- Oppose plan (13 responses);

- Oppose big box (13 responses);
- Commercial should be kept within the original plan boundaries (10 responses);
- Concern that buildings will be unattractive/insensitive to surrounding area (8 responses);
- Essential for high quality design, landscaping and architecture (7 responses);
- No input from residents was considered/already decided (7 responses);
- Should be scenic/landscaped/well-screened (6 responses);
- Interchange at 32 Avenue/152 Street and Highway 99 should be completed (6 responses);
- Oppose interchange at 24 Avenue and Highway 99 (5 responses);

10. *Other comments*

- General Comments
  - No comment (74 responses);
  - Developer-driven/area residents have no say (24 responses);
  - Area character is being destroyed (24 responses);
  - Support plan (22 responses);
  - Oppose plan (22 responses);
  - Moved to the area for the rural character (15 responses);
  - Proceed/move forward with the plan (9 responses);
  - Plan being driven by money (8 responses);
  - Should be located elsewhere that needs this upgrade/should be in area with less impacts and costs (7 responses);
  - Concern with effect on existing area businesses (7 responses);
  - Concerns with format and what was presented at the open house (6 responses);
  - Will no longer have to leave the area to shop (5 responses);
- Land Use
  - Need plan for are next to Corridor (90 responses);
  - Enough commercial in the area/no commercial here (9 responses);
  - Oppose big box and strip malls (8 responses);
- Environment
  - Concern with pollution and run-off into creeks and habitat (9 responses);
- Transportation
  - Oppose truck route on 24 Avenue (359 responses);
  - Increased traffic (17 responses);
  - Oppose interchange at 24 Avenue and Highway 99 (5 responses);
  - Truck route should be at 32 Avenue (5 responses);
- Design Guidelines
  - Will look unattractive like other big box centres/would have moved there if wanted to live by it (13 responses).



Appendix IX

<b>Location</b>	<b>Site Area (+/- acres)</b>
24 Avenue Node – Northwest Quadrant	28
24 Avenue Node – Southwest Quadrant	22
24 Avenue Node – Northeast Quadrant	13
24 Avenue Node – Southeast Quadrant	22
Total 24 Avenue Node	85
Guildford Town Centre	64
South Pointe Exchange	22
Peninsula Village	11

Comparative  
Commercial Area  
Data  
24 Avenue  
Commercial Node  
Compared to other  
Surrey Shopping  
Centres

Appendix X

