

Meeting Notes



Citizen's Advisory Committee Meeting 7

Date/Time: Thursday, April 19, 5:30-8:30

Place: Surrey City Hall: Planning Room #1

Next Meeting:

Attendees: Vena Sandhu, CAC Member
Paul Fenske, CAC Member
Nadine Adams, CAC Member
Eric Chen, CAC Member
Delmar Robertson, CAC Member
Cindy Lighthouse, CAC Member
Chuck Brook, CAC Member
Brad Lambert, CAC Member
Avtar Johl, CAC Member
Anthony Hepworth, CAC Member
Stephen Godwin, City of Surrey
Phillip Bellefontaine, City of Surrey
Ileana Kosa, City of Surrey
Fay Wong, City of Surrey
Erin Schultz, City of Surrey
Don Luymes, City of Surrey
Bharghav Parghi, City of Surrey
Denise Cook, Denise Cook Design
John Steil, Stantec

Absentees: Prit Pal Sandhu, CAC Member
Norm Porter, CAC Member
Mike Proskow, CAC Member
Arnold Fenrick, CAC Member

Distribution: All in attendance + absentees

1. Introduction

- **Welcome:** John Steil welcomed CAC members to the 7th CAC meeting.
- **Agenda:** The agenda for the meeting was reviewed and accepted.
- **Meeting Notes:** The CAC #6 meeting notes were circulated. No concerns were raised with the minutes—accepted as presented.
- **Binder:** Fay Wong had placed additional material on the project website (this material was also circulated by email previously to CAC members).

2. Environmental Update

- John updated the CAC on the results of the recent environmental work and consideration by the ERC (Surrey's Environmental Review Committee, including DFO). They have confirmed the status of creeks, but there are two areas that require some additional work. In the meantime, the planning process will continue so as not to cause any delay. Stephen discussed Surrey's process and how decisions will be made

at the detailed stage. There will be some variability/flexibility that comes into play then having regard for issues like the inclusion of pathways, erosion or geotechnical, beavers, adjacent uses, etc. Surrey works closely with DFO but does not use RAR (riparian area requirements).

3. Heritage Update

- Denise Cook made a PowerPoint presentation based on her report (which was previously circulated to CAC) investigating the heritage context for GH4. John talked about the value of heritage in future development (naming, infrastructure, interpretation, etc.) to build community value. Discussion followed: vistas are very different depending on your location, ALR area adds to the ambience of the area, the rural character is important, 176 Street is a corridor, how do you retain traces of the rural character, the need to 'tease out' through things like trail design and urban design guidelines, the need for guidelines to be flexible and adaptable to foster good design, the inspiration of the new fire hall, more discussion is needed at the design stage, possibility of a heritage panel at the open house, there is not a lot of inspirational buildings, the rail is important, special areas of tree specimens in Redwood Park that could be an inspiration for landscaping in GH4, there is a need for direct inter-connections, need for more emphasis or focus on 20 Avenue, don't turn your back on the park, need to keep up the aesthetics of South Surrey, use creeks as part of entrances, open space is important to the look and feel. The presentation will be placed on the website.

4. Options

- John presented the revised options—reminding everyone that it is not picking A, B, or C, but selecting the various preferred elements from each issue area, then ultimately combining them into a preferred option. A report from Madrone is anticipated to offer advice on adequacy of hubs and corridors, etc. There was considerable discussion on the merits of hubs and corridors: the system requires compensation for excess dedication, the land is very expensive, can only afford so much open space, a large space may be of benefit to the larger community and maybe should be paid for by the community at large, an argument could be made to distributing the open space amenity throughout the neighbourhood, how best to expend limited resources, cannot maintain wildlife on the amount of non-riparian land Surrey is able to get normally, we cannot rely on ALR for wildlife habitat as it may become more industrialized with greenhouses, a city wide levy as the open space will provide a number of environmental services like air quality, there are overlapping values to accomplish, enhance and make riparian areas wider, need to look at economics as well as environmental aspects, we need good information to make decisions, the relative merits are important, connectivity is a very important element, is it fair to put all the burden on the developer, the City tries to get good value for land it purchases, the expectation here is for development, Council seems to have high expectations for green space here, discussion about quantity (the ice cream scoop analogy), we are all paying, there is a difference in charges to new or existing residents, what is the relationship to a wildlife management strategy, there is an inherent strategy in terms of corridors etc, could think about no net loss in habitat or species richness, Madrone is to advise on issues, different species like different types of spaces, Environmental Advisory Committee had noted before the lack of incorporation of more wildlife area into the plan, there is some rationale for locating the hub as suggested by the tracing paper on Option A (near ALR, near riparian areas, variety of landscapes, etc.), there are

issues about equity, need green space for people as well, the public needs to know the issues, need to get bigger bang for the buck by overlapping values, try for options that include the same amount of land—just distribute it differently, is being green and unique limited to hubs and corridors, the results from Madrone should help address these issues, road rights-of-way contribute green space, you can bring in new trees (and different species), and potential for bareland stratas to have their own green space. Would people be willing to pay an extra \$12,000/dwelling unit to live in a community with a larger wildlife hub? Since the last version, some options have been revised with different layouts of storm ponds on the west side—they will have different pros and cons with respect to land requirements, storage, operation and maintenance, as well as integrating with the open space system. There may be different advantages in terms of implementation and equity. Could rail corridors be used for ponds—perhaps, but for now they have been looked at as the buffer to the ALR and as an offset to the lower density transitions requirements of existing City policy.

5. Open House Panels

- John presented the draft open house panels. The stress is on the consideration of the list of issues, not picking A, B, or C. The panels were circulated previously and are on the website. Numbers of units and open space will be calculated on the preferred option, taking into account servicing, transportation, and school population factors. Examples of cross sections similar to that proposed for 24 Avenue would be 152 Street in Rosemary Heights near 34 Avenue or 64 Avenue in West Cloverdale, among others. Panels need to address the issues/mechanisms around the acquisition of green space.

6. Process

- After the open house, the work will commence on developing the preferred option. A meeting of CAC will likely be scheduled for early June. The summer will entail fine tuning and work on the costing, etc. It is suggested that the next open house will be after the November election.

7. Next Meeting

- As noted above, to be determined.

8. Items from CAC Members

- No additional items were raised.

9. Adjournment

- Given the depth of discussion, the meeting was longer than typical and adjourned at 8:30 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. The meeting notes will be considered for approval at the next CAC meeting.

STANTEC CONSULTING LTD.

John Steil, FCIP
Stantec Consulting Ltd
john.steil@stantec.com