

# **SUMMARY OF PUBLIC HEARING SUBMISSIONS**

**April 22, 2024  
B.1 - 7921-0272-00**

Public Hearing Correspondence received  
after Thursday noon

ITEM	BYLAW	COMMENT
Support		
B.1	21208/21209	A. Huang expressing support for the proposal.
Opposition		
B.1	21208/21209	K. Sk expressing opposition for the proposal.
B.1	21208/21209	A. Manji expressing opposition for the proposal citing traffic infrastructure, safety concerns for pedestrians and vehicles and street parking.
B.1	21208/21209	R. Kurian expressing opposition for the proposal citing safety risk for pedestrians and vehicles, privacy, and parking.
B.1	21208/21209	G. Gill expressing opposition for the proposal.
B.1	21208/21209	D. Gill expressing opposition for the proposal.
B.1	21208/21209	L. Robichaud expressing opposition for the proposal citing congestion.
B.1	21208/21209	P. Sandhu expressing opposition for the proposal.
B.1	21208/21209	J. Sidhu expressing opposition for the proposal.
B.1	21208/21209	R. Sidhu expressing opposition for the proposal.
B.1	21208/21209	S. Rai expressing opposition for the proposal.
B.1	21208/21209	S. Rai expressing opposition for the proposal.
B.1	21208/21209	J. Grewal expressing opposition for the proposal.
B.1	21208/21209	P. Sawal expressing opposition for the proposal citing traffic, safety risks of pedestrians, parking and privacy.
B.1	21208/21209	M. Singh expressing opposition for the proposal.
B.1	21208/21209	G. Gill expressing opposition for the proposal citing congestion, privacy and infrastructure.
B.1	21208/21209	G. Gill expressing opposition for the proposal citing congestion, privacy and infrastructure.
B.1	21208/21209	S. Sandhu expressing opposition for the proposal citing congestion and traffic.
B.1	21208/21209	S. Sandhu expressing opposition for the proposal citing privacy and congestion.
B.1	21208/21209	S. Sandhu expressing opposition for the proposal citing infrastructure and character of neighbourhood.
B.1	21208/21209	J. Mudhar expressing opposition for the proposal citing congestion, traffic and privacy.
B.1	21208/21209	N. Sandhu expressing opposition for the proposal citing privacy and traffic.
B.1	21208/21209	H. Kang expressing opposition for the proposal.
B.1	21208/21209	H. Kang expressing opposition for the proposal.
B.1	21208/21209	H. Kalirai expressing opposition for the proposal.
B.1	21208/21209	D. Lidhar expressing opposition for the proposal citing no neighbourhood consultation, privacy and congestion.
B.1	21208/21209	B. Kang expressing opposition for the proposal.
B.1	21208/21209	I. Kang expressing opposition for the proposal.
B.1	21208/21209	J. Kang expressing opposition for the proposal.
B.1	21208/21209	S. Lidhar expressing opposition for the proposal citing space, congestion and traffic.
B.1	21208/21209	S. Kaur expressing opposition for the proposal.
B.1	21208/21209	T. Kalirai expressing opposition for the proposal.
B.1	21208/21209	T. Kalirai expressing opposition for the proposal.

B.1	21208/21209	T. Kalirai expressing opposition for the proposal.
B.1	21208/21209	A. Sandhu expressing opposition for the proposal citing parking, traffic, risk of pedestrian safety, privacy, schools and more portables and congestion.
B.1	21208/21209	K. Hundal expressing opposition for the proposal citing children's safety, increased traffic and congestion.
B.1	21208/21209	H. Parhar expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighbourhood and traffic.
B.1	21208/21209	S. Parhar expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighbourhood and traffic.
B.1	21208/21209	S. Mangat expressing opposition for the proposal citing parking, safety risks for pedestrians and traffic.
B.1	21208/21209	C. Harper expressing opposition for the proposal citing traffic, safety risks of residents and pedestrians, increase in number of accidents, parking and privacy.
B.1	21208/21209	C. Keen expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighbourhood.
B.1	21208/21209	J. Sangha expressing opposition for the proposal.
B.1	21208/21209	J. Sangha expressing opposition for the proposal.
B.1	21208/21209	C. Chung expressing opposition for the proposal.
B.1	21208/21209	C. Sangha expressing opposition for the proposal.
B.1	21208/21209	S. Sidhu expressing opposition for the proposal.
B.1	21208/21209	J. Sidhu expressing opposition for the proposal.
B.1	21208/21209	N. Kaur expressing opposition for the proposal.
B.1	21208/21209	S. Sidhu expressing opposition for the proposal.
B.1	21208/21209	A. Sekhon expressing opposition for the proposal citing privacy, congestion, and traffic.
B.1	21208/21209	P. Hans expressing opposition for the proposal citing traffic, congestions, privacy and buffer zone trees is not sufficient.
B.1	21208/21209	P. Hans expressing opposition for the proposal citing traffic, privacy and congestion.
B.1	21208/21209	A. Ramakrishnan expressing opposition for the proposal citing traffic, safety risk for pedestrians, parking and privacy.
B.1	21208/21209	A. Bhagtana expressing opposition for the proposal.
B.1	21208/21209	D. Gill expressing opposition for the proposal.
B.1	21208/21209	J. Bhagtana expressing opposition for the proposal.
B.1	21208/21209	M. Sanghera expressing opposition for the proposal.
B.1	21208/21209	R. Kingra expressing opposition for the proposal citing traffic and crowding with street parking.
B.1	21208/21209	D. Lavoie expressing opposition for the proposal citing congestions, parking, traffic and pedestrian safety.
B.1	21208/21209	B. Kingra expressing opposition for the proposal.
B.1	21208/21209	G. Kingra expressing opposition for the proposal citing traffic and parking.
B.1	21208/21209	S. Kingra expressing opposition for the proposal.
B.1	21208/21209	V. Kingra expressing opposition for the proposal.
B.1	21208/21209	R. Whitbread and G. Whitbread expressing opposition for the proposal citing traffic, safety issues, parking and plenty of existing commercial services.
B.1	21208/21209	P. Dhaliwal expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighbourhood.
B.1	21208/21209	M. Sanghera expressing opposition for the proposal.

B.1	21208/21209	S. Sandal expressing opposition for the proposal citing privacy and safety concerns.
B.1	21208/21209	P. Samra expressing opposition for the proposal citing aesthetic of community, infrastructure, safety, traffic, congestion, transit, parking, school, hospital, and transparency.
B.1	21208/21209	A. Azrawat expressing opposition for the proposal citing lack of discussion, noise, traffic, and safety.
B.1	21208/21209	M. Sanghera expressing opposition for the proposal citing congestion, privacy, infrastructure, safety, traffic, noise, and disruption.
B.1	21208/21209	A. Azrawat expressing opposition for the proposal citing lack of discussion, noise, traffic, and safety.
B.1	21208/21209	P. Sanghera expressing opposition for the proposal.
B.1	21208/21209	J. Singh expressing opposition for the proposal citing safety, school, and infrastructure.
B.1	21208/21209	K. Thomasson expressing opposition for the proposal citing traffic, parking, school, and green space.
B.1	21208/21209	S. Samra expressing opposition for the proposal citing congestion and safety.
B.1	21208/21209	P. Samra expressing opposition for the proposal citing safety.
B.1	21208/21209	B. Khaira, K. Khaira, I. Khaira and M. Khaira expressing opposition for the proposal citing traffic, parking, forest, views, and privacy.
B.1	21208/21209	R. Landale expressing opposition for the proposal.
B.1	21208/21209	R. Winston expressing opposition for the proposal.
Concern		
B.1	21208/21209	T. Rana expressing concerns for the proposal citing congestion, privacy, and character of neighbourhood.
B.1	21208/21209	S. Pelia expressing concerns for the proposal citing privacy and tranquility.

**From:** Ficocelli, Jennifer  
**To:** Clerks Department Webmail  
**Subject:** FW: Delegation Developments for April 22, 2024 RCPH  
**Date:** April 22, 2024 8:15:40 AM  
**Attachments:** image001.png  
**Importance:** High

Jennifer

JENNIFER FICOCELLI | CITY CLERK AND DIRECTOR LEGISLATIVE SERVICES

**CITY OF SURREY**

Legislative Services - Corporate Services

13450 104th Ave, Surrey, BC, Canada V3T 1V8

T 604.591.4380 [www.surrey.ca](http://www.surrey.ca)

**From:** R [REDACTED] Landale [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Sunday, April 21, 2024 3:04 PM

**To:** Locke, Brenda <Brenda.Locke@surrey.ca>; Stutt, Rob <Rob.Stutt@surrey.ca>; Elford, Doug <Doug.Elford@surrey.ca>; Hepner, Gordon <GHepner@surrey.ca>; Bains, Harry <Harry.Bains@surrey.ca>; Annis, Linda <Linda.Annis@surrey.ca>; Nagra, Mandeep <Mandeep.Nagra@surrey.ca>; Bose, Mike <Mike.Bose@surrey.ca>; Kooner, Pardeep <Pardeep.Kooner@surrey.ca>; Ficocelli, Jennifer <Jennifer.Ficocelli@surrey.ca>; Neuman, Scott <SNeuman@surrey.ca>; Luymes, Don <Don.Luymes@surrey.ca>; Chan, Nadia <NChan@surrey.ca>  
**Cc:** 'Tom Zytaruk' <tom.zytaruk@surreynowleader.com>; 'Lauren Collins' <lauren.collins@surreynowleader.com>; 'Peach Arch News' <editorial@peacearchnews.com>; 'Editor' <editor@cloverdalereporter.com>; editor@whiterocksun.com

**Subject:** RE: Delegation Developments for April 22, 2024 RCPH

**Importance:** High

To Council,

Please “Register” in objection to this Electronic Regular Council Public Hearing Meeting April 22nd.2024 in respect to ALL Development Applications noted and the Corporate Report “in Protest” to this new undemocratic degenerating process. Please be informed I will not be electronically participating in the meeting tonight.



**Have a nice protective meeting in “Isolation” from your Electors  
7921-0272-00 No support.**

**7921-0170-00 Absolute objection to the destruction of 14 of 28  
mature trees.**

**7923-0134-00 Absolute objection to the destruction of 33 of 33  
mature trees.**

**7920-0040-00 Absolute objection to the destruction of 41 of 42  
mature trees, on October 16, 2023 Council approved 7923-0166-00 to  
destroy 12 more trees.**

**7924-0020-00 No support.**

**CR 2024-R058 Absolute objection to amendments proposed in the  
“Darts Hill Neighbourhood Concept Plan  
Amendments” due to:**

**1. Terrible “undisclosed (*secretes*)” impacts on future  
tree destruction within the NCP designated area,  
and the Redwood Park Space, which includes  
portions of treed lands in the ALR.**

2. Inclusive of future negative environmental (streamside and Hazardous Steep Slope) impacts on Thomson Creek.

3. It is hereby noted and recorded the proposed amendments to the NCP impacts “8 LOTS City Purchased Designated Parkland (382,425m<sup>2</sup>)”, as generally outlined in Appendix I drawings.

4. Once adopted by Council tonight these lands as proposed will be sold off to Developers without Consultation to the “Electors Alternative Approval Process”, in accordance with the legal provisions of the CCC 26 (these City Parklands belong to everyone, to every single Property Taxpayer across all 6 Town centres that make up this “City of

Parks”, here in Surrey. Grave concerns are recorded herein in relation to page 2 quote: *“the City is reviewing many NCPs to ensure that parkland acquisition funds can be appropriately targeted in areas that will see an increase in family-oriented housing. This further increased density in neighbourhoods necessitates a review of future parkland recognizing that neighbourhood park space with active amenities will be even more desired by residents. In relation to Dart’s Hill, city staff have heard from area residents about the importance of neighbourhood parks in the plan area”*.

The proposed NCP amendments in this Corporate Report do exactly the opposite to the afore referenced quote, by redesignating City Parkland for development under the disguise of Bill 44.

**Only Council tonight can maintain Redwood Park as a natural park space on city owned land.**

5. Contrary to OCP Policy for proportionate Park Space per 10,000 residents, this proposed NCP amendments ignores City Policy, quote from page 5: *“Staff are proposing to redesignate 1734 and 1750 - 168 Street from ‘Proposed Park’ to ‘Medium Density Townhouse’ and to update the OCP to align with this change.”* The noted Park Lands are already “City Purchased Park land”, they are not “Proposed” until Council adopts this Corporate Report.

6. Consequential to the preceding 5 identified concerns this delegation concedes a degree of support for, quote: *“park specific amenities for the expansion of Darts Hill Garden Park once the property is acquired by the City.”*

10– DP/DVP's Approved April 22, 2024	Existing	Remove	Retain	Replace	Deficit	Green City Fund
<b>GRAND TOTALS</b>	229	184	26	316	141	49,200
<b>% of Existing Trees</b>	100.0%	80.3%	11.4%	138.0%	61.4%	

**26 City Trees will be destroyed with no compensation to the GCF**

0 DP & 0 DVPs include the possibility of City Boulevard trees could be destroyed TBD later

**SURREY TREE DEFORESTATION TABLE January to Dec,2024**

60 DP/DVPs Approved between January to December 2024	Existing	Remove	Retain	Replace	Deficit	Green City Fund
<b>GRAND TOTALS</b>	2,782	2,092	668	2,770	1,339	\$596,379.00
<b>% of Existing Trees</b>	100.0%	75.2%	24.0%	99.6%	48.1%	

**To date: 77 City Trees will be destroyed with 12 having no compensation to the GCF**

**HOW MANY TREES HAVE BEEN PLANTED SINCE OCTOBER 12th.2023 ??**



**( in theory  $\cong$  1,500 PER WEEK, 6 months later WHERE ARE the  
45,500 Trees? )**

(<https://www.surrey.ca/city-government/mayor-council/mayor-brenda-locke/mayorscorner#:~:text=This%20year%2C%20I%20signed%20the%20Global%20Trees%20in,you%20can%20help%20us%20grow%20our%20urban%20forest%3F> )

Timesheet: DPs and DVPs, started delegation writing process Friday April 19th 9:30am to Sunday April 21st. 3:00pm  
= 8.0 hours, (download, read, write and x'check)

Respectfully,

Ri [REDACTED] Landale.

Fleetwood Surrey, Resident.

From: [REDACTED] [\[REDACTED\]](#)  
To: [Locke, Brenda](#); [Clerks Department](#); [Webmail](#); [Stutt, Rob](#); [Hepler, Gordon](#); [Bains, Harry](#); [Bose, Mike](#); [Elford, Doug](#); [Kooner, Pardeep](#); [Annis, Linda](#); [Nagra, Mandeeep](#)  
Subject: Fwd: Delegation Developments for April 22, 2024 RCPH  
Date: April 21, 2024 9:20:32 PM  
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

---

Greetings -  
I am in complete agreement and fully support Mr. R. [REDACTED] Landael's objections as here listed. Sincerely,  
[REDACTED] Winston  
Surrey Resident

**From:** Ficocelli, Jennifer  
**To:** Clerks Department Webmail  
**Subject:** FW: Delegation Developments for April 22, 2024 RCPH  
**Date:** April 22, 2024 8:15:40 AM  
**Attachments:** image001.png  
**Importance:** High

Jennifer

JENNIFER FICOCELLI | CITY CLERK AND DIRECTOR LEGISLATIVE SERVICES

**CITY OF SURREY**

Legislative Services - Corporate Services

13450 104th Ave, Surrey, BC, Canada V3T 1V8

T 604.591.4380 [www.surrey.ca](http://www.surrey.ca)

**From:** R [REDACTED] Landale [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Sunday, April 21, 2024 3:04 PM

**To:** Locke, Brenda <Brenda.Locke@surrey.ca>; Stutt, Rob <Rob.Stutt@surrey.ca>; Elford, Doug <Doug.Elford@surrey.ca>; Hepner, Gordon <GHepner@surrey.ca>; Bains, Harry <Harry.Bains@surrey.ca>; Annis, Linda <Linda.Annis@surrey.ca>; Nagra, Mandeep <Mandeep.Nagra@surrey.ca>; Bose, Mike <Mike.Bose@surrey.ca>; Kooner, Pardeep <Pardeep.Kooner@surrey.ca>; Ficocelli, Jennifer <Jennifer.Ficocelli@surrey.ca>; Neuman, Scott <SNeuman@surrey.ca>; Luymes, Don <Don.Luymes@surrey.ca>; Chan, Nadia <NChan@surrey.ca>  
**Cc:** 'Tom Zytaruk' <tom.zytaruk@surreynowleader.com>; 'Lauren Collins' <lauren.collins@surreynowleader.com>; 'Peach Arch News' <editorial@peacearchnews.com>; 'Editor' <editor@cloverdalereporter.com>; editor@whiterocksun.com

**Subject:** RE: Delegation Developments for April 22, 2024 RCPH

**Importance:** High

To Council,

Please “Register” in objection to this Electronic Regular Council Public Hearing Meeting April 22nd.2024 in respect to ALL Development Applications noted and the Corporate Report “in Protest” to this new undemocratic degenerating process. Please be informed I will not be electronically participating in the meeting tonight.



**Have a nice protective meeting in “Isolation” from your Electors  
7921-0272-00 No support.**

**7921-0170-00 Absolute objection to the destruction of 14 of 28  
mature trees.**

**7923-0134-00 Absolute objection to the destruction of 33 of 33  
mature trees.**

**7920-0040-00 Absolute objection to the destruction of 41 of 42  
mature trees, on October 16, 2023 Council approved 7923-0166-00 to  
destroy 12 more trees.**

**7924-0020-00 No support.**

**CR 2024-R058 Absolute objection to amendments proposed in the  
“Darts Hill Neighbourhood Concept Plan  
Amendments” due to:**

**1. Terrible “undisclosed (*secretes*)” impacts on future  
tree destruction within the NCP designated area,  
and the Redwood Park Space, which includes  
portions of treed lands in the ALR.**

2. Inclusive of future negative environmental (streamside and Hazardous Steep Slope) impacts on Thomson Creek.

3. It is hereby noted and recorded the proposed amendments to the NCP impacts “8 LOTS City Purchased Designated Parkland (382,425m<sup>2</sup>)”, as generally outlined in Appendix I drawings.

4. Once adopted by Council tonight these lands as proposed will be sold off to Developers without Consultation to the “Electors Alternative Approval Process”, in accordance with the legal provisions of the CCC 26 (these City Parklands belong to everyone, to every single Property Taxpayer across all 6 Town centres that make up this “City of

Parks”, here in Surrey. Grave concerns are recorded herein in relation to page 2 quote: *“the City is reviewing many NCPs to ensure that parkland acquisition funds can be appropriately targeted in areas that will see an increase in family-oriented housing. This further increased density in neighbourhoods necessitates a review of future parkland recognizing that neighbourhood park space with active amenities will be even more desired by residents. In relation to Dart’s Hill, city staff have heard from area residents about the importance of neighbourhood parks in the plan area”*.

The proposed NCP amendments in this Corporate Report do exactly the opposite to the afore referenced quote, by redesignating City Parkland for development under the disguise of Bill 44.

**Only Council tonight can maintain Redwood Park as a natural park space on city owned land.**

5. Contrary to OCP Policy for proportionate Park Space per 10,000 residents, this proposed NCP amendments ignores City Policy, quote from page 5: *“Staff are proposing to redesignate 1734 and 1750 - 168 Street from ‘Proposed Park’ to ‘Medium Density Townhouse’ and to update the OCP to align with this change.”* The noted Park Lands are already “City Purchased Park land”, they are not “Proposed” until Council adopts this Corporate Report.

6. Consequential to the preceding 5 identified concerns this delegation concedes a degree of support for, quote: *“park specific amenities for the expansion of Darts Hill Garden Park once the property is acquired by the City.”*

10– DP/DVP's Approved April 22, 2024	Existing	Remove	Retain	Replace	Deficit	Green City Fund
<b>GRAND TOTALS</b>	229	184	26	316	141	49,200
<b>% of Existing Trees</b>	100.0%	80.3%	11.4%	138.0%	61.4%	

**26 City Trees will be destroyed with no compensation to the GCF**

0 DP & 0 DVPs include the possibility of City Boulevard trees could be destroyed TBD later

**SURREY TREE DEFORESTATION TABLE January to Dec,2024**

60 DP/DVPs Approved between January to December 2024	Existing	Remove	Retain	Replace	Deficit	Green City Fund
<b>GRAND TOTALS</b>	2,782	2,092	668	2,770	1,339	\$596,379.00
<b>% of Existing Trees</b>	100.0%	75.2%	24.0%	99.6%	48.1%	

**To date: 77 City Trees will be destroyed with 12 having no compensation to the GCF**

**HOW MANY TREES HAVE BEEN PLANTED SINCE OCTOBER 12th.2023 ??**

**( in theory  $\cong$  1,500 PER WEEK, 6 months later WHERE ARE the  
45,500 Trees? )**

(<https://www.surrey.ca/city-government/mayor-council/mayor-brenda-locke/mayorscorner#:~:text=This%20year%2C%20I%20signed%20the%20Global%20Trees%20in,you%20can%20help%20us%20grow%20our%20urban%20forest%3F> )

Timesheet: DPs and DVPs, started delegation writing process Friday April 19th 9:30am to Sunday April 21st. 3:00pm  
= 8.0 hours, (download, read, write and x'check)

Respectfully,

Ri [REDACTED] Landale.

Fleetwood Surrey, Resident.

**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 19/04/2024, K SK, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 19, 2024 3:33:37 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **K**  
Last Name: **SK**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Cloverdale**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional:





**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 20/04/2024, A Manji, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 20, 2024 5:46:58 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **A**  
Last Name: **Manji**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Cloverdale**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional: **I am very opposed to this development. The immediate area does not have sufficient traffic infrastructure for the density proposed. Having only one exit on 188th will cause tremendous safety concerns for pedestrians and other vehicles. There is already not enough street parking for all tenants of secondary suites in the area. There is ample room for development for increased residential space on the south-east corner of 192nd and Hwy 10 and that is where this**

**project should go!**



[www.surrey.ca](http://www.surrey.ca)

**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 20/04/2024, A Huang, expressing Support to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 20, 2024 7:58:37 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **A**  
Last Name: **Huang**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Cloverdale**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Support**  
Comments - Optional: **This kind of mixed use development is what Surrey needs to build if we are to mitigate the housing crisis and form walkable communities. This site will be minutes away from Cloverdale Town Centre and the new Surrey Langley Skytrain by route 342. As a resident of the neighbourhood I will enjoy the new commercial spaces and plazas, which will serve to reduce car trips and bring a new gathering space for the otherwise quiet single**

**detached housed  
neighbourhood.**



[www.surrey.ca](http://www.surrey.ca)

**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 20/04/2024, R Kurian, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 20, 2024 8:42:19 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **R**  
Last Name: **Kurian**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Cloverdale**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional: **Safety risk for pedestrians as well as vehicular accidents due to increased traffic. Lost privacy for homes adjacent to the property as well as parking issues for tenants and visitors. Strongly recommend not approving the project.**



**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, G Gill, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 9:59:28 AM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **G**  
Last Name: **Gill**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Newton**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional:



**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, D Gill, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 10:00:11 AM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **D**  
Last Name: **Gill**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Newton**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional:



**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, L Robichaud, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 11:47:57 AM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **L**  
Last Name: **Robichaud**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Cloverdale**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional: **Would cause too much congestion**





**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, P Sandhu, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 1:44:22 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **P**  
Last Name: **Sandhu**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Cloverdale**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional:



**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, J Sidhu, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 2:25:00 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **J**  
Last Name: **Sidhu**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Cloverdale**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional:



**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, R Sidhu, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 2:33:42 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **R**  
Last Name: **Sidhu**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Cloverdale**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional:



[www.surrey.ca](http://www.surrey.ca)

**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, S Rai, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 3:24:36 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **S**  
Last Name: **Rai**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Cloverdale**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional:



**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, S Rai, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 3:24:37 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **S**  
Last Name: **Rai**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Cloverdale**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional:



**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, J Grewal, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 4:30:00 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **J**  
Last Name: **Grewal**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Guilford**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional:



**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, P Sawal, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 4:32:29 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **P**  
Last Name: **Sawal**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Cloverdale**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional: **This development will add to:  
Already congesting traffic at 188 and Hwy 10 intersection  
Longer wait times at the intersection  
Safety risk of residents and pedestrians and increase in number of accidents  
Parking issue for tenants and visitors  
Compromised privacy of homes in the vicinity**



**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, M Singh, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 4:38:36 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **M**  
Last Name: **Singh**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Cloverdale**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional:





**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, G GILL, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 5:47:05 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **G**  
Last Name: **GILL**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Cloverdale**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional: **Doesn't make sense for this area - once I've read the plan - too many issues around congestion, privacy and infrastructure. Not ready for final release without neighborhood consultation.**



**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, G GILL, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 5:47:07 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **G**  
Last Name: **GILL**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Cloverdale**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional: **Doesn't make sense for this area - once I've read the plan - too many issues around congestion, privacy and infrastructure. Not ready for final release without neighborhood consultation.**



**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, S Sandhu, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 6:06:32 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **S**  
Last Name: **Sandhu**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **No**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **n/a**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional: **Doesn't make sense for the area! Too much congestion and traffic.**



**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, S Sandhu, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 6:10:20 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **S**  
Last Name: **Sandhu**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Cloverdale**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional: **I do not agree with this development as there is no consideration to privacy and congestion**



**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, S Sandhu, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 6:14:07 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **S**  
Last Name: **Sandhu**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Cloverdale**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional: **Not enough infrastructure for it and doesn't fit with the neighborhood**



**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, J Mudhar, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 6:21:34 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **J**  
Last Name: **Mudhar**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Cloverdale**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional: **Development doesn't make sense - does not address congestion issues, too much traffic on 188st and privacy issues.**



**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, N Sandhu, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 6:29:14 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **N**  
Last Name: **Sandhu**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Cloverdale**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional: **I am in opposition of this development. Doesn't address any privacy issues because the houses too close (which were sold by the developer himself). He didn't consider traffic on the 188st side. Please reconsider this development.**



**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, H Kang, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 6:34:10 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **H**  
Last Name: **Kang**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Cloverdale**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional:





**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, H Kang, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 6:37:51 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **H**  
Last Name: **Kang**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Newton**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional:



**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, H Kalirai, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 6:38:34 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **H**  
Last Name: **Kalirai**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Whalley**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional:



**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, D Lidhar, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 6:39:20 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **D**  
Last Name: **Lidhar**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Cloverdale**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional: **There was no neighborhood consultation and there was no signage evident. It's buried in the grass. When I finally read the plans - there is no consideration on privacy and congestion.**



**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, B Kang, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 6:39:30 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **B**  
Last Name: **Kang**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Newton**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional:



**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, I Kang, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 6:40:48 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **I**  
Last Name: **Kang**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Newton**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional:



**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, J Kang, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 6:42:44 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **J**  
Last Name: **Kang**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Newton**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional:



**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, S Lidhar, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 6:46:12 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **S**  
Last Name: **Lidhar**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Cloverdale**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional: **Development was originally only 2 stories which works for the area. 5 story doesn't make sense - it's not enough space and neighboring houses are too close. Congestion and traffic will be a huge issue.**



**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, S Kaur, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 12:07:14 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **S**  
Last Name: **Kaur**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Cloverdale**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional:





**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, T Kalirai, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 6:47:50 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **T**  
Last Name: **Kalirai**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Whalley**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional:



[www.surrey.ca](http://www.surrey.ca)

**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, T Kalirai, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 6:48:18 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **T**  
Last Name: **Kalirai**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Whalley**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional:



[www.surrey.ca](http://www.surrey.ca)

**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, T Kalirai, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 6:49:14 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **T**  
Last Name: **Kalirai**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Whalley**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional:



[www.surrey.ca](http://www.surrey.ca)

**From:** [As. 22\(1\) Sandhu](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** PLR-7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 9:05:52 AM

---

Hello

We Disagree with the Development

I am one of the resident of 188 /55Ave.

Few questions regarding the project:

Parking

For the proposed building where the 161 parking stalls will be made? At present our neighborhood people park in front of houses and walk down the street to their houses. After work hours there is barely any parking spot left on the street side. Imagine 74 houses coming in that residential zone, it will become more crowded. As the parking spots suggested by the developers are for residents and the shoppers of that complex, let's take into consideration for 74 households there would be on an average of 150 vehicles; as such parking spots are not enough. Definitely the parking of those houses will spill out on the streets which will add to the already existing position.

Intersection waiting time -

All the residential and industrial area on 52ave and 188 st they use mainly intersections on 188, and 184 streets ; building these 74 units will increase the local traffic and imagine how busy the intersection will be with even more wait time for left turns. There is already considerable wait time at present and we have seen many accidents at all the intersections with impatient drivers. And this is also a risk for pedestrians

Privacy

Building such a tall building will invade the privacy of the neighborhood.

Schools

Definitely the children from these houses have to be accommodated in the existing school, which will add to the portables

Another example; I used to live on 64and 143A Surrey and surrounded by town houses and then more town houses were built opposite side of 64Ave . They didn't have enough parking spots in their residential area so they parked across 64 ave on our residential area and walk down to their town houses. In that neighborhood if guest needs to park, they can't find the spots to park. I personally feel this is just a plan made in hurry. The city need to plan well and the facilities for the new zoning area should be kept in mind while planning. It will not only increase the congestion, but will also create other problems such as residents getting agitated for the parking spots and getting into arguments. Another thing I would like to mention is in the same neighborhood one of our known parked their car on the street in front of someone else's house ( where that house owner used to park), he got a note written on his windshield asking not to park there in a threatening manner and later another day the tire was deflated.

The shops are needed as this neighborhood was missing this kind of facility, however building 74 units will increase so many problems mention as mentioned above.

This development is not to build the neighborhood nor the benefit of it, it is totally for personal profit and greed of the developer.

Regards

**s. 22(1)** Sandhu

**s. 22(1)**

Surrey BC

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

**From:** s. 22(1)hunda  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** Project No: 7921-0272-00 Development  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 10:30:56 AM

---

Hello,

I hope this message finds you well.

I am emailing to state my opposition regarding the 7921-0272-00 development.

I understand the need for development and I am a supporting of development but, I am worried about the lack of public information and the potential impact on children's safety due to increased traffic congestion in the area.

There was no public information about the project which has been concerning - there was no signage in the area for months and, I believe it is essential for the community to be well-informed about developments that could significantly impact our neighborhood. It is challenging for residents to understand the full scope of the project and its potential consequences. The developers did not follow the proper steps.

I am concerned about the potential increase in traffic congestion around the development. The safety of children in the community is of huge importance to everyone. I believe the Increased traffic could pose a significant risk to children who walk or bike to school or play in the neighborhood.

I encourage the city to engage with residents to ensure that their voices and concerns are heard and considered in the decision-making process.

Thanks,  
K s. 22(1) H

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

**From:** Hs. 22(1) Parhar  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** Development Project: 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 11:32:42 AM

---

Hi: I completely disagree with the proposed development.

I live a block from the proposed development and will be directly effected.

1: Will change the character of the neighbourhood

2: Traffic will be a mess with 74 residential units, plus the commercial units.

Thank you,

Hs. 22(1)

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** s. 22(1) Parhar  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** development project: 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 1:32:29 PM

---

Hello. I completely disagree with this development. 74 new residential units will the change the character and traffic flow of the area for worse.

Thank you,  
Ss. 22(1) Parhar  
S. 22(1)



**From:** [S. 22\(1\) Mangat](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** Development Project 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 1:44:18 PM

---

To whom it may concern

I am a resident of Cloverdale residing on 188 St and 53A Avenue, Surrey. Upon learning of the large development proposed on the corner of 188 St and 56 Ave, I'd like to express my concerns with this proposal and share that I strongly disagree with this development.

This large development does not take into consideration an already busy neighborhood with extensive parking issues and existing safety risks for pedestrians due to the high speeding allowances and traffic flow on 56 Ave and 188 St. By adding a multi-story development, the aforementioned concerns will be amplified, causing additional concerns for current residents and pedestrians.

Please additionally consider the parking requirements which will be needed to meet the new hospital currently under development in our neighborhood on 180 St. While we welcome this development as it is intended to address ever increasing healthcare requirements, adding a multi-story residential building in this same neighborhood is exceptionally inconsiderate of current and future residents.

I have confidence in our city council to make the right decisions for our community and look forward to the hearing on April 22nd.

Many thanks,  
**S. 22(1) Mangat**

**From:** [C. 22\(1\) Harper](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** DEVELOPMENT PROJECT 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 4:34:17 PM

---

**\We are residents of this particular neighborhood/community**

**I/We DISAGREE/OPPOSE with this specific development project.**

**This development will add to:**

**Already congesting traffic at 188 and Hwy 10 intersection**

**Longer wait times at the intersection**

**Safety risk of residents and pedestrians and increase in number of accidents**

**Parking issue for tenants and visitors**

**Compromised privacy of homes in the vicinity**

**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, C Keen, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 6:56:01 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **C**  
Last Name: **Keen**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Cloverdale**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional: **I don't agree with this development - it ruins the character of the neighborhood.**



**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, J Sangha, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 6:58:26 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **J**  
Last Name: **Sangha**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Cloverdale**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional:



**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, J Sangha, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 6:58:55 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **J**  
Last Name: **Sangha**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Cloverdale**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional:



**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, C Chung, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 6:59:06 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **C**  
Last Name: **Chung**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Cloverdale**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional:



**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, C Sangha, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 6:59:18 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **C**  
Last Name: **Sangha**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Cloverdale**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional:



**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, S Sidhu, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 6:59:37 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **S**  
Last Name: **Sidhu**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Cloverdale**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional:





**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, J Sidhu, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 7:00:36 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **J**  
Last Name: **Sidhu**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Cloverdale**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional:



**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, N Kaur, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 7:35:48 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **N**  
Last Name: **Kaur**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Cloverdale**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional:



**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, S Sidhu, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 7:00:13 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **S**  
Last Name: **Sidhu**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Cloverdale**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional:



**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, A Sekhon, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 7:42:00 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **A**  
Last Name: **Sekhon**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Cloverdale**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional: **Do not agree with this proposal - doesn't address issues on privacy, congestion and traffic issues. Please re consider**



**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, P Hans, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 7:49:09 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **P**  
Last Name: **Hans**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Cloverdale**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional: **I do not support this development. It brings zero benefits to the community. Causes increased amount of traffic and congestion. Houses on the south side must be mad/upset because it ruins their backyard privacy. Buffer zone trees is not sufficient**



**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, P Hans, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 7:52:20 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **P**  
Last Name: **Hans**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Cloverdale**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional: **Development is horrible for the area. Plans did not consider the well being of the residents in the neighborhood. There was no signage or any information available for people to view these plans. I had to dig around to find them. Please reconsider as it causes more issues than resolves them (traffic, privacy, congestion)**

**From:** A <sup>s. 22(1)</sup> Ramakrishnan  
**To:** <sup>s. 22(1)</sup> ment Webmail  
**Cc:** <sup>s. 22(1)</sup>  
**Subject:** Development project 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 7:50:38 PM

---

I am writing this note as the owner of the property at **Surrey Resident** and fundamentally DISAGREE with the development .

The area is largely single family and building. 74 unit residential property will increase traffic , safety risk for pedestrians, parking issues and privacy lost for single family homes and more importantly value which we have built and chosen this area for a reason.

If affordability is an issue , the city should consider building on another plot where there are existing apartments.

I DISAGREE with this development

A <sup>s. 22(1)</sup>  
Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, A Bhagtana, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 8:24:08 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **A**  
Last Name: **Bhagtana**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Fleetwood**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional:





**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, D Gill, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 8:22:57 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **D**  
Last Name: **Gill**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **No**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **n/a**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional:



**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, J Bhagtana, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 8:24:43 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **J**  
Last Name: **Bhagtana**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Fleetwood**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional:



**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, M Sanghera, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 9:52:55 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **M**  
Last Name: **Sanghera**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Cloverdale**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional:



**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, R Kingra, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 9:13:35 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **R**  
Last Name: **Kingra**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Cloverdale**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional: **Increased traffic and crowding with street parking**



**From:** [REDACTED] Lavoie  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** Development projet:7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 9:37:57 PM

---

To whom it may concern

I am writing to say I strongly disagree with this project. I live at [REDACTED] Surrey Resident and our neighbourhood is already congested due to all of the basement suites. Adding this would make things increasingly worse. Parking on the street is very hard to come by all ready. I can't imagine what it would be like adding this to the neighbourhood. We also have of plenty of stores in our area already. There are also two elementary schools near by that children walk to. Added traffic would make walking to school more dangerous.

Please do not allow this to go through!

Thank you  
[REDACTED] Lavoie

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, B Kingra, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 10:01:38 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **B**  
Last Name: **Kingra**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Fleetwood**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional:



**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, G Kingra, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 10:03:41 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **G**  
Last Name: **Kingra**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Fleetwood**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional: **Increased traffic and harder to get a street parking. We moved to this area to get away from the traffic and were told as such before**



**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, S Kingra, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 10:02:14 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **S**  
Last Name: **Kingra**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Fleetwood**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional:





**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, V Kingra, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 10:00:53 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **V**  
Last Name: **Kingra**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Fleetwood**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional:



**From:** R. [REDACTED] Whitbread  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** DEVELOPMENT PROJECT:7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 10:33:23 PM

---

I DISAGREE with this development proposing an amendment to the OFFICIAL COMMUNITY I moved here from a subdivision of small ranchers in Surrey. We were retired and not planning on moving. There was no OCP changes made but that area became a subdivision of 3,000 to 5,000 sq ft buildings with 1 and 2 suites rented out. The building on one side of us raising the elevation 2 feet. After moving to this area in 2016 development ensued with like homes and additional roadways as is normal. This continues to increase traffic substantially as new homes are still being built . It will continue to increase during and after the building of the hospital. Having an entrance to the proposed development off 188 street so close to 56 ave is definitely a SAFETY ISSUE. Unfortunately many drivers today should not be behind the wheel, longer wait times, lack of courtesy, non rule followers, frustration etc. cause far too many accidents. It is prudent personal making such decisions consider the safety of all citizens.

Irrespective of the reasons. Also parking is already an issue in this area. Re: Lack of commercial facilities. This area is not lacking commercial services. So close to Cloverdale Square Village, Hillcrest Village Shopping Centre and Willowbrook. Thank you for your consideration of our concerns. R. [REDACTED] & G. [REDACTED] Whitbread

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 21/04/2024, P Dhaliwal, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 11:52:19 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **P**  
Last Name: **Dhaliwal**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Cloverdale**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional: **This development is a bad idea -I wish I knew about it earlier. It will only cause problems for the community. It is better to have a smaller scale development which fits the character of the neighborhood. Please reconsider.**



**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 22/04/2024, M Sanghera, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 22, 2024 8:48:14 AM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **M**  
Last Name: **Sanghera**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Cloverdale**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional:



**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 22/04/2024, S Sandal, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 22, 2024 6:22:03 AM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **S**  
Last Name: **Sandal**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Cloverdale**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional: **Invasion of privacy and safety concerns.**



**From:** [p52210 Samra](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** Development Project: 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 21, 2024 10:34:00 PM

---

Project Number 7921-0272-00

Dear Council Members,

I am writing to you to share my opposition to the project. I do not believe it serves the best interests of the community. This project doesn't fit the aesthetic of the surrounding community. We don't have any other apartments or townhouses in our close vicinity, and I believe that is mainly because our neighbourhood doesn't have the necessary infrastructure in place to accommodate them. I am against the residential component of this project because I do not believe we have the infrastructure necessary to accommodate that many people. I believe the original project which was only a commercial building was going to be a great addition to the community and was looking forward to it. Its' operation would be during business hours and I believed it would provide services that our neighbourhood greatly needed and would cut down on congestion because there wouldn't be the need to drive to get necessities like we need to do at this time.

My biggest concern is regarding safety in regard to pedestrians. For majority of the neighbourhood the catchment area is Sunrise Ridge Elementary School and Clayton Heights Secondary School. A lot of children walk across the highway in this area without supervision. The intersection at Hwy 10 and 188<sup>th</sup> has seen 128 accidents from 2018 to 2022. There is not even a left turn signal to leave the subdivision. I asked the Project Planner, John Koch-Schulte what changes would be made to make it safer for pedestrians because of the increase in traffic from this project and he advised me "it's a complicated intersection" and no changes would be made. If this intersection is "complicated" and will not see any improvements, how can it be expected to take on all of the increased traffic that comes with the residential component of this proposed building. It concerns me that there does not seem to be a proactive approach to this intersection, to avoid the possible issues pedestrians will face. That doesn't sit well with me, and I have serious concerns on how seriously the City is looking at the impact of said project on the many pedestrians both adults but especially children since we cannot expect them to have the same critical thinking skills as adults. To ask them to negotiate a driveway and highway so close to each other is asking a lot. I also have concerns with the City trees that are in the proposal. To have City trees put up onto 188th creates obstacles for drivers. Pedestrians are meant to be seen. There should be no obstacles in the sightlines of drivers both going in and out of the project.

Another major issue I have is that there is only one driveway and that is it off 188<sup>th</sup>. 188<sup>th</sup> is already busy and to have the driveway so close to the highway will only add to the congestion

and back up Highway 10. Most developments you see today don't have only one driveway to ease the flow of traffic. I don't think we should create another congested intersection on Highway 10. If we choose to take another route our options are 184th and 192nd which are counterproductive because we have to move away from Highway 10 only to drive back up to it and both the streets are not that close to us.

There is also the issue of transit. There will be no bus times added to the existing bus route which is already busy and I believe inadequate. This neighbourhood is vehicle dependent. We have a lot of families with children in the neighbourhood making the primary mode of transportation for many their vehicle. The new residents of the development will also most likely be vehicle dependent further adding congestion to the already busy highway.

Parking is another issue I have. There are a lot of vehicles in our neighbourhood. We have people that cannot find parking on their own streets, so they have to go to other streets in the neighbourhood. Our streets are regularly packed. To have 102 parking spaces for 74 residential units does not seem adequate. To think that most households won't have at least two vehicles is naïve. The overflow will then be parking on the street which already has difficulty accommodating the vehicles that are already in the neighbourhood.

I also viewed the projection from the Surrey School District and I am not in agreement that there will only be 10 kids from this project. We have an abundance of multigenerational homes in our neighbourhood and to believe that this project would also house multigenerational families. Both the elementary and secondary school are over capacity. I found it interesting that the report mentioned the school capacity considerations for the elementary school but not for the secondary school which is way more over capacity. Adding to an already strained system does not help any of the children already in the neighbourhood. John had advised that if Sunrise Ridge can't accept the children from the project due to capacity that they can go to another school however, that wouldn't be beneficial to the new residents, and I wouldn't be surprised if they weren't advised of that possibility before purchasing their units. Also, if new residents come to our neighbourhood, they should be able to go to the school within their catchment. I believe this is a huge disservice to all children and their families.

I understand one of the rationales of recommendation was the construction of the new Surrey Hospital is expected to increase the demand for additional housing in the Cloverdale area. We already know that the construction of the new hospital will not be sufficient to deal with the city's health care crisis. Doctors from Surrey Memorial have already gone on record stating that the new hospital will not meet the region's current needs let alone when it's completed in 2030. Adding more people to this area will further congest the new hospital.

I inquired if there were any similar projects to this proposal and John had advised me that there is no similar project to this on Highway 10 and that is why I think there should be more due diligence concerning the impact on the surrounding community regarding this project.

I don't believe there has been transparency with this project. I have had great trouble getting into contact with the Project Planner. I had left him a voicemail which he did not return until almost a week later and that was because I followed-up with another member from the City who forwarded a message to him. When I finally did speak to him about my questions and concerns, he only agreed with them so he knows issues exist but hasn't come up with any solutions to them. I believe in progress, but I also believe that projects should be built with the necessary infrastructure in place so that we don't have the same issues that Langley is having where they have built so much but have realized they lack infrastructure. When you know there are going to be issues why not rectify them at the beginning of a project instead of when it's already built and causing issues for the neighbourhood. It creates ill will against developers and the City where we expect that our best interests are taken into consideration. John mentioned that the Provincial government wants high density housing but if the Mayor is pushing back against the government when it comes to policing why cant the City push back against high density housing projects that don't have the necessary infrastructure. Isn't that also in the best interests of the citizens.

P<sup>s. 22(1)</sup> Samra



**From:** [A s. 22\(1\) Azrawat](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** B.01 7921-0272-00 /18778 No. 10 highway  
**Date:** April 22, 2024 12:48:26 AM

---

To Councillors,

I am in opposition to the Development - B.01 7921-0272-00. There has been a lack of community discussions regarding this project. There was no discussions with the surrounding neighbours and the signage on the property was on the ground and in the grass. It looks like it has been there for months...

I am concerned about the potential excessive noise that would result from the construction of this development. To build underground parking with a 5 story high building, it will be a lot of noise and traffic in the area for maybe even a year. There will be no peace in the neighborhood. I know there are regular homes in the neighborhood that are being built but that's bearable as it is not a huge inconvenience. This construction will clog up the intersection and make it unsafe.

Thanks,

A [s. 22\(1\)](#)

**From:** M. S.  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** Project Number 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 22, 2024 6:47:00 AM

---

Dear Council,

I'm reaching out to share some serious concerns regarding the proposed Project Number 7921-0272-00 in our community.

This development raises significant issues regarding congestion and privacy that I believe require careful consideration. The anticipated increase in traffic congestion, coupled with the lack of infrastructure upgrades, poses safety risks for pedestrians and cyclists and could lead to longer commute times for residents.

As a mother, the safety of my family is paramount, and I am deeply concerned about the implications of increased development in our community. With each new project comes the potential for increased traffic, noise, and disruptions, all of which can pose significant safety risks for children. Whether it's navigating busy streets on the way to school or playing outdoors in areas impacted by construction, the safety of our children must be a top priority. Additionally, as development progresses, there may be changes to the infrastructure that could affect pedestrian safety, such as new roads or intersections. It's essential that these concerns are addressed proactively to ensure that our community remains a safe and welcoming place for families

I urge the council to thoroughly assess these concerns before reaching any decisions regarding project approval. It's crucial that the development aligns with the best interests of the community and considers the long-term implications for our quality of life. I am definitely opposed to this development.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I trust that you will give thoughtful consideration to the concerns raised by myself and other residents.

Sincerely,  
Sanghera Family  
Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [1822 Rana](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** Misrepresentation Regarding B.01 7921-0272-00 /18778 No. 10 highway  
**Date:** April 22, 2024 8:48:17 AM

---

Hello Councillors,

I am emailing again to provide additional information that was missed in my previous email against the B.01 7921-0272-00 /18778 No. 10 highway development in our neighborhood. When purchasing the parcel building lot south of the development, the developer initially stated that the development would only be a two stories tall mixed use building, which was in 2021. However, more recently I was notified that they intend to build a five-story structure instead. I have read that this five story mixed use structure application has also been with the city since 2021 (at the same time I purchased my lot from the developer). Similar statements were said to other neighbour's (who also bought parcel building lots on the south perimeter of the development) for which they can attest to as well.

This discrepancy is concerning as it significantly impacts the property I purchased based on the initial information provided. Given that the developer knew of the plans to change the development to a 5-story building but not providing contradicting information at the time of sale is disheartening. The change in the scale of the development has potential implications for the surrounding area, including increased congestion, lack of privacy and altered the neighborhood's character.

Within the last 6 months, the developer has had conversations with the home owners who lived on the south perimeter of the development, and he still failed to acknowledge that there was a change in the plans. It was the developers responsibility to inform the residents of this change for which he failed to do so. Additionally there was no signage available on the development lot to inform the community (please see the pictures attached). The sign has been buried in the grass for months.

I and other residents tried to reach out to John Koche Schul (project planner) for more information and feedback but he has not been responsive even after numerous follow ups.

This has caused significant concern among residents. The increase in height drastically changes the character of the neighborhood and raises questions about the integrity of the entire project. Residents were led to believe that the development would be in line with the existing scale of the neighborhood, only to discover that this is not the case.

Lastly, I would like to clarify that I am in support of development in this city but not at the compromise of the existing community. I believe that the original plan for a two story mixed use building is a viable solution for the area located on 18778 No. 10 highway.

Please re-consider this development proposal. The community should have been given accurate information from the start and should have a voice in developments that impact our neighborhood.

Pictures for reference:





Warm regards,

Tina Rana

**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 22/04/2024, P Sanghera, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 22, 2024 8:49:08 AM

---

MySurrey portal logo



---

**New submission received.**

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **P**  
Last Name: **Sanghera**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Cloverdale**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 1  
0 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 N  
o. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional:



[www.surrey.ca](http://www.surrey.ca)

**From:** s. 22(1) Pelia  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** Project 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 22, 2024 10:09:21 AM

---

Dear Council Members,

I hope this message finds you well.

I want to express my concerns regarding the proposed development project in our neighborhood. While I understand the importance of urban development, I believe this particular project raises significant privacy issues for residents in the area.

The proposed height of the development would overlook several residential properties, including mine, compromising the privacy and tranquility of our homes. This intrusion on our privacy is a major concern for many residents who value the peaceful and private nature of our neighborhood.

The current height of the trees is insufficient to block the view of the proposed residential. I believe this was the primary purpose of planting them. This lack of adequate screening undermines the effectiveness of the buffer and does not address the concerns of residents in the area. Further more these trees in our yards cause extra maintenance for which my family and other families do not want the burden to take care of.

I respectfully request that taller hedges be considered for planting on the developers property to enhance the effectiveness. It is crucial that the buffer provides the necessary screening and privacy for the residents in the area.

I'm also requesting that the council reconsider the height and design of the proposed development to address these privacy concerns. It is crucial that any development in our neighborhood respects the privacy and well-being of its residents.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I trust that you will consider our concerns as you review the development proposal.

**From:** J<sup>S. 22(1)</sup> Singh  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** Development Project 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 22, 2024 10:21:34 AM  
**Importance:** High

---

As a neighbour to this property, I wholeheartedly oppose this development for many practical reasons. This type of development does not belong in this neighbourhood. It will create a dangerous traffic situation with people making wild maneuvers to enter and exit this property so close to Highway 10. There are already people making U-Turns in this stretch, semi trucks who are not allowed to be on 188 Street traveling at high rates of speed all day and night, along with other traffic speeding and running stop signs, now you want to add 74 families and their vehicles? It does not make any sense.

Also, one of our local elementary schools is already closed to in-cachement registration as of this coming Fall, having so many additional families added to existing school infrastructure will overwhelm our little schools.

In summary, the existing road and school infrastructure needs a lot of work before a development such as this be considered. It is not an appropriate addition to our neighbourhood which has become infinitely busier and more dangerous in the 14 years since I have lived here. Please do not pile on with the approval of this development.

Thank you for your consideration,

J<sup>S. 22(1)</sup> Singh

**Surrey Resident**



**From:**

s. 22(1)

**To:**

[Clerks Department Webmail](#)

**Subject:**

Application No. 7921-0272-00 (18756- No. 10 Highway, 18778 No. 10 Highway)

**Date:**

April 22, 2024 8:48:55 AM

---

Mayor, Council, Planning and Engineering,

This proposed change to zoning at 18756 and 18778 No. 10 Highway should be denied. This would be the tallest building in Cloverdale yet its not in Cloverdale. Its in a subdivision outside of the downtown of Cloverdale. This building is appropriate for downtown Cloverdale.

This is supposed to be a single family neighborhood. Because of all of the suites in each house there are cars parked all along the road. Lawns are quickly disappearing as driveways grow to accommodate all the vehicles for the people in the suites. Adding shopping and 72 more homes will jam up the road to the point emergency vehicles will not be able to make it through.

Where will the 72 home owners of these condos park? On the street?

Where will the children go to school? They will have to cross Highway 10 to attend school.

Where is the green space for the enjoyment of the residents. Because of how the development was allowed to proceed in the area there were no areas given up by developers for a park. No trees for shade. Where can the children go to play? On the street? With all the cars?


If these are residents for seniors, where can they walk away from traffic for daily exercise? How will they get groceries? A bus will require them to cross a very busy Highway 10.

The corner of 188 th and Highway 10 is busy enough. Add 72 more homes, 72 or more cars plus delivery vehicles for the shops.

The developer is saying the right words to you but this will not make it a more environmentally friendly neighborhood. There will not be reduced vehicle traffic. It will be increased.

Please come to our neighborhood and sit and watch the activity and you will see for yourselves what is going on. Please do not add more traffic to the area.

Please reject this ammendment to the Bylaw and Zoning.

K  Thomasson, B.Sc.

**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 22/04/2024, S Samra, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 22, 2024 11:31:40 AM

---

MySurrey portal logo



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **S**  
Last Name: **Samra**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Cloverdale**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional: **I am concerned with this proposal as I believe add a great deal of congestion to the intersection at hwy 10 and 188 st. With the 188 st entry and exit I am concerned that with such a large volume of of cars coming in and out of this area it will be dangerous to navigate. I was okay when the proposal was only for commercial units. With 74 residential units I do not see how the intersection can handle this volume.**

**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 22/04/2024, P Samra, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0272-00  
**Date:** April 22, 2024 11:49:00 AM

---

MySurrey portal logo



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **P**  
Last Name: **Samra**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Cloverdale**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.01 7921-0272-00 | 18756 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway (18778 No. 10 (56 Avenue) Highway)**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional: **I am greatly concerned with the impact this proposal will have for pedestrians and especially young children. With the proposed 74 unit residential unit proposed my children now have to navigate not only an already overwhelmed intersection but also the only entry and exit for the proposed residential unit. I wish every driver would drive safely but, we know this is not the case. The proposal also shows extra trees which makes seeing pedestrians a greater challenge.**

**From:** [REDACTED] Khaira  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** IE: Development Proposal 188St & 56Ave  
**Date:** April 22, 2024 10:12:30 AM

---

To whom it may concern,

We are writing to submit our concerns for the proposed development of a 5-story mixed-use residential building of 74 units. We are staunchly opposed to this development for many reasons. Firstly, having an entry/exit point via only 188 St can cause many potential issues- for example, increased wait times at that already busy intersection. Secondly, the street parking in our neighborhood is already close to capacity due to multiple family occupancies. The residents and tenants of this neighborhood should have access to parking close to their homes, especially considering some of the residents have mobility issues. Lastly, views of our beautiful forested areas and of the mountains will be completely obstructed by such a tall building, and backyard privacy of many homes will be compromised.

We will be attending this evenings council hearing and hope that these concerns will be addressed.

Sincerely,

BS. 22(1) Kulvinder, I [REDACTED] and M [REDACTED] Khaira

# **SUMMARY OF PUBLIC HEARING SUBMISSIONS**

**April 22, 2024**  
**B.2 - 7921-0170-00**

Public Hearing Correspondence received  
after Thursday noon

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>BYLAW</b>	<b>COMMENT</b>
Opposition		
B.2	21206/21207	J. Gill expressing opposition for the proposal citing number of lots proposed, traffic, parking, wider streets, sidewalks and more schools.
B.2	21206/21207	R. Landale expressing opposition for the proposal citing trees.
B.2	21206/21207	R. Winston expressing opposition for the proposal citing trees.

**From:** Ficocelli, Jennifer  
**To:** Clerks Department Webmail  
**Subject:** FW: Delegation Developments for April 22, 2024 RCPH  
**Date:** April 22, 2024 8:15:40 AM  
**Attachments:** image001.png  
**Importance:** High

Jennifer

JENNIFER FICOCELLI | CITY CLERK AND DIRECTOR LEGISLATIVE SERVICES

**CITY OF SURREY**

Legislative Services - Corporate Services

13450 104th Ave, Surrey, BC, Canada V3T 1V8

T 604.591.4380 [www.surrey.ca](http://www.surrey.ca)

**From:** R [REDACTED] Landale [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Sunday, April 21, 2024 3:04 PM

**To:** Locke, Brenda <Brenda.Locke@surrey.ca>; Stutt, Rob <Rob.Stutt@surrey.ca>; Elford, Doug <Doug.Elford@surrey.ca>; Hepner, Gordon <GHepner@surrey.ca>; Bains, Harry <Harry.Bains@surrey.ca>; Annis, Linda <Linda.Annis@surrey.ca>; Nagra, Mandeep <Mandeep.Nagra@surrey.ca>; Bose, Mike <Mike.Bose@surrey.ca>; Kooner, Pardeep <Pardeep.Kooner@surrey.ca>; Ficocelli, Jennifer <Jennifer.Ficocelli@surrey.ca>; Neuman, Scott <SNeuman@surrey.ca>; Luymes, Don <Don.Luymes@surrey.ca>; Chan, Nadia <NChan@surrey.ca>  
**Cc:** 'Tom Zytaruk' <tom.zytaruk@surreynowleader.com>; 'Lauren Collins' <lauren.collins@surreynowleader.com>; 'Peach Arch News' <editorial@peacearchnews.com>; 'Editor' <editor@cloverdalereporter.com>; editor@whiterocksun.com

**Subject:** RE: Delegation Developments for April 22, 2024 RCPH

**Importance:** High

To Council,

**Please “Register” in objection to this Electronic Regular Council Public Hearing Meeting April 22nd.2024 in respect to ALL Development Applications noted and the Corporate Report “in Protest” to this new undemocratic degenerating process. Please be informed I will not be electronically participating in the meeting tonight.**



It requires seven to eight trees to provide enough oxygen for one person per year.

**Have a nice protective meeting in “Isolation” from your Electors  
7921-0272-00 No support.**

**7921-0170-00 Absolute objection to the destruction of 14 of 28  
mature trees.**

**7923-0134-00 Absolute objection to the destruction of 33 of 33  
mature trees.**

**7920-0040-00 Absolute objection to the destruction of 41 of 42  
mature trees, on October 16, 2023 Council approved 7923-0166-00 to  
destroy 12 more trees.**

**7924-0020-00 No support.**

**CR 2024-R058 Absolute objection to amendments proposed in the  
“Darts Hill Neighbourhood Concept Plan  
Amendments” due to:**

**1. Terrible “undisclosed (*secretes*)” impacts on future  
tree destruction within the NCP designated area,  
and the Redwood Park Space, which includes  
portions of treed lands in the ALR.**



2. Inclusive of future negative environmental (streamside and Hazardous Steep Slope) impacts on Thomson Creek.

3. It is hereby noted and recorded the proposed amendments to the NCP impacts “8 LOTS City Purchased Designated Parkland (382,425m<sup>2</sup>)”, as generally outlined in Appendix I drawings.

4. Once adopted by Council tonight these lands as proposed will be sold off to Developers without Consultation to the “Electors Alternative Approval Process”, in accordance with the legal provisions of the CCC 26 (these City Parklands belong to everyone, to every single Property Taxpayer across all 6 Town centres that make up this “City of

Parks”, here in Surrey. Grave concerns are recorded herein in relation to page 2 quote: *“the City is reviewing many NCPs to ensure that parkland acquisition funds can be appropriately targeted in areas that will see an increase in family-oriented housing. This further increased density in neighbourhoods necessitates a review of future parkland recognizing that neighbourhood park space with active amenities will be even more desired by residents. In relation to Dart’s Hill, city staff have heard from area residents about the importance of neighbourhood parks in the plan area”*.

The proposed NCP amendments in this Corporate Report do exactly the opposite to the afore referenced quote, by redesignating City Parkland for development under the disguise of Bill 44.

**Only Council tonight can maintain Redwood Park as a natural park space on city owned land.**

5. Contrary to OCP Policy for proportionate Park Space per 10,000 residents, this proposed NCP amendments ignores City Policy, quote from page 5: *“Staff are proposing to redesignate 1734 and 1750 - 168 Street from ‘Proposed Park’ to ‘Medium Density Townhouse’ and to update the OCP to align with this change.”* The noted Park Lands are already “City Purchased Park land”, they are not “Proposed” until Council adopts this Corporate Report.

6. Consequential to the preceding 5 identified concerns this delegation concedes a degree of support for, quote: *“park specific amenities for the expansion of Darts Hill Garden Park once the property is acquired by the City.”*

10– DP/DVP's Approved April 22, 2024	Existing	Remove	Retain	Replace	Deficit	Green City Fund
<b>GRAND TOTALS</b>	229	184	26	316	141	49,200
<b>% of Existing Trees</b>	100.0%	80.3%	11.4%	138.0%	61.4%	

**26 City Trees will be destroyed with no compensation to the GCF**

0 DP & 0 DVPs include the possibility of City Boulevard trees could be destroyed TBD later

**SURREY TREE DEFORESTATION TABLE January to Dec,2024**

60 DP/DVPs Approved between January to December 2024	Existing	Remove	Retain	Replace	Deficit	Green City Fund
<b>GRAND TOTALS</b>	2,782	2,092	668	2,770	1,339	\$596,379.00
<b>% of Existing Trees</b>	100.0%	75.2%	24.0%	99.6%	48.1%	

**To date: 77 City Trees will be destroyed with 12 having no compensation to the GCF**

**HOW MANY TREES HAVE BEEN PLANTED SINCE OCTOBER 12th.2023 ??**

**( in theory  $\cong$  1,500 PER WEEK, 6 months later WHERE ARE the  
45,500 Trees? )**

(<https://www.surrey.ca/city-government/mayor-council/mayor-brenda-locke/mayorscorner#:~:text=This%20year%2C%20I%20signed%20the%20Global%20Trees%20in,you%20can%20help%20us%20grow%20our%20urban%20forest%3F> )

Timesheet: DPs and DVPs, started delegation writing process Friday April 19th 9:30am to Sunday April 21st. 3:00pm  
= 8.0 hours, (download, read, write and x'check)

Respectfully,

Ri [REDACTED] Landale.

Fleetwood Surrey, Resident.

From: [REDACTED] [\[REDACTED\]](#)  
To: [Locke, Brenda](#); [Clerks Department](#); [Webmail](#); [Stutt, Rob](#); [Hepler, Gordon](#); [Bains, Harry](#); [Bose, Mike](#); [Elford, Doug](#); [Kooner, Pardeep](#); [Annis, Linda](#); [Nagra, Mandeeep](#)  
Subject: Fwd: Delegation Developments for April 22, 2024 RCPH  
Date: April 21, 2024 9:20:32 PM  
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

---

Greetings -  
I am in complete agreement and fully support Mr. R. [REDACTED] Landael's objections as here listed. Sincerely,  
[REDACTED] Winston  
Surrey Resident

**From:** Ficocelli, Jennifer  
**To:** Clerks Department Webmail  
**Subject:** FW: Delegation Developments for April 22, 2024 RCPH  
**Date:** April 22, 2024 8:15:40 AM  
**Attachments:** image001.png  
**Importance:** High

Jennifer

JENNIFER FICOCELLI | CITY CLERK AND DIRECTOR LEGISLATIVE SERVICES

**CITY OF SURREY**

Legislative Services - Corporate Services

13450 104th Ave, Surrey, BC, Canada V3T 1V8

T 604.591.4380 [www.surrey.ca](http://www.surrey.ca)

**From:** R [REDACTED] Landale [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Sunday, April 21, 2024 3:04 PM

**To:** Locke, Brenda <Brenda.Locke@surrey.ca>; Stutt, Rob <Rob.Stutt@surrey.ca>; Elford, Doug <Doug.Elford@surrey.ca>; Hepner, Gordon <GHepner@surrey.ca>; Bains, Harry <Harry.Bains@surrey.ca>; Annis, Linda <Linda.Annis@surrey.ca>; Nagra, Mandeep <Mandeep.Nagra@surrey.ca>; Bose, Mike <Mike.Bose@surrey.ca>; Kooner, Pardeep <Pardeep.Kooner@surrey.ca>; Ficocelli, Jennifer <Jennifer.Ficocelli@surrey.ca>; Neuman, Scott <SNeuman@surrey.ca>; Luymes, Don <Don.Luymes@surrey.ca>; Chan, Nadia <NChan@surrey.ca>  
**Cc:** 'Tom Zytaruk' <tom.zytaruk@surreynowleader.com>; 'Lauren Collins' <lauren.collins@surreynowleader.com>; 'Peach Arch News' <editorial@peacearchnews.com>; 'Editor' <editor@cloverdalereporter.com>; editor@whiterocksun.com

**Subject:** RE: Delegation Developments for April 22, 2024 RCPH

**Importance:** High

To Council,

Please “Register” in objection to this Electronic Regular Council Public Hearing Meeting April 22nd.2024 in respect to ALL Development Applications noted and the Corporate Report “in Protest” to this new undemocratic degenerating process. Please be informed I will not be electronically participating in the meeting tonight.



**Have a nice protective meeting in “Isolation” from your Electors  
7921-0272-00 No support.**

**7921-0170-00 Absolute objection to the destruction of 14 of 28  
mature trees.**

**7923-0134-00 Absolute objection to the destruction of 33 of 33  
mature trees.**

**7920-0040-00 Absolute objection to the destruction of 41 of 42  
mature trees, on October 16, 2023 Council approved 7923-0166-00 to  
destroy 12 more trees.**

**7924-0020-00 No support.**

**CR 2024-R058 Absolute objection to amendments proposed in the  
“Darts Hill Neighbourhood Concept Plan  
Amendments” due to:**

**1. Terrible “undisclosed (*secretes*)” impacts on future  
tree destruction within the NCP designated area,  
and the Redwood Park Space, which includes  
portions of treed lands in the ALR.**

2. Inclusive of future negative environmental (streamside and Hazardous Steep Slope) impacts on Thomson Creek.

3. It is hereby noted and recorded the proposed amendments to the NCP impacts “8 LOTS City Purchased Designated Parkland (382,425m<sup>2</sup>)”, as generally outlined in Appendix I drawings.

4. Once adopted by Council tonight these lands as proposed will be sold off to Developers without Consultation to the “Electors Alternative Approval Process”, in accordance with the legal provisions of the CCC 26 (these City Parklands belong to everyone, to every single Property Taxpayer across all 6 Town centres that make up this “City of

Parks”, here in Surrey. Grave concerns are recorded herein in relation to page 2 quote: *“the City is reviewing many NCPs to ensure that parkland acquisition funds can be appropriately targeted in areas that will see an increase in family-oriented housing. This further increased density in neighbourhoods necessitates a review of future parkland recognizing that neighbourhood park space with active amenities will be even more desired by residents. In relation to Dart’s Hill, city staff have heard from area residents about the importance of neighbourhood parks in the plan area”*.

The proposed NCP amendments in this Corporate Report do exactly the opposite to the afore referenced quote, by redesignating City Parkland for development under the disguise of Bill 44.

**Only Council tonight can maintain Redwood Park as a natural park space on city owned land.**

5. Contrary to OCP Policy for proportionate Park Space per 10,000 residents, this proposed NCP amendments ignores City Policy, quote from page 5: *“Staff are proposing to redesignate 1734 and 1750 - 168 Street from ‘Proposed Park’ to ‘Medium Density Townhouse’ and to update the OCP to align with this change.”* The noted Park Lands are already “City Purchased Park land”, they are not “Proposed” until Council adopts this Corporate Report.

6. Consequential to the preceding 5 identified concerns this delegation concedes a degree of support for, quote: *“park specific amenities for the expansion of Darts Hill Garden Park once the property is acquired by the City.”*

10– DP/DVP's Approved April 22, 2024	Existing	Remove	Retain	Replace	Deficit	Green City Fund
<b>GRAND TOTALS</b>	229	184	26	316	141	49,200
<b>% of Existing Trees</b>	100.0%	80.3%	11.4%	138.0%	61.4%	

**26 City Trees will be destroyed with no compensation to the GCF**

0 DP & 0 DVPs include the possibility of City Boulevard trees could be destroyed TBD later

**SURREY TREE DEFORESTATION TABLE January to Dec,2024**

60 DP/DVPs Approved between January to December 2024	Existing	Remove	Retain	Replace	Deficit	Green City Fund
<b>GRAND TOTALS</b>	2,782	2,092	668	2,770	1,339	\$596,379.00
<b>% of Existing Trees</b>	100.0%	75.2%	24.0%	99.6%	48.1%	

**To date: 77 City Trees will be destroyed with 12 having no compensation to the GCF**

**HOW MANY TREES HAVE BEEN PLANTED SINCE OCTOBER 12th.2023 ??**



**( in theory  $\cong$  1,500 PER WEEK, 6 months later WHERE ARE the  
45,500 Trees? )**

(<https://www.surrey.ca/city-government/mayor-council/mayor-brenda-locke/mayorscorner#:~:text=This%20year%2C%20I%20signed%20the%20Global%20Trees%20in,you%20can%20help%20us%20grow%20our%20urban%20forest%3F> )

Timesheet: DPs and DVPs, started delegation writing process Friday April 19th 9:30am to Sunday April 21st. 3:00pm  
= 8.0 hours, (download, read, write and x'check)

Respectfully,

Ri [REDACTED] Landale.

Fleetwood Surrey, Resident.

**From:** [MySurrey Portal](#)  
**To:** [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** 19/04/2024, J Gill, expressing Opposed to the 7921-0170-00  
**Date:** April 19, 2024 4:33:11 PM

---



---

## New submission received.

---

### Contact Information

First Initial: **J**  
Last Name: **Gill**  
Are you a resident of Surrey or do you own property in Surrey? **Yes**  
Select Your Neighbourhood: **Guilford**

### Submission Details

Select a Category: **1.Public Hearing Bylaws**  
Select an Item: **B.02 7921-0170-00 | 10162 and 10188 - 172 Street**  
Select your support level:: **Opposed**  
Comments - Optional: **I oppose the number of lots proposed. 13 lots across the street from my single family house (with NO basement suite) is ridiculous. This is suppose to be a SINGLE FAMILY neighborhood. I image the proposed lots and houses will all have at least one basement suite. The number of proposed lots will not only increase traffic but will also increase the amount of cars on the road and parked on the street. We need wider streets, sidewalks and more schools not 13 lots in a small area. Do**

**not pass this!**



[www.surrey.ca](http://www.surrey.ca)

# **SUMMARY OF PUBLIC HEARING SUBMISSIONS**

**April 22, 2024  
B.3 - 7923-0134-00**

Public Hearing Correspondence received  
after Thursday noon

ITEM	BYLAW	COMMENT
Opposition		
B.3	21203/21204	R. Landale expressing opposition for the proposal citing trees.
B.3	21203/21204	R. Winston expressing opposition for the proposal citing trees.

**From:** Ficocelli, Jennifer  
**To:** Clerks Department Webmail  
**Subject:** FW: Delegation Developments for April 22, 2024 RCPH  
**Date:** April 22, 2024 8:15:40 AM  
**Attachments:** image001.png  
**Importance:** High

Jennifer

JENNIFER FICOCELLI | CITY CLERK AND DIRECTOR LEGISLATIVE SERVICES

**CITY OF SURREY**

Legislative Services - Corporate Services

13450 104th Ave, Surrey, BC, Canada V3T 1V8

T 604.591.4380 [www.surrey.ca](http://www.surrey.ca)

**From:** R [REDACTED] Landale [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Sunday, April 21, 2024 3:04 PM

**To:** Locke, Brenda <Brenda.Locke@surrey.ca>; Stutt, Rob <Rob.Stutt@surrey.ca>; Elford, Doug <Doug.Elford@surrey.ca>; Hepner, Gordon <GHepner@surrey.ca>; Bains, Harry <Harry.Bains@surrey.ca>; Annis, Linda <Linda.Annis@surrey.ca>; Nagra, Mandeep <Mandeep.Nagra@surrey.ca>; Bose, Mike <Mike.Bose@surrey.ca>; Kooner, Pardeep <Pardeep.Kooner@surrey.ca>; Ficocelli, Jennifer <Jennifer.Ficocelli@surrey.ca>; Neuman, Scott <SNeuman@surrey.ca>; Luymes, Don <Don.Luymes@surrey.ca>; Chan, Nadia <NChan@surrey.ca>  
**Cc:** 'Tom Zytaruk' <tom.zytaruk@surreynowleader.com>; 'Lauren Collins' <lauren.collins@surreynowleader.com>; 'Peach Arch News' <editorial@peacearchnews.com>; 'Editor' <editor@cloverdalereporter.com>; editor@whiterocksun.com

**Subject:** RE: Delegation Developments for April 22, 2024 RCPH

**Importance:** High

To Council,

**Please “Register” in objection to this Electronic Regular Council Public Hearing Meeting April 22nd.2024 in respect to ALL Development Applications noted and the Corporate Report “in Protest” to this new undemocratic degenerating process. Please be informed I will not be electronically participating in the meeting tonight.**



**Have a nice protective meeting in “Isolation” from your Electors  
7921-0272-00 No support.**

**7921-0170-00 Absolute objection to the destruction of 14 of 28  
mature trees.**

**7923-0134-00 Absolute objection to the destruction of 33 of 33  
mature trees.**

**7920-0040-00 Absolute objection to the destruction of 41 of 42  
mature trees, on October 16, 2023 Council approved 7923-0166-00 to  
destroy 12 more trees.**

**7924-0020-00 No support.**

**CR 2024-R058 Absolute objection to amendments proposed in the  
“Darts Hill Neighbourhood Concept Plan  
Amendments” due to:**

**1. Terrible “undisclosed (*secretes*)” impacts on future  
tree destruction within the NCP designated area,  
and the Redwood Park Space, which includes  
portions of treed lands in the ALR.**

2. Inclusive of future negative environmental (streamside and Hazardous Steep Slope) impacts on Thomson Creek.

3. It is hereby noted and recorded the proposed amendments to the NCP impacts “8 LOTS City Purchased Designated Parkland (382,425m<sup>2</sup>)”, as generally outlined in Appendix I drawings.

4. Once adopted by Council tonight these lands as proposed will be sold off to Developers without Consultation to the “Electors Alternative Approval Process”, in accordance with the legal provisions of the CCC 26 (these City Parklands belong to everyone, to every single Property Taxpayer across all 6 Town centres that make up this “City of

Parks”, here in Surrey. Grave concerns are recorded herein in relation to page 2 quote: *“the City is reviewing many NCPs to ensure that parkland acquisition funds can be appropriately targeted in areas that will see an increase in family-oriented housing. This further increased density in neighbourhoods necessitates a review of future parkland recognizing that neighbourhood park space with active amenities will be even more desired by residents. In relation to Dart’s Hill, city staff have heard from area residents about the importance of neighbourhood parks in the plan area”*.

The proposed NCP amendments in this Corporate Report do exactly the opposite to the afore referenced quote, by redesignating City Parkland for development under the disguise of Bill 44.

**Only Council tonight can maintain Redwood Park as a natural park space on city owned land.**



5. Contrary to OCP Policy for proportionate Park Space per 10,000 residents, this proposed NCP amendments ignores City Policy, quote from page 5: *“Staff are proposing to redesignate 1734 and 1750 - 168 Street from ‘Proposed Park’ to ‘Medium Density Townhouse’ and to update the OCP to align with this change.”* The noted Park Lands are already “City Purchased Park land”, they are not “Proposed” until Council adopts this Corporate Report.

6. Consequential to the preceding 5 identified concerns this delegation concedes a degree of support for, quote: *“park specific amenities for the expansion of Darts Hill Garden Park once the property is acquired by the City.”*

10– DP/DVP's Approved April 22, 2024	Existing	Remove	Retain	Replace	Deficit	Green City Fund
<b>GRAND TOTALS</b>	229	184	26	316	141	49,200
<b>% of Existing Trees</b>	100.0%	80.3%	11.4%	138.0%	61.4%	

**26 City Trees will be destroyed with no compensation to the GCF**

0 DP & 0 DVPs include the possibility of City Boulevard trees could be destroyed TBD later

**SURREY TREE DEFORESTATION TABLE January to Dec,2024**

60 DP/DVPs Approved between January to December 2024	Existing	Remove	Retain	Replace	Deficit	Green City Fund
<b>GRAND TOTALS</b>	2,782	2,092	668	2,770	1,339	\$596,379.00
<b>% of Existing Trees</b>	100.0%	75.2%	24.0%	99.6%	48.1%	

**To date: 77 City Trees will be destroyed with 12 having no compensation to the GCF**

**HOW MANY TREES HAVE BEEN PLANTED SINCE OCTOBER 12th.2023 ??**

**( in theory  $\cong$  1,500 PER WEEK, 6 months later WHERE ARE the  
45,500 Trees? )**

(<https://www.surrey.ca/city-government/mayor-council/mayor-brenda-locke/mayorscorner#:~:text=This%20year%2C%20I%20signed%20the%20Global%20Trees%20in,you%20can%20help%20us%20grow%20our%20urban%20forest%3F> )

Timesheet: DPs and DVPs, started delegation writing process Friday April 19th 9:30am to Sunday April 21st. 3:00pm  
= 8.0 hours, (download, read, write and x'check)

Respectfully,

Ri [REDACTED] Landale.

Fleetwood Surrey, Resident.

From: [REDACTED] [\[REDACTED\]](#)  
To: [Locke, Brenda](#); [Cleeks Department](#); [Webmail](#); [Stutt, Rob](#); [Hepler, Gordon](#); [Bains, Harry](#); [Bose, Mike](#); [Elford, Doug](#); [Kooner, Pardeep](#); [Annis, Linda](#); [Negra, Mandeeep](#)  
Subject: Fwd: Delegation Developments for April 22, 2024 RCPH  
Date: April 21, 2024 9:20:32 PM  
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

---

Greetings -  
I am in complete agreement and fully support Mr. R. [REDACTED] Landael's objections as here listed. Sincerely,  
[REDACTED] Winston  
Surrey Resident

**From:** Ficocelli, Jennifer  
**To:** Clerks Department Webmail  
**Subject:** FW: Delegation Developments for April 22, 2024 RCPH  
**Date:** April 22, 2024 8:15:40 AM  
**Attachments:** image001.png  
**Importance:** High

Jennifer

JENNIFER FICOCELLI | CITY CLERK AND DIRECTOR LEGISLATIVE SERVICES

**CITY OF SURREY**

Legislative Services - Corporate Services

13450 104th Ave, Surrey, BC, Canada V3T 1V8

T 604.591.4380 [www.surrey.ca](http://www.surrey.ca)

**From:** R [REDACTED] Landale [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Sunday, April 21, 2024 3:04 PM

**To:** Locke, Brenda <Brenda.Locke@surrey.ca>; Stutt, Rob <Rob.Stutt@surrey.ca>; Elford, Doug <Doug.Elford@surrey.ca>; Hepner, Gordon <GHepner@surrey.ca>; Bains, Harry <Harry.Bains@surrey.ca>; Annis, Linda <Linda.Annis@surrey.ca>; Nagra, Mandeep <Mandeep.Nagra@surrey.ca>; Bose, Mike <Mike.Bose@surrey.ca>; Kooner, Pardeep <Pardeep.Kooner@surrey.ca>; Ficocelli, Jennifer <Jennifer.Ficocelli@surrey.ca>; Neuman, Scott <SNeuman@surrey.ca>; Luymes, Don <Don.Luymes@surrey.ca>; Chan, Nadia <NChan@surrey.ca>  
**Cc:** 'Tom Zytaruk' <tom.zytaruk@surreynowleader.com>; 'Lauren Collins' <lauren.collins@surreynowleader.com>; 'Peach Arch News' <editorial@peacearchnews.com>; 'Editor' <editor@cloverdalereporter.com>; editor@whiterocksun.com

**Subject:** RE: Delegation Developments for April 22, 2024 RCPH

**Importance:** High

To Council,

Please “Register” in objection to this Electronic Regular Council Public Hearing Meeting April 22nd.2024 in respect to ALL Development Applications noted and the Corporate Report “in Protest” to this new undemocratic degenerating process. Please be informed I will not be electronically participating in the meeting tonight.



It requires seven to eight trees to provide enough oxygen for one person per year.

**Have a nice protective meeting in “Isolation” from your Electors  
7921-0272-00 No support.**

**7921-0170-00 Absolute objection to the destruction of 14 of 28  
mature trees.**

**7923-0134-00 Absolute objection to the destruction of 33 of 33  
mature trees.**

**7920-0040-00 Absolute objection to the destruction of 41 of 42  
mature trees, on October 16, 2023 Council approved 7923-0166-00 to  
destroy 12 more trees.**

**7924-0020-00 No support.**

**CR 2024-R058 Absolute objection to amendments proposed in the  
“Darts Hill Neighbourhood Concept Plan  
Amendments” due to:**

**1. Terrible “undisclosed (*secretes*)” impacts on future  
tree destruction within the NCP designated area,  
and the Redwood Park Space, which includes  
portions of treed lands in the ALR.**

2. Inclusive of future negative environmental (streamside and Hazardous Steep Slope) impacts on Thomson Creek.

3. It is hereby noted and recorded the proposed amendments to the NCP impacts “8 LOTS City Purchased Designated Parkland (382,425m<sup>2</sup>)”, as generally outlined in Appendix I drawings.

4. Once adopted by Council tonight these lands as proposed will be sold off to Developers without Consultation to the “Electors Alternative Approval Process”, in accordance with the legal provisions of the CCC 26 (these City Parklands belong to everyone, to every single Property Taxpayer across all 6 Town centres that make up this “City of

Parks”, here in Surrey. Grave concerns are recorded herein in relation to page 2 quote: *“the City is reviewing many NCPs to ensure that parkland acquisition funds can be appropriately targeted in areas that will see an increase in family-oriented housing. This further increased density in neighbourhoods necessitates a review of future parkland recognizing that neighbourhood park space with active amenities will be even more desired by residents. In relation to Dart’s Hill, city staff have heard from area residents about the importance of neighbourhood parks in the plan area”*.

The proposed NCP amendments in this Corporate Report do exactly the opposite to the afore referenced quote, by redesignating City Parkland for development under the disguise of Bill 44.

**Only Council tonight can maintain Redwood Park as a natural park space on city owned land.**

5. Contrary to OCP Policy for proportionate Park Space per 10,000 residents, this proposed NCP amendments ignores City Policy, quote from page 5: *“Staff are proposing to redesignate 1734 and 1750 - 168 Street from ‘Proposed Park’ to ‘Medium Density Townhouse’ and to update the OCP to align with this change.”* The noted Park Lands are already “City Purchased Park land”, they are not “Proposed” until Council adopts this Corporate Report.

6. Consequential to the preceding 5 identified concerns this delegation concedes a degree of support for, quote: *“park specific amenities for the expansion of Darts Hill Garden Park once the property is acquired by the City.”*

10– DP/DVP's Approved April 22, 2024	Existing	Remove	Retain	Replace	Deficit	Green City Fund
<b>GRAND TOTALS</b>	229	184	26	316	141	49,200
<b>% of Existing Trees</b>	100.0%	80.3%	11.4%	138.0%	61.4%	

**26 City Trees will be destroyed with no compensation to the GCF**

0 DP & 0 DVPs include the possibility of City Boulevard trees could be destroyed TBD later

**SURREY TREE DEFORESTATION TABLE January to Dec,2024**

60 DP/DVPs Approved between January to December 2024	Existing	Remove	Retain	Replace	Deficit	Green City Fund
<b>GRAND TOTALS</b>	2,782	2,092	668	2,770	1,339	\$596,379.00
<b>% of Existing Trees</b>	100.0%	75.2%	24.0%	99.6%	48.1%	

**To date: 77 City Trees will be destroyed with 12 having no compensation to the GCF**

**HOW MANY TREES HAVE BEEN PLANTED SINCE OCTOBER 12th.2023 ??**

**( in theory  $\cong$  1,500 PER WEEK, 6 months later WHERE ARE the  
45,500 Trees? )**

(<https://www.surrey.ca/city-government/mayor-council/mayor-brenda-locke/mayorscorner#:~:text=This%20year%2C%20I%20signed%20the%20Global%20Trees%20in,you%20can%20help%20us%20grow%20our%20urban%20forest%3F> )

Timesheet: DPs and DVPs, started delegation writing process Friday April 19th 9:30am to Sunday April 21st. 3:00pm  
= 8.0 hours, (download, read, write and x'check)

Respectfully,

Ri [REDACTED] Landale.

Fleetwood Surrey, Resident.



# **SUMMARY OF PUBLIC HEARING SUBMISSIONS**

**April 22, 2024**  
**B.4 - 7920-0040-00**

Public Hearing Correspondence received  
after Thursday noon

ITEM	BYLAW	COMMENT
Opposition		
B.4	21200	R. Landale expressing opposition for the proposal citing trees.
B.4	21200	R. Winston expressing opposition for the proposal citing trees.

**From:** Ficocelli, Jennifer  
**To:** Clerks Department Webmail  
**Subject:** FW: Delegation Developments for April 22, 2024 RCPH  
**Date:** April 22, 2024 8:15:40 AM  
**Attachments:** image001.png  
**Importance:** High

Jennifer

JENNIFER FICOCELLI | CITY CLERK AND DIRECTOR LEGISLATIVE SERVICES

**CITY OF SURREY**

Legislative Services - Corporate Services

13450 104th Ave, Surrey, BC, Canada V3T 1V8

T 604.591.4380 [www.surrey.ca](http://www.surrey.ca)

**From:** R [REDACTED] Landale [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Sunday, April 21, 2024 3:04 PM

**To:** Locke, Brenda <Brenda.Locke@surrey.ca>; Stutt, Rob <Rob.Stutt@surrey.ca>; Elford, Doug <Doug.Elford@surrey.ca>; Hepner, Gordon <GHepner@surrey.ca>; Bains, Harry <Harry.Bains@surrey.ca>; Annis, Linda <Linda.Annis@surrey.ca>; Nagra, Mandeep <Mandeep.Nagra@surrey.ca>; Bose, Mike <Mike.Bose@surrey.ca>; Kooner, Pardeep <Pardeep.Kooner@surrey.ca>; Ficocelli, Jennifer <Jennifer.Ficocelli@surrey.ca>; Neuman, Scott <SNeuman@surrey.ca>; Luymes, Don <Don.Luymes@surrey.ca>; Chan, Nadia <NChan@surrey.ca>  
**Cc:** 'Tom Zytaruk' <tom.zytaruk@surreynowleader.com>; 'Lauren Collins' <lauren.collins@surreynowleader.com>; 'Peach Arch News' <editorial@peacearchnews.com>; 'Editor' <editor@cloverdalereporter.com>; editor@whiterocksun.com

**Subject:** RE: Delegation Developments for April 22, 2024 RCPH

**Importance:** High

To Council,

Please “Register” in objection to this Electronic Regular Council Public Hearing Meeting April 22nd.2024 in respect to ALL Development Applications noted and the Corporate Report “in Protest” to this new undemocratic degenerating process. Please be informed I will not be electronically participating in the meeting tonight.



It requires seven to eight trees to provide enough oxygen for one person per year.

**Have a nice protective meeting in “Isolation” from your Electors  
7921-0272-00 No support.**

**7921-0170-00 Absolute objection to the destruction of 14 of 28  
mature trees.**

**7923-0134-00 Absolute objection to the destruction of 33 of 33  
mature trees.**

**7920-0040-00 Absolute objection to the destruction of 41 of 42  
mature trees, on October 16, 2023 Council approved 7923-0166-00 to  
destroy 12 more trees.**

**7924-0020-00 No support.**

**CR 2024-R058 Absolute objection to amendments proposed in the  
“Darts Hill Neighbourhood Concept Plan  
Amendments” due to:**

**1. Terrible “undisclosed (*secretes*)” impacts on future  
tree destruction within the NCP designated area,  
and the Redwood Park Space, which includes  
portions of treed lands in the ALR.**

2. Inclusive of future negative environmental (streamside and Hazardous Steep Slope) impacts on Thomson Creek.

3. It is hereby noted and recorded the proposed amendments to the NCP impacts “8 LOTS City Purchased Designated Parkland (382,425m<sup>2</sup>)”, as generally outlined in Appendix I drawings.

4. Once adopted by Council tonight these lands as proposed will be sold off to Developers without Consultation to the “Electors Alternative Approval Process”, in accordance with the legal provisions of the CCC 26 (these City Parklands belong to everyone, to every single Property Taxpayer across all 6 Town centres that make up this “City of

Parks”, here in Surrey. Grave concerns are recorded herein in relation to page 2 quote: *“the City is reviewing many NCPs to ensure that parkland acquisition funds can be appropriately targeted in areas that will see an increase in family-oriented housing. This further increased density in neighbourhoods necessitates a review of future parkland recognizing that neighbourhood park space with active amenities will be even more desired by residents. In relation to Dart’s Hill, city staff have heard from area residents about the importance of neighbourhood parks in the plan area”*.

The proposed NCP amendments in this Corporate Report do exactly the opposite to the afore referenced quote, by redesignating City Parkland for development under the disguise of Bill 44.

**Only Council tonight can maintain Redwood Park as a natural park space on city owned land.**

5. Contrary to OCP Policy for proportionate Park Space per 10,000 residents, this proposed NCP amendments ignores City Policy, quote from page 5: *“Staff are proposing to redesignate 1734 and 1750 - 168 Street from ‘Proposed Park’ to ‘Medium Density Townhouse’ and to update the OCP to align with this change.”* The noted Park Lands are already “City Purchased Park land”, they are not “Proposed” until Council adopts this Corporate Report.

6. Consequential to the preceding 5 identified concerns this delegation concedes a degree of support for, quote: *“park specific amenities for the expansion of Darts Hill Garden Park once the property is acquired by the City.”*

10– DP/DVP's Approved April 22, 2024	Existing	Remove	Retain	Replace	Deficit	Green City Fund
<b>GRAND TOTALS</b>	229	184	26	316	141	49,200
<b>% of Existing Trees</b>	100.0%	80.3%	11.4%	138.0%	61.4%	

**26 City Trees will be destroyed with no compensation to the GCF**

0 DP & 0 DVPs include the possibility of City Boulevard trees could be destroyed TBD later

**SURREY TREE DEFORESTATION TABLE January to Dec,2024**

60 DP/DVPs Approved between January to December 2024	Existing	Remove	Retain	Replace	Deficit	Green City Fund
<b>GRAND TOTALS</b>	2,782	2,092	668	2,770	1,339	\$596,379.00
<b>% of Existing Trees</b>	100.0%	75.2%	24.0%	99.6%	48.1%	

**To date: 77 City Trees will be destroyed with 12 having no compensation to the GCF**

**HOW MANY TREES HAVE BEEN PLANTED SINCE OCTOBER 12th.2023 ??**

**( in theory  $\cong$  1,500 PER WEEK, 6 months later WHERE ARE the  
45,500 Trees? )**

(<https://www.surrey.ca/city-government/mayor-council/mayor-brenda-locke/mayorscorner#:~:text=This%20year%2C%20I%20signed%20the%20Global%20Trees%20in,you%20can%20help%20us%20grow%20our%20urban%20forest%3F> )

Timesheet: DPs and DVPs, started delegation writing process Friday April 19th 9:30am to Sunday April 21st. 3:00pm  
= 8.0 hours, (download, read, write and x'check)

Respectfully,

Ri [REDACTED] Landale.

Fleetwood Surrey, Resident.

From: [REDACTED] [\[REDACTED\]](#)  
To: [Locke, Brenda](#); [Clerks Department](#); [Webmail](#); [Stutt, Rob](#); [Hepler, Gordon](#); [Bains, Harry](#); [Bose, Mike](#); [Elford, Doug](#); [Kooner, Pardeep](#); [Annis, Linda](#); [Negra, Mandee](#)  
Subject: Fwd: Delegation Developments for April 22, 2024 RCPH  
Date: April 21, 2024 9:20:32 PM  
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

---

Greetings -

I am in complete agreement and fully support Mr. R. [REDACTED] Landael's objections as here listed. Sincerely,

[REDACTED] Winston

Surrey Resident



**From:** Ficocelli, Jennifer  
**To:** Clerks Department Webmail  
**Subject:** FW: Delegation Developments for April 22, 2024 RCPH  
**Date:** April 22, 2024 8:15:40 AM  
**Attachments:** image001.png  
**Importance:** High

Jennifer

JENNIFER FICOCELLI | CITY CLERK AND DIRECTOR LEGISLATIVE SERVICES

**CITY OF SURREY**

Legislative Services - Corporate Services

13450 104th Ave, Surrey, BC, Canada V3T 1V8

T 604.591.4380 [www.surrey.ca](http://www.surrey.ca)

**From:** R [REDACTED] Landale [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Sunday, April 21, 2024 3:04 PM

**To:** Locke, Brenda <Brenda.Locke@surrey.ca>; Stutt, Rob <Rob.Stutt@surrey.ca>; Elford, Doug <Doug.Elford@surrey.ca>; Hepner, Gordon <GHepner@surrey.ca>; Bains, Harry <Harry.Bains@surrey.ca>; Annis, Linda <Linda.Annis@surrey.ca>; Nagra, Mandeep <Mandeep.Nagra@surrey.ca>; Bose, Mike <Mike.Bose@surrey.ca>; Kooner, Pardeep <Pardeep.Kooner@surrey.ca>; Ficocelli, Jennifer <Jennifer.Ficocelli@surrey.ca>; Neuman, Scott <SNeuman@surrey.ca>; Luymes, Don <Don.Luymes@surrey.ca>; Chan, Nadia <NChan@surrey.ca>  
**Cc:** 'Tom Zytaruk' <tom.zytaruk@surreynowleader.com>; 'Lauren Collins' <lauren.collins@surreynowleader.com>; 'Peach Arch News' <editorial@peacearchnews.com>; 'Editor' <editor@cloverdalereporter.com>; editor@whiterocksun.com

**Subject:** RE: Delegation Developments for April 22, 2024 RCPH

**Importance:** High

To Council,

Please “Register” in objection to this Electronic Regular Council Public Hearing Meeting April 22nd.2024 in respect to ALL Development Applications noted and the Corporate Report “in Protest” to this new undemocratic degenerating process. Please be informed I will not be electronically participating in the meeting tonight.



It requires seven to eight trees to provide enough oxygen for one person per year.

**Have a nice protective meeting in “Isolation” from your Electors  
7921-0272-00 No support.**

**7921-0170-00 Absolute objection to the destruction of 14 of 28  
mature trees.**

**7923-0134-00 Absolute objection to the destruction of 33 of 33  
mature trees.**

**7920-0040-00 Absolute objection to the destruction of 41 of 42  
mature trees, on October 16, 2023 Council approved 7923-0166-00 to  
destroy 12 more trees.**

**7924-0020-00 No support.**

**CR 2024-R058 Absolute objection to amendments proposed in the  
“Darts Hill Neighbourhood Concept Plan  
Amendments” due to:**

**1. Terrible “undisclosed (*secretes*)” impacts on future  
tree destruction within the NCP designated area,  
and the Redwood Park Space, which includes  
portions of treed lands in the ALR.**

2. Inclusive of future negative environmental (streamside and Hazardous Steep Slope) impacts on Thomson Creek.

3. It is hereby noted and recorded the proposed amendments to the NCP impacts “8 LOTS City Purchased Designated Parkland (382,425m<sup>2</sup>)”, as generally outlined in Appendix I drawings.

4. Once adopted by Council tonight these lands as proposed will be sold off to Developers without Consultation to the “Electors Alternative Approval Process”, in accordance with the legal provisions of the CCC 26 (these City Parklands belong to everyone, to every single Property Taxpayer across all 6 Town centres that make up this “City of

Parks”, here in Surrey. Grave concerns are recorded herein in relation to page 2 quote: *“the City is reviewing many NCPs to ensure that parkland acquisition funds can be appropriately targeted in areas that will see an increase in family-oriented housing. This further increased density in neighbourhoods necessitates a review of future parkland recognizing that neighbourhood park space with active amenities will be even more desired by residents. In relation to Dart’s Hill, city staff have heard from area residents about the importance of neighbourhood parks in the plan area”*.

The proposed NCP amendments in this Corporate Report do exactly the opposite to the afore referenced quote, by redesignating City Parkland for development under the disguise of Bill 44.

**Only Council tonight can maintain Redwood Park as a natural park space on city owned land.**

5. Contrary to OCP Policy for proportionate Park Space per 10,000 residents, this proposed NCP amendments ignores City Policy, quote from page 5: *“Staff are proposing to redesignate 1734 and 1750 - 168 Street from ‘Proposed Park’ to ‘Medium Density Townhouse’ and to update the OCP to align with this change.”* The noted Park Lands are already “City Purchased Park land”, they are not “Proposed” until Council adopts this Corporate Report.

6. Consequential to the preceding 5 identified concerns this delegation concedes a degree of support for, quote: *“park specific amenities for the expansion of Darts Hill Garden Park once the property is acquired by the City.”*

10- DP/DVP's Approved April 22, 2024	Existing	Remove	Retain	Replace	Deficit	Green City Fund
<b>GRAND TOTALS</b>	229	184	26	316	141	49,200
<b>% of Existing Trees</b>	100.0%	80.3%	11.4%	138.0%	61.4%	

**26 City Trees will be destroyed with no compensation to the GCF**

0 DP & 0 DVPs include the possibility of City Boulevard trees could be destroyed TBD later

**SURREY TREE DEFORESTATION TABLE January to Dec,2024**

60 DP/DVPs Approved between January to December 2024	Existing	Remove	Retain	Replace	Deficit	Green City Fund
<b>GRAND TOTALS</b>	2,782	2,092	668	2,770	1,339	\$596,379.00
<b>% of Existing Trees</b>	100.0%	75.2%	24.0%	99.6%	48.1%	

**To date: 77 City Trees will be destroyed with 12 having no compensation to the GCF**

**HOW MANY TREES HAVE BEEN PLANTED SINCE OCTOBER 12th.2023 ??**

**( in theory  $\cong$  1,500 PER WEEK, 6 months later WHERE ARE the  
45,500 Trees? )**

(<https://www.surrey.ca/city-government/mayor-council/mayor-brenda-locke/mayorscorner#:~:text=This%20year%2C%20I%20signed%20the%20Global%20Trees%20in,you%20can%20help%20us%20grow%20our%20urban%20forest%3F> )

Timesheet: DPs and DVPs, started delegation writing process Friday April 19th 9:30am to Sunday April 21st. 3:00pm  
= 8.0 hours, (download, read, write and x'check)

Respectfully,

Ri [REDACTED] Landale.

Fleetwood Surrey, Resident.

# **SUMMARY OF PUBLIC HEARING SUBMISSIONS**

**April 22, 2024  
B.5 - 7924-0020-00**

Public Hearing Correspondence received  
after Thursday noon

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>APPLICATION</b>	<b>COMMENT</b>
Opposition		
B.5	7924-0020-00	K. Sollied expressing opposition for the proposal.
B.5	7924-0020-00	R. Landale expressing opposition for the proposal.
B.5	7924-0020-00	R. Winston expressing opposition for the proposal.
Concern		
B.5	7924-0020-00	A. Chen expressing concerns for the proposal citing noise.
B.5	7924-0020-00	J. Butler Smythe and L. Boni expressing concerns for the proposal citing noise, speeding, parking and quiet neighbourhood.

**From:** Ficocelli, Jennifer  
**To:** Clerks Department Webmail  
**Subject:** FW: Delegation Developments for April 22, 2024 RCPH  
**Date:** April 22, 2024 8:15:40 AM  
**Attachments:** image001.png  
**Importance:** High

Jennifer

JENNIFER FICOCELLI | CITY CLERK AND DIRECTOR LEGISLATIVE SERVICES

**CITY OF SURREY**

Legislative Services - Corporate Services

13450 104th Ave, Surrey, BC, Canada V3T 1V8

T 604.591.4380 [www.surrey.ca](http://www.surrey.ca)

**From:** R [REDACTED] Landale [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Sunday, April 21, 2024 3:04 PM

**To:** Locke, Brenda <Brenda.Locke@surrey.ca>; Stutt, Rob <Rob.Stutt@surrey.ca>; Elford, Doug <Doug.Elford@surrey.ca>; Hepner, Gordon <GHepner@surrey.ca>; Bains, Harry <Harry.Bains@surrey.ca>; Annis, Linda <Linda.Annis@surrey.ca>; Nagra, Mandeep <Mandeep.Nagra@surrey.ca>; Bose, Mike <Mike.Bose@surrey.ca>; Kooner, Pardeep <Pardeep.Kooner@surrey.ca>; Ficocelli, Jennifer <Jennifer.Ficocelli@surrey.ca>; Neuman, Scott <SNeuman@surrey.ca>; Luymes, Don <Don.Luymes@surrey.ca>; Chan, Nadia <NChan@surrey.ca>  
**Cc:** 'Tom Zytaruk' <tom.zytaruk@surreynowleader.com>; 'Lauren Collins' <lauren.collins@surreynowleader.com>; 'Peach Arch News' <editorial@peacearchnews.com>; 'Editor' <editor@cloverdalereporter.com>; editor@whiterocksun.com

**Subject:** RE: Delegation Developments for April 22, 2024 RCPH

**Importance:** High

To Council,

Please “Register” in objection to this Electronic Regular Council Public Hearing Meeting April 22nd.2024 in respect to ALL Development Applications noted and the Corporate Report “in Protest” to this new undemocratic degenerating process. Please be informed I will not be electronically participating in the meeting tonight.





It requires seven to eight trees to provide enough oxygen for one person per year.

**Have a nice protective meeting in “Isolation” from your Electors  
7921-0272-00 No support.**

**7921-0170-00 Absolute objection to the destruction of 14 of 28  
mature trees.**

**7923-0134-00 Absolute objection to the destruction of 33 of 33  
mature trees.**

**7920-0040-00 Absolute objection to the destruction of 41 of 42  
mature trees, on October 16, 2023 Council approved 7923-0166-00 to  
destroy 12 more trees.**

**7924-0020-00 No support.**

**CR 2024-R058 Absolute objection to amendments proposed in the  
“Darts Hill Neighbourhood Concept Plan  
Amendments” due to:**

**1. Terrible “undisclosed (*secretes*)” impacts on future  
tree destruction within the NCP designated area,  
and the Redwood Park Space, which includes  
portions of treed lands in the ALR.**

2. Inclusive of future negative environmental (streamside and Hazardous Steep Slope) impacts on Thomson Creek.

3. It is hereby noted and recorded the proposed amendments to the NCP impacts “8 LOTS City Purchased Designated Parkland (382,425m<sup>2</sup>)”, as generally outlined in Appendix I drawings.

4. Once adopted by Council tonight these lands as proposed will be sold off to Developers without Consultation to the “Electors Alternative Approval Process”, in accordance with the legal provisions of the CCC 26 (these City Parklands belong to everyone, to every single Property Taxpayer across all 6 Town centres that make up this “City of

Parks”, here in Surrey. Grave concerns are recorded herein in relation to page 2 quote: *“the City is reviewing many NCPs to ensure that parkland acquisition funds can be appropriately targeted in areas that will see an increase in family-oriented housing. This further increased density in neighbourhoods necessitates a review of future parkland recognizing that neighbourhood park space with active amenities will be even more desired by residents. In relation to Dart’s Hill, city staff have heard from area residents about the importance of neighbourhood parks in the plan area”*.

The proposed NCP amendments in this Corporate Report do exactly the opposite to the afore referenced quote, by redesignating City Parkland for development under the disguise of Bill 44.

**Only Council tonight can maintain Redwood Park as a natural park space on city owned land.**

5. Contrary to OCP Policy for proportionate Park Space per 10,000 residents, this proposed NCP amendments ignores City Policy, quote from page 5: *“Staff are proposing to redesignate 1734 and 1750 - 168 Street from ‘Proposed Park’ to ‘Medium Density Townhouse’ and to update the OCP to align with this change.”* The noted Park Lands are already “City Purchased Park land”, they are not “Proposed” until Council adopts this Corporate Report.

6. Consequential to the preceding 5 identified concerns this delegation concedes a degree of support for, quote: *“park specific amenities for the expansion of Darts Hill Garden Park once the property is acquired by the City.”*

10– DP/DVP's Approved April 22, 2024	Existing	Remove	Retain	Replace	Deficit	Green City Fund
<b>GRAND TOTALS</b>	229	184	26	316	141	49,200
<b>% of Existing Trees</b>	100.0%	80.3%	11.4%	138.0%	61.4%	

**26 City Trees will be destroyed with no compensation to the GCF**

0 DP & 0 DVPs include the possibility of City Boulevard trees could be destroyed TBD later

**SURREY TREE DEFORESTATION TABLE January to Dec,2024**

60 DP/DVPs Approved between January to December 2024	Existing	Remove	Retain	Replace	Deficit	Green City Fund
<b>GRAND TOTALS</b>	2,782	2,092	668	2,770	1,339	\$596,379.00
<b>% of Existing Trees</b>	100.0%	75.2%	24.0%	99.6%	48.1%	

**To date: 77 City Trees will be destroyed with 12 having no compensation to the GCF**

**HOW MANY TREES HAVE BEEN PLANTED SINCE OCTOBER 12th.2023 ??**

**( in theory  $\cong$  1,500 PER WEEK, 6 months later WHERE ARE the  
45,500 Trees? )**

(<https://www.surrey.ca/city-government/mayor-council/mayor-brenda-locke/mayorscorner#:~:text=This%20year%2C%20I%20signed%20the%20Global%20Trees%20in,you%20can%20help%20us%20grow%20our%20urban%20forest%3F> )

Timesheet: DPs and DVPs, started delegation writing process Friday April 19th 9:30am to Sunday April 21st. 3:00pm  
= 8.0 hours, (download, read, write and x'check)

Respectfully,

Ri [REDACTED] Landale.

Fleetwood Surrey, Resident.

From: [REDACTED] [\[REDACTED\]](#)  
To: [Locke, Brenda](#); [Clerks Department](#); [Webmail](#); [Stutt, Rob](#); [Hepler, Gordon](#); [Bains, Harry](#); [Bose, Mike](#); [Elford, Doug](#); [Kooner, Pardeep](#); [Annis, Linda](#); [Nagra, Mandeeep](#)  
Subject: Fwd: Delegation Developments for April 22, 2024 RCPH  
Date: April 21, 2024 9:20:32 PM  
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

---

Greetings -

I am in complete agreement and fully support Mr. R. [REDACTED] Landael's objections as here listed. Sincerely,

[REDACTED] Winston

Surrey Resident

**From:** Ficocelli, Jennifer  
**To:** Clerks Department Webmail  
**Subject:** FW: Delegation Developments for April 22, 2024 RCPH  
**Date:** April 22, 2024 8:15:40 AM  
**Attachments:** image001.png  
**Importance:** High

Jennifer

JENNIFER FICOCELLI | CITY CLERK AND DIRECTOR LEGISLATIVE SERVICES

**CITY OF SURREY**

Legislative Services - Corporate Services

13450 104th Ave, Surrey, BC, Canada V3T 1V8

T 604.591.4380 [www.surrey.ca](http://www.surrey.ca)

**From:** R [REDACTED] Landale [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Sunday, April 21, 2024 3:04 PM

**To:** Locke, Brenda <Brenda.Locke@surrey.ca>; Stutt, Rob <Rob.Stutt@surrey.ca>; Elford, Doug <Doug.Elford@surrey.ca>; Hepner, Gordon <GHepner@surrey.ca>; Bains, Harry <Harry.Bains@surrey.ca>; Annis, Linda <Linda.Annis@surrey.ca>; Nagra, Mandeep <Mandeep.Nagra@surrey.ca>; Bose, Mike <Mike.Bose@surrey.ca>; Kooner, Pardeep <Pardeep.Kooner@surrey.ca>; Ficocelli, Jennifer <Jennifer.Ficocelli@surrey.ca>; Neuman, Scott <SNeuman@surrey.ca>; Luymes, Don <Don.Luymes@surrey.ca>; Chan, Nadia <NChan@surrey.ca>  
**Cc:** 'Tom Zytaruk' <tom.zytaruk@surreynowleader.com>; 'Lauren Collins' <lauren.collins@surreynowleader.com>; 'Peach Arch News' <editorial@peacearchnews.com>; 'Editor' <editor@cloverdalereporter.com>; editor@whiterocksun.com

**Subject:** RE: Delegation Developments for April 22, 2024 RCPH

**Importance:** High

To Council,

**Please “Register” in objection to this Electronic Regular Council Public Hearing Meeting April 22nd.2024 in respect to ALL Development Applications noted and the Corporate Report “in Protest” to this new undemocratic degenerating process. Please be informed I will not be electronically participating in the meeting tonight.**



It requires seven to eight trees to provide enough oxygen for one person per year.

**Have a nice protective meeting in “Isolation” from your Electors  
7921-0272-00 No support.**

**7921-0170-00 Absolute objection to the destruction of 14 of 28  
mature trees.**

**7923-0134-00 Absolute objection to the destruction of 33 of 33  
mature trees.**

**7920-0040-00 Absolute objection to the destruction of 41 of 42  
mature trees, on October 16, 2023 Council approved 7923-0166-00 to  
destroy 12 more trees.**

**7924-0020-00 No support.**

**CR 2024-R058 Absolute objection to amendments proposed in the  
“Darts Hill Neighbourhood Concept Plan  
Amendments” due to:**

**1. Terrible “undisclosed (*secretes*)” impacts on future  
tree destruction within the NCP designated area,  
and the Redwood Park Space, which includes  
portions of treed lands in the ALR.**

2. Inclusive of future negative environmental (streamside and Hazardous Steep Slope) impacts on Thomson Creek.

3. It is hereby noted and recorded the proposed amendments to the NCP impacts “8 LOTS City Purchased Designated Parkland (382,425m<sup>2</sup>)”, as generally outlined in Appendix I drawings.

4. Once adopted by Council tonight these lands as proposed will be sold off to Developers without Consultation to the “Electors Alternative Approval Process”, in accordance with the legal provisions of the CCC 26 (these City Parklands belong to everyone, to every single Property Taxpayer across all 6 Town centres that make up this “City of

Parks”, here in Surrey. Grave concerns are recorded herein in relation to page 2 quote: *“the City is reviewing many NCPs to ensure that parkland acquisition funds can be appropriately targeted in areas that will see an increase in family-oriented housing. This further increased density in neighbourhoods necessitates a review of future parkland recognizing that neighbourhood park space with active amenities will be even more desired by residents. In relation to Dart’s Hill, city staff have heard from area residents about the importance of neighbourhood parks in the plan area”*.

The proposed NCP amendments in this Corporate Report do exactly the opposite to the afore referenced quote, by redesignating City Parkland for development under the disguise of Bill 44.

**Only Council tonight can maintain Redwood Park as a natural park space on city owned land.**



5. Contrary to OCP Policy for proportionate Park Space per 10,000 residents, this proposed NCP amendments ignores City Policy, quote from page 5: *“Staff are proposing to redesignate 1734 and 1750 - 168 Street from ‘Proposed Park’ to ‘Medium Density Townhouse’ and to update the OCP to align with this change.”* The noted Park Lands are already “City Purchased Park land”, they are not “Proposed” until Council adopts this Corporate Report.

6. Consequential to the preceding 5 identified concerns this delegation concedes a degree of support for, quote: *“park specific amenities for the expansion of Darts Hill Garden Park once the property is acquired by the City.”*

10– DP/DVP's Approved April 22, 2024	Existing	Remove	Retain	Replace	Deficit	Green City Fund
<b>GRAND TOTALS</b>	229	184	26	316	141	49,200
<b>% of Existing Trees</b>	100.0%	80.3%	11.4%	138.0%	61.4%	

**26 City Trees will be destroyed with no compensation to the GCF**

0 DP & 0 DVPs include the possibility of City Boulevard trees could be destroyed TBD later

**SURREY TREE DEFORESTATION TABLE January to Dec,2024**

60 DP/DVPs Approved between January to December 2024	Existing	Remove	Retain	Replace	Deficit	Green City Fund
<b>GRAND TOTALS</b>	2,782	2,092	668	2,770	1,339	\$596,379.00
<b>% of Existing Trees</b>	100.0%	75.2%	24.0%	99.6%	48.1%	

**To date: 77 City Trees will be destroyed with 12 having no compensation to the GCF**

**HOW MANY TREES HAVE BEEN PLANTED SINCE OCTOBER 12th.2023 ??**

**( in theory  $\cong$  1,500 PER WEEK, 6 months later WHERE ARE the  
45,500 Trees? )**

(<https://www.surrey.ca/city-government/mayor-council/mayor-brenda-locke/mayorscorner#:~:text=This%20year%2C%20I%20signed%20the%20Global%20Trees%20in,you%20can%20help%20us%20grow%20our%20urban%20forest%3F> )

Timesheet: DPs and DVPs, started delegation writing process Friday April 19th 9:30am to Sunday April 21st. 3:00pm  
= 8.0 hours, (download, read, write and x'check)

Respectfully,

Ri [REDACTED] Landale.

Fleetwood Surrey, Resident.

# **SUMMARY OF PUBLIC HEARING SUBMISSIONS**

**April 22, 2024  
B.6 - CR 2024- R058**

Public Hearing Correspondence received  
after Thursday noon

ITEM	BYLAW	COMMENT
Opposition		
CR 2024-R058	21215	R. Landale expressing opposition for the proposal citing trees and future negative environmental impacts.
CR 2024-R058	21215	R. Winston expressing opposition for the proposal citing trees and future negative environmental impacts.

**From:** Ficocelli, Jennifer  
**To:** Clerks Department Webmail  
**Subject:** FW: Delegation Developments for April 22, 2024 RCPH  
**Date:** April 22, 2024 8:15:40 AM  
**Attachments:** image001.png  
**Importance:** High

Jennifer

JENNIFER FICOCELLI | CITY CLERK AND DIRECTOR LEGISLATIVE SERVICES

**CITY OF SURREY**

Legislative Services - Corporate Services

13450 104th Ave, Surrey, BC, Canada V3T 1V8

T 604.591.4380 [www.surrey.ca](http://www.surrey.ca)

**From:** R [REDACTED] Landale [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Sunday, April 21, 2024 3:04 PM

**To:** Locke, Brenda <Brenda.Locke@surrey.ca>; Stutt, Rob <Rob.Stutt@surrey.ca>; Elford, Doug <Doug.Elford@surrey.ca>; Hepner, Gordon <GHepner@surrey.ca>; Bains, Harry <Harry.Bains@surrey.ca>; Annis, Linda <Linda.Annis@surrey.ca>; Nagra, Mandeep <Mandeep.Nagra@surrey.ca>; Bose, Mike <Mike.Bose@surrey.ca>; Kooner, Pardeep <Pardeep.Kooner@surrey.ca>; Ficocelli, Jennifer <Jennifer.Ficocelli@surrey.ca>; Neuman, Scott <SNeuman@surrey.ca>; Luymes, Don <Don.Luymes@surrey.ca>; Chan, Nadia <NChan@surrey.ca>  
**Cc:** 'Tom Zytaruk' <tom.zytaruk@surreynowleader.com>; 'Lauren Collins' <lauren.collins@surreynowleader.com>; 'Peach Arch News' <editorial@peacearchnews.com>; 'Editor' <editor@cloverdalereporter.com>; editor@whiterocksun.com

**Subject:** RE: Delegation Developments for April 22, 2024 RCPH

**Importance:** High

To Council,

Please “Register” in objection to this Electronic Regular Council Public Hearing Meeting April 22nd.2024 in respect to ALL Development Applications noted and the Corporate Report “in Protest” to this new undemocratic degenerating process. Please be informed I will not be electronically participating in the meeting tonight.



**Have a nice protective meeting in “Isolation” from your Electors  
7921-0272-00 No support.**

**7921-0170-00 Absolute objection to the destruction of 14 of 28  
mature trees.**

**7923-0134-00 Absolute objection to the destruction of 33 of 33  
mature trees.**

**7920-0040-00 Absolute objection to the destruction of 41 of 42  
mature trees, on October 16, 2023 Council approved 7923-0166-00 to  
destroy 12 more trees.**

**7924-0020-00 No support.**

**CR 2024-R058 Absolute objection to amendments proposed in the  
“Darts Hill Neighbourhood Concept Plan  
Amendments” due to:**

**1. Terrible “undisclosed (*secretes*)” impacts on future  
tree destruction within the NCP designated area,  
and the Redwood Park Space, which includes  
portions of treed lands in the ALR.**

2. Inclusive of future negative environmental (streamside and Hazardous Steep Slope) impacts on Thomson Creek.

3. It is hereby noted and recorded the proposed amendments to the NCP impacts “8 LOTS City Purchased Designated Parkland (382,425m<sup>2</sup>)”, as generally outlined in Appendix I drawings.

4. Once adopted by Council tonight these lands as proposed will be sold off to Developers without Consultation to the “Electors Alternative Approval Process”, in accordance with the legal provisions of the CCC 26 (these City Parklands belong to everyone, to every single Property Taxpayer across all 6 Town centres that make up this “City of

Parks”, here in Surrey. Grave concerns are recorded herein in relation to page 2 quote: *“the City is reviewing many NCPs to ensure that parkland acquisition funds can be appropriately targeted in areas that will see an increase in family-oriented housing. This further increased density in neighbourhoods necessitates a review of future parkland recognizing that neighbourhood park space with active amenities will be even more desired by residents. In relation to Dart’s Hill, city staff have heard from area residents about the importance of neighbourhood parks in the plan area”*.

The proposed NCP amendments in this Corporate Report do exactly the opposite to the afore referenced quote, by redesignating City Parkland for development under the disguise of Bill 44.

**Only Council tonight can maintain Redwood Park as a natural park space on city owned land.**

5. Contrary to OCP Policy for proportionate Park Space per 10,000 residents, this proposed NCP amendments ignores City Policy, quote from page 5: *“Staff are proposing to redesignate 1734 and 1750 - 168 Street from ‘Proposed Park’ to ‘Medium Density Townhouse’ and to update the OCP to align with this change.”* The noted Park Lands are already “City Purchased Park land”, they are not “Proposed” until Council adopts this Corporate Report.

6. Consequential to the preceding 5 identified concerns this delegation concedes a degree of support for, quote: *“park specific amenities for the expansion of Darts Hill Garden Park once the property is acquired by the City.”*

10– DP/DVP's Approved April 22, 2024	Existing	Remove	Retain	Replace	Deficit	Green City Fund
<b>GRAND TOTALS</b>	229	184	26	316	141	49,200
<b>% of Existing Trees</b>	100.0%	80.3%	11.4%	138.0%	61.4%	

**26 City Trees will be destroyed with no compensation to the GCF**

0 DP & 0 DVPs include the possibility of City Boulevard trees could be destroyed TBD later

**SURREY TREE DEFORESTATION TABLE January to Dec,2024**

60 DP/DVPs Approved between January to December 2024	Existing	Remove	Retain	Replace	Deficit	Green City Fund
<b>GRAND TOTALS</b>	2,782	2,092	668	2,770	1,339	\$596,379.00
<b>% of Existing Trees</b>	100.0%	75.2%	24.0%	99.6%	48.1%	

**To date: 77 City Trees will be destroyed with 12 having no compensation to the GCF**

**HOW MANY TREES HAVE BEEN PLANTED SINCE OCTOBER 12th.2023 ??**



**( in theory  $\cong$  1,500 PER WEEK, 6 months later WHERE ARE the  
45,500 Trees? )**

(<https://www.surrey.ca/city-government/mayor-council/mayor-brenda-locke/mayorscorner#:~:text=This%20year%2C%20I%20signed%20the%20Global%20Trees%20in,you%20can%20help%20us%20grow%20our%20urban%20forest%3F> )

Timesheet: DPs and DVPs, started delegation writing process Friday April 19th 9:30am to Sunday April 21st. 3:00pm  
= 8.0 hours, (download, read, write and x'check)

Respectfully,

Ri [REDACTED] Landale.

Fleetwood Surrey, Resident.

From: [REDACTED]  
To: [Locke, Brenda](#); [Clerks Department](#); [Webmail](#); [Stutt, Rob](#); [Hepler, Gordon](#); [Bains, Harry](#); [Bose, Mike](#); [Elford, Doug](#); [Kooner, Pardeep](#); [Annis, Linda](#); [Nagra, Mandeeep](#)  
Subject: Fwd: Delegation Developments for April 22, 2024 RCPH  
Date: April 21, 2024 9:20:32 PM  
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

---

Greetings -  
I am in complete agreement and fully support Mr. R [REDACTED] Landael's objections as here listed. Sincerely,  
[REDACTED] Winston  
Surrey Resident

**From:** Ficocelli, Jennifer  
**To:** Clerks Department Webmail  
**Subject:** FW: Delegation Developments for April 22, 2024 RCPH  
**Date:** April 22, 2024 8:15:40 AM  
**Attachments:** image001.png  
**Importance:** High

Jennifer

JENNIFER FICOCELLI | CITY CLERK AND DIRECTOR LEGISLATIVE SERVICES

**CITY OF SURREY**

Legislative Services - Corporate Services

13450 104th Ave, Surrey, BC, Canada V3T 1V8

T 604.591.4380 [www.surrey.ca](http://www.surrey.ca)

**From:** R [REDACTED] Landale [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Sunday, April 21, 2024 3:04 PM

**To:** Locke, Brenda <Brenda.Locke@surrey.ca>; Stutt, Rob <Rob.Stutt@surrey.ca>; Elford, Doug <Doug.Elford@surrey.ca>; Hepner, Gordon <GHepner@surrey.ca>; Bains, Harry <Harry.Bains@surrey.ca>; Annis, Linda <Linda.Annis@surrey.ca>; Nagra, Mandeep <Mandeep.Nagra@surrey.ca>; Bose, Mike <Mike.Bose@surrey.ca>; Kooner, Pardeep <Pardeep.Kooner@surrey.ca>; Ficocelli, Jennifer <Jennifer.Ficocelli@surrey.ca>; Neuman, Scott <SNeuman@surrey.ca>; Luymes, Don <Don.Luymes@surrey.ca>; Chan, Nadia <NChan@surrey.ca>  
**Cc:** 'Tom Zytaruk' <tom.zytaruk@surreynowleader.com>; 'Lauren Collins' <lauren.collins@surreynowleader.com>; 'Peach Arch News' <editorial@peacearchnews.com>; 'Editor' <editor@cloverdalereporter.com>; editor@whiterocksun.com

**Subject:** RE: Delegation Developments for April 22, 2024 RCPH

**Importance:** High

To Council,

Please “Register” in objection to this Electronic Regular Council Public Hearing Meeting April 22nd.2024 in respect to ALL Development Applications noted and the Corporate Report “in Protest” to this new undemocratic degenerating process. Please be informed I will not be electronically participating in the meeting tonight.



It requires seven to eight trees to provide enough oxygen for one person per year.

**Have a nice protective meeting in “Isolation” from your Electors  
7921-0272-00 No support.**

**7921-0170-00 Absolute objection to the destruction of 14 of 28  
mature trees.**

**7923-0134-00 Absolute objection to the destruction of 33 of 33  
mature trees.**

**7920-0040-00 Absolute objection to the destruction of 41 of 42  
mature trees, on October 16, 2023 Council approved 7923-0166-00 to  
destroy 12 more trees.**

**7924-0020-00 No support.**

**CR 2024-R058 Absolute objection to amendments proposed in the  
“Darts Hill Neighbourhood Concept Plan  
Amendments” due to:**

**1. Terrible “undisclosed (*secretes*)” impacts on future  
tree destruction within the NCP designated area,  
and the Redwood Park Space, which includes  
portions of treed lands in the ALR.**

2. Inclusive of future negative environmental (streamside and Hazardous Steep Slope) impacts on Thomson Creek.

3. It is hereby noted and recorded the proposed amendments to the NCP impacts “8 LOTS City Purchased Designated Parkland (382,425m<sup>2</sup>)”, as generally outlined in Appendix I drawings.

4. Once adopted by Council tonight these lands as proposed will be sold off to Developers without Consultation to the “Electors Alternative Approval Process”, in accordance with the legal provisions of the CCC 26 (these City Parklands belong to everyone, to every single Property Taxpayer across all 6 Town centres that make up this “City of

Parks”, here in Surrey. Grave concerns are recorded herein in relation to page 2 quote: *“the City is reviewing many NCPs to ensure that parkland acquisition funds can be appropriately targeted in areas that will see an increase in family-oriented housing. This further increased density in neighbourhoods necessitates a review of future parkland recognizing that neighbourhood park space with active amenities will be even more desired by residents. In relation to Dart’s Hill, city staff have heard from area residents about the importance of neighbourhood parks in the plan area”*.

The proposed NCP amendments in this Corporate Report do exactly the opposite to the afore referenced quote, by redesignating City Parkland for development under the disguise of Bill 44.

**Only Council tonight can maintain Redwood Park as a natural park space on city owned land.**

5. Contrary to OCP Policy for proportionate Park Space per 10,000 residents, this proposed NCP amendments ignores City Policy, quote from page 5: *“Staff are proposing to redesignate 1734 and 1750 - 168 Street from ‘Proposed Park’ to ‘Medium Density Townhouse’ and to update the OCP to align with this change.”* The noted Park Lands are already “City Purchased Park land”, they are not “Proposed” until Council adopts this Corporate Report.

6. Consequential to the preceding 5 identified concerns this delegation concedes a degree of support for, quote: *“park specific amenities for the expansion of Darts Hill Garden Park once the property is acquired by the City.”*

10– DP/DVP's Approved April 22, 2024	Existing	Remove	Retain	Replace	Deficit	Green City Fund
<b>GRAND TOTALS</b>	229	184	26	316	141	49,200
<b>% of Existing Trees</b>	100.0%	80.3%	11.4%	138.0%	61.4%	

**26 City Trees will be destroyed with no compensation to the GCF**

0 DP & 0 DVPs include the possibility of City Boulevard trees could be destroyed TBD later

**SURREY TREE DEFORESTATION TABLE January to Dec,2024**

60 DP/DVPs Approved between January to December 2024	Existing	Remove	Retain	Replace	Deficit	Green City Fund
<b>GRAND TOTALS</b>	2,782	2,092	668	2,770	1,339	\$596,379.00
<b>% of Existing Trees</b>	100.0%	75.2%	24.0%	99.6%	48.1%	

**To date: 77 City Trees will be destroyed with 12 having no compensation to the GCF**

**HOW MANY TREES HAVE BEEN PLANTED SINCE OCTOBER 12th.2023 ??**

**( in theory  $\cong$  1,500 PER WEEK, 6 months later WHERE ARE the  
45,500 Trees? )**

(<https://www.surrey.ca/city-government/mayor-council/mayor-brenda-locke/mayorscorner#:~:text=This%20year%2C%20I%20signed%20the%20Global%20Trees%20in,you%20can%20help%20us%20grow%20our%20urban%20forest%3F> )

Timesheet: DPs and DVPs, started delegation writing process Friday April 19th 9:30am to Sunday April 21st. 3:00pm  
= 8.0 hours, (download, read, write and x'check)

Respectfully,

Ri [REDACTED] Landale.

Fleetwood Surrey, Resident.