



Draft Meeting Notes

Citizen's Advisory Committee Meeting 3

Date/Time: Thursday, September 9th 5:30-8:00
Place: South Surrey Recreation Centre 14601 – 20th Avenue
Next Meeting: Thursday, September 30th
Attendees: Arnold Fenrick, CAC Member
Avtar Johl, CAC Member
Brad Lambert, CAC Member
Chuck Brook, CAC Member
Cindy Lightheart, CAC Member
Delmar Robertson, CAC Member
Eric Chen, CAC Member
Mike Proskow, CAC Member
Nadine Adams, CAC Member
Norm Porter, CAC Member
Paul Fenske, CAC Member
Prit Pal Sandhu, CAC Member
Vena Sandhu, CAC Member
Bhargav Parghi, City of Surrey
Don Luymes, City of Surrey
Fay Wong, City of Surrey
Mira Petrovic, City of Surrey
Remi Dube, City of Surrey
Stephen Godwin, City of Surrey
John Steil, Stantec
Siobhan Murphy, Stantec

Absentees: Anthony Hepworth, CAC Member

Distribution: All in attendance + absentees

Welcome: Community Planning Manager Don welcomed CAC members to the third meeting. Luymes then turned the meeting over to John who continued the meeting.

Agenda: The agenda for the meeting was reviewed, which was followed by John making the CAC aware of the availability of the **CAC #2 meeting notes** and asked the group if there were any items that were missed from the meeting notes.

At this point, there was a request to discuss the revised schedule, which included two additional meetings, and a slight variation in meeting times and date. City staff wanted the CAC to see the Draft Scenarios and have discussion several times before the next Public Open House. Norm requested a discussion about the decision to not include an alternate that was made at the last meeting when he was not present.

Eric said that the consultants do not represent him although he is a member of the Developers group. He wants to be free to express his own opinions. Norm felt in general that there was poor optics in terms of CAC membership with respect to consultants representing the Developers group being part of the CAC, that it left the CAC open to criticism and that they (the consultants) should remove themselves. Eric said he is not getting the information he needs from the Developers group's consultants. Norm explained that the developers pay the consultants based on the percentage of hectares that they own.

John reiterated his concern about the CAC membership issue, which has been discussed at both of the previous meetings; that he wants the process to move forward with the established CAC structure. Don agreed and reminded the committee that their role is to advise; that there is no voting. Avtar said the Developers group had paid for a lot of work that has already been completed.

Mike said it was important to provide several options for each issue, to provide a range of choices, because not everyone on the CAC will agree. John acknowledged this, but noted that it was important for the CAC to make recommendations, for example about the planning principles, which will continue to evolve. Mike said he wants a way to represent divergent views.

Nadine said she would not be able to attend the new October CAC meeting date and that she was one person representing a group of people. She was able to commit to the original schedule, but feels she will be letting down her group now with the revised schedule.

Avtar reminded the CAC that members represent the community and themselves. Norm expressed his opinion again about unbalanced representation on the CAC. Avtar says he feels it is a strength of the process. John tabled this discussion, and reiterated the purpose of his role, which is to endeavor to make sure all people's interests are represented at the CAC meetings.

Minutes: There were no issues with the minutes. They stand.

Binder: Reminder of the revised General Land Use Plan (GLUP) map distributed at CAC #2, but no new additions at this meeting. Bhargav explained why the map had been corrected.

Discussion: Sustainability Charter – Indicators & Checklists

Siobhan made a brief explanation in response to a request by Mike at CAC #2 about how the Sustainability Charter, Sustainability Checklists, and Sustainability Indicators could impact secondary plans such as Grandview Heights NCP #4.

- The Sustainability Charter was completed in 2009
- A Sustainability Checklist is currently being developed by the City and will likely be forwarded to Council for approval in early 2011
- Don Luymes added that he has developed an informal checklist in the Planning Department that includes six criteria: density, jobs/resident ratio, land use mix, residential type mix; percentage of green space; proximity to transit and amenities.

Mike asked how it is being received. Currently Don has run it by the Development Advisory Committee, and will be presenting it to the Sustainability Indicators Taskforce and the Environmental Advisory Committee.

Dinner Break

Vision Discussion

John described some of the changes made since the last meeting.

Principles Discussion

John described the Planning Principles, which start with several general planning principles, and are then broken down into particular land use issues. He said some of the planning principles are objective, some are measurable, some are broader; some more specific.

4.1 Overall Principles comments:

There was discussion about validity of using the GLUP as the starting point for developing the Planning Principles. One view is that it is outdated and could be more innovative, that it should also consider new information. The other view is that the GLUP is only a starting point and that there was room to improve/amend the GLUP and improve the NCP. Some changes were already proposed (adding 9 lots on 16th Ave; adjusting boundaries of Science of the Soul). It was generally agreed that the wording should be that new changes will have to be justified on sound planning, innovative ideas, and new information.

4.2 Environment comments:

There needs to be consistency using the words 'shall' and 'will' in the Principles. Avtar said the second bullet in 4.2 referring to clustering being used as a tool to increase open space is not equitable. This is also in 4.4 Housing (last bullet).

Mike supports clustering as a tool to preserve green space—it's an important tool. Avtar said he had an issue with the word 'equitable'—If the clustering is fixed; it's not that equitable in terms of exchange. John suggested that a new bullet be made under 4.2 and delete clustering and just discuss density transfer. Don said it's important to note where clustering starts. Norm cited an example of a clustering that saved 50% for green space. Avtar said the North Grandview amendment, which was a similar situation in terms of clustering, was not working well.

The Planning Principles are meant to be general and broad, and can be refined in more detailed design. It would be useful to revisit this line of discussion when looking at the three draft Land Use Scenarios.

Norm said he thinks clustering and density transfer needs to go with the land use, and the minimum parcel sizes that are designated for that land use. There also needs to be a negotiation between neighbours. The NCP has to attach the right density. He does not agree with taking out the words 'equity' and 'density transfer'. He also suggested adding to the fifth bullet - 'existing and urban' before tree canopy.

4.3 Edges and Transition

Wording about the Agricultural Land Commission and City's Agricultural Advisory Committee's approval of transitions along the edges of the Agricultural Land Reserve is to be revised to refer to City Policy.

Avtar noted he had forwarded a report on agricultural interface for distribution to CAC members.

John will email the report to CAC members along with three other documents. They were City Policy 0-23 about Residential Buffering Adjacent to the ALR/Agricultural Boundary, pages 10 and 11 from the GLUP which outlines the Council-approved policy, and a separate document that interprets the Council Policy 0-23 and the Development Permit Guidelines of the OCP specifically in the context of Grandview Heights NCP #4. This will be discussed at the next meeting.

4.4 Housing

Avtar would like to see more flexibility in distributing density throughout the community.

4.5 Commercial/Community Focus

There was discussion about the need for the community to be integrated using a range of transportation modes: walking, cycling, and driving. This provides community focus.

Norm thought the word ‘neighborhood –based’ should be broadened. John referred to the marketing study done by Coriolis Consulting, which recommended making a larger commercial centre to the west of NCP #4, which would be more central for all of Grandview to access. The NCP #4 commercial site would provide more local service. Norm said he had also commissioned a report that found that the word ‘neighborhood-based’ is too confining. He said there is an implied scale here, and that word should be removed because it is too site specific.

Eric stressed that businesses need to be viable. Eric preferred commercial at 176 St and 24 Ave as it should not have a school nearby, citing safety and transportation concerns. Chuck said he interpreted ‘neighborhood-based’ to mean that it is designed to serve the local residents. He also said a community heart is a very important component of place-making, and that there are many good examples of it. If future residents need more items than the local amenities can provide, they can go to a larger centre further away. Brad mentioned Grandview Corners as an example of a commercial area that has a village feel that he likes, which has no school nearby. Norm did not disagree with the last two points by Lambert and Brook with reference to the viability and the village feel, but does not think that we need to be specific at the principle level. But he also thinks it is important to emphasize vibrancy and viability. He would like to make the Principle broad so that it is not limiting. John said it appeared that the committee was not making any headway on this point and the Draft Land Use Scenarios would put alternatives forward on this.

Mike said this is an important issue because NCP #4 is quite isolated; the development of this NCP needs to be creative and carefully thought out. Avtar noted that the GLUP says the commercial area is to be at a neighborhood scale.

4.6 Transportation

City of Surrey Transportation Engineer Mira Petrovic provided comments on transportation specifically as it relates to Hwy 15 and accessibility. Her points included:

- The City is constrained by the requirements by the Province’s Ministry of Transportation (MoT). MoT generally limits access to 400m intervals; City of Surrey prefers 200 m combining full and restricted movements. Access every 400 m will work well for all turning movements into/from the community and limited right in right out accesses at 200 m along Hwy 15 and 24 Ave will be dispersed local traffic more evenly throughout the neighborhood.

- 24 Ave is very important at the local level since it connects Campbell Heights (a significant employment area) with Grandview Corners (a regional shopping centre) and Hwy 99.
- 4.6 is a good principle that will make the community livable and workable
- The whole area needs to be interconnected; the City can work around the special areas
- In reference to the grid network, all local traffic will go from neighborhood roads to main roads; block size in the local roads system should be between 100 – 120 m not exceeding 200 m in some instances; site specific examples will be different and general planning principles should be high-level.
- Accessibility for Commercial areas: generally, developers like them at intersections of major roads, but accessibility of these locations create safety issues. Access to commercial areas should be from public roads within the neighborhood.
- Local neighborhood traffic is not considered cutting through traffic since it is the traffic of people that live in the same well connected neighborhood. Roads ending with cul-de-sacs are not considered as a part of the local road network since they do not provide any connectivity and serves private homes only. It is important to consider adjacent areas and create an open and connected community and keep local traffic and neighborhood circulation off major arterials.
- School location should be accessible from local roads, maximum from collector roads, and fronting at least two roads.

4.7 Amenities

There was some concern about the proximity of retail to schools.

4.8 Servicing

Brad does not like the implications of the word ‘staged’. Don clarified that what Brad Lambert meant was whether one area must be built out before another area is begun, which is not the intent here.

Norm questioned the note on the first bullet, which discusses acquisition for transportation and utilities. Don clarified that it is important to understand that developers and owners will be absorbing the cost of servicing. Servicing will decide the viability of development.

Remi noted developers pay the servicing costs. The trunk servicing is usually included in the 10-year servicing plan, but it may not make it into the 10 year plan. (The Terms of Reference for NCP #4 state: *The Owners' Group understands and agrees that the works undertaken may not be included in the 10 year Servicing Plan and may not be eligible for DCC rebates. If the cost of works exceeds DCC revenues for the area, special levies may be charged. Cost recovery may be achieved through the Development Works Agreement Process, which requires successful petitioning of benefiting properties and a By-law.*)

4.9 Urban Design

Nadine: At Morgan Creek, there are limited entrances and better design for neighborhoods. She wants to see a more organic flow.

4.10 Heritage

No comments.

4.11 Implementation

General comments about the sequencing/staging of development: please take out all of the wording on staging and sequencing. The second bullet with the phrase 'phased rezonings' is standard planning practice in Surrey.

Avtar noted this principle is missing compensation for landowners. It was in the July 21st draft, fourth bullet. Don said the City of Surrey compensates usually through density. A fund could be established that everyone pays into. There are alternatives in the legislation. May have to negotiate if the City does not want to give much density. This issue will have to be addressed again.

Item: Draft Land Use Scenarios Discussion

John presented the rationale and basic differences between three alternatives.

Brad: The school sites in Scenario 1 and 2 are the same, but is in a different location in Scenario 3.

Mira: The roads are represented by lines only, they are not to scale for now.

Eric: Wants to see less access to Hwy 15 in all of the scenarios.

Mike: Is there light-controlled access points every 400m onto 176th? Because there is a rise in elevation on 176th. That's a real problem: trucks rush the lights going up and down hills. Through traffic is a priority, but we need right-of-ways east and west. There are a lot of challenges. Mira: We (City of Surrey) have to plan for both. 400 m is a very large distance. But accessibility and safety is a priority for NCP #4. Avtar: What does the Ministry of Transportation (MoT) want? John: At the first Inter-Agency Committee meeting, they said 400m. John Steil: Right in /Right out requires additional right-of-way.

Mira: MoT will put medians up. We need to address what's on the other side of 176th to understand the east/west connections. For frontage, you need a lot of space. 24th Ave will be 6 lanes in 30 years. We need setbacks and buffers for major roads.

John: Buffering is shown along 176th for all three scenarios.

Paul: I'd like to know more about the road hierarchy. John: there is a preference for a fine-grained road network to ensure traffic is fairly well-distributed. In Scenario 3, we've put an example of a boulevard road.

Mira: There will be two kinds of roads: collector roads and through/local roads with cross sections showing two-way traffic with parking and bike lanes on both sides; A person should get from one side of the community to the other through inter-connected roads. In Scenario 3, there could be more connectivity south of 24th Ave.

Nadine: the school shouldn't be on 24th in Scenario 3. Mira: There won't be access on 24th Avenue. Don: Having the school fronting onto 24th is good for CEPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design), but there will be no access from 24th. John: There is green space fairly consistently along 24th.

What is the number of units for NCP #4? John: I did a quick back of envelope calculation; about 4200 units for Scenario 3. It would be less for Scenario 1. Don: It may be approximately 10,000 people. We may need another school.

John (responding to what the Roman Catholic Church's plans are in NCP 4 for their parcel): They say they are not making any short-term plans. They are interested in working together to discuss a land swap.

John: I'd like to get more comments from the CAC members on the three scenarios. Deadline is two weeks today (Thursday, September 23rd).

Items from CAC

Norm would like an alternate for meeting; all other NCP processes have allowed it. The GLUP had alternates.
Don: It's important for the group to be cohesive. Membership has to be limited. Sometimes the alternate structure has been abused. If the group changes its mind, that's fine.

There was continued discussion about the issue of consultants on the CAC. One view is that they can help provide professional advice and constructive solutions. Another view is that it appears to be a conflict of interest as the CAC mandate is to put the "community's interest above your own." Optics are important in the process.

John says this has taken a lot of discussion time and we really need to go with the structure that has been accepted by Surrey.

It was agreed that it's preferable that members try to attend meetings, but the CAC process will include alternatives. The obligation is on the member to bring them up to speed. Let us know when they are coming to meetings.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:30 PM.

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

STANTEC CONSULTING LTD.

Siobhan Murphy
Planner
Siobhan.Murphy@stantec.com