## PUBLIC HEARING: August 8, 2022

Public Hearing Correspondence received before Thursday noon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>B/L#/REF</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.8</td>
<td>20716</td>
<td>Email dated August 1, 2022, M. &amp; M. Kessler expressing opposition for the proposal citing trees, lot sizes, noise, and traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.8</td>
<td>20716</td>
<td>Submission dated August 3, 2022, T. Forsyth expressing opposition for the proposal citing scenery, safety, lot sizes and traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.9</td>
<td>20729/20730</td>
<td>Email dated August 3, 2022, B. &amp; L. Middleton expressing opposition for the proposal noise and traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.9</td>
<td>20729/20730</td>
<td>Email dated August 4, 2022, B. Gardner expressing opposition for the proposal environment, agricultural land and traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.14</td>
<td>20719/20720</td>
<td>Email dated August 4, 2022, Y. Parmar expressing concern for the proposal utilities and property maintenance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.15</td>
<td>20727/20728</td>
<td>Submission dated August 3, 2022, J. Motz expressing opposition for the proposal citing busy, safety, number of houses and traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.15</td>
<td>20727/20728</td>
<td>Submission dated August 3, 2022, J. Motz expressing opposition for the proposal citing busy, safety, number of houses and traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.24</td>
<td>7922-0147-00</td>
<td>Email dated July 29, 2022, E. MacCaig expressing opposition for the proposal citing roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.24</td>
<td>7922-0147-00</td>
<td>Email dated August 3, 2022, S. Brasnett expressing opposition for the proposal citing roads, notices, noise, trucks and traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.24</td>
<td>7922-0147-00</td>
<td>Email dated August 4, 2022, M. Reddy expressing opposition for the proposal citing roads, park, noise, trucks and traffic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WE HAVE LIVED AND RAISED OUR FAMILY IN THE SAME S. 22(1) LOCATION. WE HAVE SEEN MANY CHANGES AND PROPOSALS, MUCH LIKE THIS ONE. IT ALWAYS MEANS: MORE PEOPLE, BIGGER HOUSES, SMALLER LOTS, OLD GROWTH TREES BEING CUT, MORE TRAFFIC, AND A TIDY PROFIT FOR THE DEVELOPERS. THESE DEVELOPERS DO NOT LIVE HERE AND DO NOT CARE HOW THIS WILL IMPACT OUR NEIGHBOURHOOD. WE WOULD LIKE TO GO ON RECORD AS BEING OPPOSED TO THIS APPLICATION. THIS WILL SET A DANGEROUS PRECEDENT FOR THE FUTURE OF OUR QUIET AND PEACEFUL NEIGHBOURHOOD. WE NOW HAVE 2 FAMILIES LIVING ON THIS SITE. WE MAY QUITE POSSIBLY HAVE 4 IF THIS IS ALLOWED. THE FACT THAT THIS HAS TO GO TO COUNCIL AND BE RE-ZONED MAKES IT WRONG. IF THIS WAS A SIMPLE ISSUE LIKE A DOUBLE LOT, THIS WOULD NOT BE A PROBLEM, OR HAVE TO BE RE-ZONED.

PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING OUT LOUD TO THE COUNCIL AND YOU WILL SEE THE ISSUES, WE HAVE WITH THIS PROPOSAL. THIS WILL SIGNIFICANTLY CHANGE THE ZONING IN THE FUTURE, AND SHOULD NOT BE PERMITTED. 5000 SQUARE FOOT LOTS ARE SIMPLY SMALL ENOUGH.

IT'S ALL IN THIS FINE PRINT BELOW

- The proposed lot sizes are 460.1 and 464.6 square metres in area, which is less than what is permitted under the RF Zone.

- The unit density of the proposed subdivision is 21.6 units per hectare, which exceeds the density permitted under the RF Zone. The Local Government Act does not permit density to be increased through a Development Variance Permit.

- As the proposed unit density exceeds what is permitted under the RF Zone, and the proposed lot area is less than what is permitted under the RF Zone, a CD Zone is required to permit subdivision of the site into two (2) single family residential lots.

The proposed lot sizes are 460.1 and 464.6 square metres in area, which is less than what is permitted under the RF Zone.

- The unit density of the proposed subdivision is 21.6 units per hectare, which exceeds the density permitted under the RF Zone. The Local Government Act does not permit density to be increased through a Development Variance Permit.

- As the proposed unit density exceeds what is permitted under the RF Zone, and the proposed lot area is less than what is permitted under the RF Zone, a CD Zone is required to permit subdivision of the site into two (2) single family residential lots.
PLEASE TAKE A PAUSE BEFORE VOTING. THANK-YOU

M. 22(1) & M. 22(1) KESSLER
New submission received.

Contact Information

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

Submission Details

Select a Public Hearing Item: B.08 7921-0256-00 | 12828 – 14A Avenue (12830 - 14A Avenue)
Select your support level:: Opposed
Comments - Optional: Ocean park is such a beautiful area. Rezoning to allow more houses on already small lots is crazy. This would also add more traffic around a kids playground.
We would like to take the moment to register our disapproval of the above application – it would add a huge amount of traffic to an area that is ill suited to receive such a massive influx of cars and people – it would seem that the developer is hell bent on getting something done with this property that is detrimental to the peace and quiet of this neighborhood - B and L Middleton – Surrey Residents

Sent from Mail for Windows
Dear Mayor McCallum and Councillors,

I am opposed to the above development proposal for the following reasons.

This land is currently zoned mixed employment. This is a very good zoning for this property as it would give commercial businesses great access to the 99 freeway, the border and 176th which would give access to the whole lower mainland via #10 Highway and Highway #1. It was my understanding that in the recent South Campbell Heights application to Metro to expand the Urban Containment Boundary to include environmentally sensitive land there, including a significant aquifer, that there was an extreme shortage of mixed employment lands. Certainly that is the way it was presented to Metro. Now we have a large area of mixed employment lands (which apparently Surrey is very short of) being proposed to rezone for housing. I'm sorry I just don't see the sense in that.

Mixed employment lands are very special, they need very specific requirements. Such as not on top of residential, which this is not, a good location, which as I have already demonstrated above this has, in spades, and not damaging environmental areas. With setbacks set down under City bylaws this would appear not to do that.

On another note, this land would seem to be a good candidate for food growing land. I note the Mayor's recent proposal to ask staff to research all available food growing land in Surrey as there is little doubt that such is and will be needed. I believe that is an excellent idea, thank you Mayor McCallum. So perhaps this proposal would best be postponed until staff have had a good chance to review this property with food production in mind. I am not saying I am an expert in such matters (other than the actual eating part!) but I would really like to see this reviewed under the Mayor's plan.
I am opposed to the change to residential development on this land and would ask Council to reject this for the reasons I have discussed above.

Sincerely,

B. Gardner,
Surrey Resident
Dear Concerned,

This is regarding the public hearing notice letter received on Aug 04, 2022 regarding redevelopment of the location from 13301 to 13355. I, Y Parmar have been an occupant of the location since [redacted]. We came to know that the land is being redeveloped and it was sold to a company named Fraser Park Realty in July 2021. Our concern is that since the new owner has taken over the premises there is no one looking into the matter related to the maintenance of the property and general utilities.

Thanks for reading the mail and for your concern.

With regards

Y Parmar

contact no.
New submission received.

Contact Information

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

Submission Details

Select a Public Hearing Item:  B.15 7921-0209-00 | Portion of 1 2244 - 102 Avenue
Select your support level::  Opposed
Comments - Optional:  I'm a concerned citizen of a development project in my neighborhood. We are a single family residential zone neighborhood and they are trying to change it to a multi residential. So they can build a 3 story, 18 townhouse unit in amongst our houses. I strongly disagree with having 18 townhouses being put in this neighborhood, 102 Ave is already a crowded Ave and emergency vehicles have hard time getting through. The added traffic would make it near impossible for a fire engine to get through.
New submission received.

Contact Information

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

Submission Details

Select a Public Hearing Item: B.15 7921-0209-00 | Portion of 12244 - 102 Avenue
Select your support level:: Opposed
Comments - Optional: As a resident living near the development of the 18 townhouse units wanting to be built, I don't approve of this development. This is a quiet family home Neighborhood that is quite crowded already. Building the 18 townhouse units will only make the street alot more busier and more crowded which we do not need in this family house neighborhood. Please reconsider building your development somewhere else.
Our family has lived in this area since [redacted] so we are very, very familiar with the area and the roads that lead up to where this temporary use permit will be. Whoever has asked for this permit and what you may approve is beyond ridiculous. The roads are not feasible for large trucks to come up into this area and I would suggest that those who work with the City of Surrey and the Council members drive over and check it out. Odds are you won't be bothered as this is not happening in your area as I'm sure it is all about money. Once again, our family has lived here since the [redacted], taxes paid every year on time.

I suggest the City of Surrey do the right thing and deny this application, it's about time you started taking care of your long time citizens and not looking at what money can come into your coffers.

I do not want this email to be ignored so I want a reply

TES. 22(1) MacCaig
Good morning,

In the last month our neighbourhood has seen multiple temporary permit development signs. As a resident on 97 ave (current address [redacted]), this is a huge concern. The first proposal sign that went up is development proposal 22-0147, or permit number 7922-0147-00. This proposal is for 25 trucks and outside steel storage in (what was) the historic Anniedale School yard - an almost 8 acre field between the residences and Highway 1. We called to inquire about the development proposal and were told that we received notification via mail "weeks ago". This is untrue. Over 30 residents on the two roads, not a single individual was informed about the proposal. The development proposal sign that was put up is only visible to two residents on the single lane road. This is currently a residential neighbourhood and a rural street. Regardless of what it is slated for, the interest of one development party will have a huge, detrimental effect on the residents.

We have recently received the notice for temporary use. This is the third attempt in a decade to try and move truck parking lots in to our neighbourhood. There are already 3 operating truck lots on 96th ave which has been an ongoing nuisance. While the proposal for one of them was for 3 trucks there are now over 20. Included in this are cooling trucks, the trailers of which are running for hours and often through the night. The fumes and noise are a constant disruption.

Our roads are not built to withstand the weight. Trucks would mean loss of frontage, widening of road, and VERY unsafe roads without sidewalks or barriers for pedestrians. Many of our residents frequently go to Tynehead park to walk and the widening of roads would make this impossible. In addition to the proposed truck lots and widening of roads would be the noise, pollution and dust. Residents are furious at this, myself included.

Regardless of what the future holds for this area, its current standing is residential. It has come to our attention that one individual or company has purchased multiple houses in the area and is responsible for the majority of the development proposals. We are concerned that the wants, needs, greed, and profiting intentions of this company is happening at the expense of numerous residents. We have NOT received any notification about these two developments - which is a legal requirement and are calling for an immediate desist until the neighbourhood
is properly notified and can have a voice.

Lastly, we bought of house with the intention of raising our kids with a decent yard, a field to play on, in a quiet neighbourhood. These truck parking lots are the last thing we want encroaching on that and disrupting the peace.

Sincerely,

S. Brasnett

Surrey Resident

Get Outlook for iOS
To the Mayor and All council members:

Here is a list of our neighborhoods reasons for opposing TUP 7922-0147-00.

- First off and most importantly This is a residential neighborhood which the planning report states in page 2 does not support this type of use for this property.

- The future NCP for this area being Light Industrial however odd that might be considering how close we are to one of Surrey’s biggest most beautiful parks. Does not support this type of use for this property also stated in planning report.

- There are already existing illegal Truck parks within very close proximity of our quiet and quaint residential area. That are not adhering to the Truck parking strategy set forth by the city.

- Can this property not be used in a way more in tune with the current zoning to create revenue while the new owner awaits redevelopment in our area.

- The fact that our houses already shake when our garbage and recycling trucks drive by. Our streets and homes were not built with the larger size of modern tandem garbage trucks never mind constant movement of even larger commercial vehicles. How would this be addressed?

- The amount of pollution both environmental and noise that will be brought to our neighborhood. ie watercourses, garbage, fuel leaks, exhaust from trucks, steel being stored effectively in our backyards.

- The added Traffic to our streets which already with the existing illegal truck parks has become a safety factor to our families. Not only from the trucks but from the drivers in their personal vehicles coming and going from these locations through our one lane roads.

- Because of the age of our neighborhood widening the road 8 meters to accommodate this TUP for one parties gain would basically have the road on many peoples doorsteps.

- The fact that due to the nature of the trucking business trucks would be coming and going at all hours of the day and night and weekend in and out of a residentially zoned neighborhood. Not addressed in the planning report.

- This is a family oriented neighborhood where new homes have recently been built.

- Are there no better options in a city as vast as ours other than here in our sleepy community to be parking large commercial vehicles. Surely the answer can’t be no.

- Is the importance of Truck parking so great that it outweighs all of our many residents and their families right to live in our peaceful community. Which is why we bought here in the first place.

- Would the purpose of allowing these truck parks in our neighborhood be to drive down our property values to facilitate more cost effective development in the area. To who’s gain? Certainly not all of us residents who have called this home for many years.

In closing we would also like to see any future TUP’s in our area with this same designation be denied earlier in the application process. As we the residents have now had to spend a great deal of what little spare time we have left in a week after working to pay our mortgages and taxes and tending to our families needs. Organizing and petitioning, letter writing and researching. All of which could be avoided if proper due diligence on the part of The
Planning and Development Department was performed as far as zoning and ordinances on the municipal level.

Sincerely longtime owner & resident at
M. Reddy
Surrey Resident
Sent from my iPad