

## PUBLIC HEARING: December 6, 2021

Correspondence received (before Thursday noon) for the Public Hearing is in your binders as follow:

| ITEM # | B/L#/REF     | COMMENTS   |
|--------|--------------|--|
| B.1    | 7921-0220-00 | Email dated November 29, 2021, A. Kaps expressing opposition for the proposal citing aquifer and trees.  |
| B.1    | 7921-0220-00 | Email dated December 2, 2021, R. Landale expressing opposition for the proposal citing agricultural land, aquifer, trees, heritage chapel, traffic, and environment.             |
| B.2    | 7921-0156-00 | Email dated December 2, 2021, R. Landale expressing opposition for the proposal citing trees, and traffic.   |
| B.3    | 7919-0361-00 | Email dated December 2, 2021, R. Landale expressing opposition for the proposal citing watercourse and children play area.   |
| B.4    | 7921-0045-00 | Email dated December 2, 2021, R. Landale expressing opposition for the proposal citing trees and traffic.  |
| B.5    | 7921-0070-00 | Email dated December 2, 2021, R. Landale expressing opposition for the proposal citing trees, steep slopes, and sewage system.   |
| B.6    | 7921-0237-00 | Email dated December 2, 2021, R. Landale expressing opposition for the proposal citing trees, detention pond, densification, and traffic.  |
| B.7    | 7921-0175-00 | Email dated December 2, 2021, R. Landale expressing opposition for the proposal citing trees and traffic.  |
| H.8    | 7921-0248-00 | Email dated December 2, 2021, R. Landale expressing concerns for the proposal citing site plan, watercourse, floodplain, and no city water, fire hydrants, or sanitary services. |
| H.9    | 7921-0076-00 | Email dated December 2, 2021, R. Landale expressing support for the proposal.  |
| H.10   | 7914-0117-01 | Email dated December 2, 2021, R. Landale expressing concerns for the proposal citing trees.  |

**From:** [s. 22\(1\) Kaps](#)  
**To:** [Patton, Allison](#); [Locke, Brenda](#); [Elford, Doug](#); [McCallum, Doug](#); [Hundial, Jack](#); [Guerra, Laurie](#); [Annis, Linda](#); [Nagra, Mandeep](#); [Pettigrew, Steven](#); [Clerks Department Webmail](#)  
**Subject:** PLR 7921-0220-00  
**Date:** November 29, 2021 8:53:04 PM

---

Well, mayor McCallum, Councillors Elford, Guerra, Patton and Nagra.....LET THE SLAUGHTER BEGIN!

All without your regard for neighbours Township of Langley's aquifer, without regard for the Tatalu/Little Campbell, without regard to Joanne Charles pleas on behalf of the Semiahmoo and it's Tatalu, without regard to the Little Campbell Hatchery on the Semiahmoo Fish And Game Club (hallelujah - there's something you didn't get your craws into).

This is just the beginning of the logging of the Hazelmere Valley.

How can you, mayor and SSC councillors, purport to represent the citizens of Surrey, when the meeting lasting after mid-night did not in the least seem to impart to you the wishes of the community?

Now we'll see you approve development after development killing off tree after tree.

Shame that you do not listen to the stakeholders who have long protected this valley,

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

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

CLERKS DEPT  
NOV 30, 2021  
7921-0220-00  
B.1 RCPH DEC 6, 2021  
xc Planning,  
Land Development

CLERKS DEPT  
NOV 22, 2021  
B.1 - 7921-0100-00  
B.2 - 7921-0044-00  
B.3 - 7920-0130-00  
B.4 - 7921-0201-00  
B.5 - 7920-0104-00  
B.6 - 7920-0290-00  
H.7 - 7921-0252-00  
H.8 - 7921-0319-00  
H.9 - 7918-0455-01  
H.10 - 7921-0108-00  
RCPH NOV 22, 21  
xc Planning,  
Land Development

**From:** Clerks Department Webmail  
**Subject:** FW: 2021 Tree Destruction for November 22, 2021 RCPH

---

**From:** R s. 22(1) Landale s. 22(1) [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** November 17, 2021 10:40 AM  
**To:** Ficocelli, Jennifer <[Jennifer.Ficocelli@surrey.ca](mailto:Jennifer.Ficocelli@surrey.ca)>; Patton, Allison <[Allison.Patton@surrey.ca](mailto:Allison.Patton@surrey.ca)>; Locke, Brenda <[Brenda.Locke@surrey.ca](mailto:Brenda.Locke@surrey.ca)>; Elford, Doug <[Doug.Elford@surrey.ca](mailto:Doug.Elford@surrey.ca)>; McCallum, Doug <[Doug.McCallum@surrey.ca](mailto:Doug.McCallum@surrey.ca)>; Hundial, Jack <[Jack.Hundial@surrey.ca](mailto:Jack.Hundial@surrey.ca)>; Guerra, Laurie <[Laurie.Guerra@surrey.ca](mailto:Laurie.Guerra@surrey.ca)>; Annis, Linda <[Linda.Annis@surrey.ca](mailto:Linda.Annis@surrey.ca)>; Nagra, Mandeep <[Mandeep.Nagra@surrey.ca](mailto:Mandeep.Nagra@surrey.ca)>; Pettigrew, Steven <[Steven.Pettigrew@surrey.ca](mailto:Steven.Pettigrew@surrey.ca)>  
**Cc:** [tom.zytaruk@surreynowleader.com](mailto:tom.zytaruk@surreynowleader.com)  
**Subject:** RE: 2021 Tree Destruction for November 22, 2021 RCPH  
**Importance:** High

Dear Council,

Please find the attached Excel Spreadsheet, to be **“Registered and Filed” in objection to 5 of 6 development applications, with concerns for 3 of 4 DVPs** on the agenda, coming to Council’s attention at the November 22<sup>nd</sup>.2021 Council meeting at 7:00pm. *Respectfully, I regret not being able to present this delegation in person.*

<https://www.surrey.ca/city-government/council-meetings-documents/current-meeting-agendas-notice-public-hearing-items>

Please review the attached Spreadsheet, I have added an extra graph on page two.

- **PLR 7921-0100-00** There is a great deal of environmental information missing in this DP & DVP Application Report, I wrote to Staff last November 11<sup>th</sup>, and await Staff reply with information.

Item 1: Very briefly, LOTs 4,5,6 &7 (see Schedule “A”) are the headwaters for “April Creek” a Natural Class B Yellow Coded creek, which passes through the Greenbelt #115L to the north of the property (See drawing in Appendix V). This development will significantly disturb, ruin or destroy the surrounding sub-surface grounds that established the headwaters. Appendix VI adds more alarm for the preservation of these headwaters “CHARACTER STUDY AND BUILDING GUIDELINES SUMMARY”, wherein the report indicates in paragraph 3 of Section 1.1 the property to East, address 16487-

28 Avenue, will “almost certainly be developed” along the same densification levels provided for in this DP & DVP application. The Arborist Drawing Appendix IV demonstrates the ground disturbances to the headwaters by the removal of the existing house foundations and the up-rooting of 19 mature trees on these 4 LOTs. This report does not address any of these issues to our city environment, parkland and the preservation of April Creek in its entirety.

**Before going onto Item 2., COSMOS indicates a Protected Park Specimen Tree “Gymnocladus” # 736717 planted 04/11/2018 on the 28 Avenue Boulevard that is in mortal danger to being cut down to facilitate LOT 7, Labeled either City 04 or City05 on the Arborist Drawing, without the actual Arborist Survey Report I cannot be more specific.**

The DP & DVP Report indicates 164A Street will be extended though the properties to connect with 28<sup>th</sup> Avenue. On the north boundary the City Planted Trees #770672 on 03/12/2020 and 776621 on 06/01/2021 These trees will require Construction Protection Zone Barriers, see Schedule “C” of the Bylaw.

Item 2: I brought to City Staff attention concerns in regards to the Cash-in-Lieu payment reported to be only \$550. **Based on the Tree Protection Bylaw 16100 - 01/11/21 Part 5 – Penalties and Part 8a - Securities,** I calculate the Cash-in-Lieu payment into the Green City Fund to be \$10,450. But even more concerning is the agreement between Parks & Rec and the developer on page 6, quote:

*“Parkland and/or Natural Area Considerations*

*To the northeast of the subject property located at 16463 – 28 Avenue, there is a "Natural" Class B (yellow-coded) watercourse located within a City owned greenbelt which runs north of the lot, flowing north through Park to 29A Avenue”.* Additionally the report indicates the developer will pay \$18,020 for 5% of unencumbered parkland, based on the Arborist Report, which is not available to the Public or Council. This unencumbered parkland is about 198 sq.metres (5%) of Greenbelt 115L, which is 3,961 sq.metres having a Gross Assessed Land value of \$1,925,000 according to COSMOS. 5% represents \$96,250, not \$18,020. How can Parks & Rec negotiate the gifting of City Parkland, **“MY LAND”** to the special interests of the developer without consultation to all Surrey Land owners and taxpayers ?, **who’s interests are City Staff representing ?**, certainly not mine. With respect to the Report

referencing the Arborist Report, Appendix IV drawing Notes 1,7 & 8 very clearly state, quote: "Note 1. The location of un-surveyed trees on this plan is approximate. Their location and ownership cannot be confirmed without being surveyed by a Registered BC Land Surveyor. Note 7. This plan is based on a topographic and tree location survey provided by the owners' Registered British Columbia Land Surveyor (BCLS) and layout drawings provide by the owners' Engineer (P Eng). Note 8. This plan is provided for context only, and is not certified as to the accuracy of the location of features or dimensions that are shown on this plan. Please refer to the original survey plan and engineering plans". It is peculiar that Notes 7 & 8 have been added, and are an advisory to the reader as to the veracity of the information contained within the drawing.

Lastly Your Worship and Council to the west address 16441-28<sup>th</sup>.Avenue 7917-0310-00 received 3<sup>rd</sup>.Reading on December 18<sup>th</sup>.2017 to sub-divide into 4 LOTS. Therein 33 of 37 mature trees will be destroyed and the Green City Fund will grow by \$21,200 creating a tree deficit of 53 trees according to the report. And before long I count 18 City Boulevard trees will be up-rooted by additional developments on the south side of 28<sup>th</sup>.Avenue, all planted around 1991-2002.

This delegation to Council took me more than 6 hours of reading and research using the DP & DVP Application Report in concert with COSMOS.

- **PLR 7921-0044-00** This developer intends to subdivide his property into two lots and build on the new smaller LOT. There are 12 mature trees impacted by this development with only 3 trees to be removed, and pay \$1,100 into the Green City Fund. One of the 3 trees to be removed according to Huckleberry Landscape Design drawing is beside the already built driveway entrance (See COSMOS Street View), so I do not understand why this beautiful Douglas Fir needs to be removed. In reference to this Development Report and all the other reports on the agenda this evening, *Is it Councils Direction to no longer require City Staff to not declare the Service Agreement Fees (see Appendix II inter-office memo) applicable to each developments ? As this appears to be the new normal in relation to all other inter-office memos, hiding financial information from Council and the Public is not transparency.*
- **PLR 7920-0130-00** This developer is unforgivable, the report indicates all 104 mature trees will be clear cut to make space for 26 Townhouses, and

pay \$52,400 into the Green City Fund. Over and above that contribution the developer will pay more than \$78,000 in Tier 1 and Affordable Housing fees, adding more than \$5,000 onto any Townhouse resale price. COSMOS Fatal Injury Layer indicates 4 accidents at the intersection of 74<sup>th</sup> Ave @ 184<sup>th</sup> St, while the 2018 Surrey Average Daily Traffic Volume Map indicates in 2014 some 5,700 on 184<sup>th</sup> Street. Council should be aware between Fraser Hwy (145 accidents) and 80<sup>th</sup> Ave a total of 56 accidents are recorded on 184<sup>th</sup> Street, which is a quite a steep hill providing direct road access to Clayton Elementary and Ecole Salish Secondary Schools. Adding to the danger on 184<sup>th</sup> Street, Council can see on COSMOS Street View parents parked vehicle in the Clayton Elementary School jammed parking LOT and on the boulevard, the tree shadows inform the time as being in the afternoon, what a dangerous mess.!!

- **It is beyond understanding why Engineering is not requiring a Traffic Volume Impact Study ahead of all the surrounding developments currently in the “Initial Review Process” or have received “Conditional Approval” for 8 different applications representing a total of 516 Townhouses all within walking distance of these two schools. Heads Up somebody, need to address the traffic problem issues coming to 184<sup>th</sup> Street now! . (*Ostrich Syndrome*,. It is a form of avoidance coping that people use to manage uncomfortable feelings or rather, not deal with them).**
- **PLR 7921-0201-00** This developer also is doing a clear cut, all two trees to be destroyed, while paying Cash in Lieu into the Green City Fund in the amount of \$2,200. Council may not be aware that in this area of Newton throughout 2021 almost every development has clear cut their Mature Trees, I keep track of these things by using COSMOS Aerial Layer views.. While densification is not unique to Panorama Ridge, this development is unique, by splitting the existing small 904 sq metre Lot into 2 parcels. Three LOTS to the west PLR 7921-0237-00 awaits Councils approval, and further west PLR 7920-0222-00 is also in “Initial Review” awaiting Councils approval, barely a Mature Tree to be left in this 64<sup>th</sup> Avenue block. I took a drive through on COSMOS Street View (the back lane) to confirm my statements, barely a Tree left. Thank you for the environmental destruction approval process -- “ReZone”. Traffic volumes indicate 27,300 in 2014 pass by this property daily, with 28,500 in 2018 one block to the east. School children crossing the street to Panorama Ridge

Secondary School should be of paramount concern to Council, but nothing has been done to address this concern in the last few years as the community grows. The intersection of 132<sup>nd</sup>.St @ 64<sup>th</sup>.Avenue reports 128 fatal or injury accidents. When is enough, enough ?

- **PLR 7920-0104-00** No Concerns.
- **PLR 7920-0290-00** This is a terrible developer, they will destroy all 69 Mature Trees, and pay Cash-in-Lieu in the amount of \$28,000 into the Green City Fund, whose also is willing to pay for this development in Tier 1 and Affordable Housing Fees greater than \$744,000 money is no object. I wrote to Staff on August 8<sup>th</sup>.2021, and copied Council regarding the underground Asbestos Piping servicing the existing 6 LOTS, as remarked on page 12 of the DP report. From my understanding the City has turned its back on the problem by passing it onto the developer, underscored by the absence of direction from the Planning Department in their Inter-Office Memo Appendix II. Opposite this development is Kwantlen Park Secondary School on 132<sup>nd</sup>. Street, COSMOS reports 11 Fatal or Injury accidents, while the 2018 Surrey Average Daily Traffic Volume Map indicates in 2018 some 11,600 vehicles pass by through intersection. One can only hope the Traffic Impact Study Report (see Appendix II) has addressed these issues besides the impact of 248 Dwelling Units will have on the local area road network.

**DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMITS**

(No speaking opportunities, Comments on these permits must be received in writing for Council’s consideration).

- **PLR 7921-0252-00** Against: On December 2<sup>nd</sup>.2019 Council gave 3<sup>rd</sup>.Reading to 7919-0107-00 ( [https://www.surrey.ca/sites/default/files/planning-reports/PLR\\_7919-0107-00.pdf](https://www.surrey.ca/sites/default/files/planning-reports/PLR_7919-0107-00.pdf) ) carried unanimously RES.R19-2096, wherein the developer proposed to cut down 31 or 71 mature trees and pay \$21,600 into the Green City Fund (pages 7 & 8). On page 4 of the report the Parks Department advised Council, quote: *“Parks notes that there are City trees that could be impacted by this application. All efforts to retain City trees must be exhausted before removal will be considered.”* Naturally this current DVP report did not include the Arborist Report and drawings, so no one can identify the City trees being impacted. By going back to the minutes of that meeting, the address 2585-141 Street no longer exists according to COSMOS being now

numbered as 2577 & 2589. Within the Application Report Appendix V provides 3 pages of “Typical Character Study Photographs”, without any house plans, so Council at that time did not know what they were approving on these newly created ½ Acre LOTS. Now this current DVP proposes additional variances that infringe on property setbacks, again without architectural drawings for Council to review. If those drawings were available, Council would learn there is a Fire Hydrant #2909 now within 1.9 metres of the new property line “setback” if approved. I am very surprised the Fire Department has either not been consulted, or have not expressed concerns, (see Appendix I and Inter-Office Memo Appendix III). If Council were to enquire of COSMOS “Street View” there is much more to learn in this DVP application, such as the 26<sup>th</sup>-Avenue condition shadowed by the surrounding tree canopy, the property is encumbered with low lying ditching on the North and East boundaries, and the property in question is also heavily treed with mature trees, amongst other things.

- **PLR 7921-0319-00** No Concerns
- **PLR 7918-0455-00** No Concerns, beyond my previous delegation April 6<sup>th</sup>.2020 in regards to the loss of 42 of 44 Mature Trees, a ratio of 91.3%.
- **PLR 7921-0108-00** A place of “Welcome – Narthex” should include Trees, so I am very disappointed the Church feels it necessary to cut down 3 of 9 matures trees. I remain understanding, while concerned the Church has such little regard and value for these 3 magnificent mature trees. Go to COSMOS Street View, a sight to behold.

Respectfully,

**Rs. 22(1)** Landale

*Fleetwood Surrey Resident*



Virus-free. [www.avast.com](http://www.avast.com)



CLERKS DEPT  
NOV 22, 2021  
B.1 - 7921-0100-00  
B.2 - 7921-0044-00  
B.3 - 7920-0130-00  
B.4 - 7921-0201-00  
B.5 - 7920-0104-00  
B.6 - 7920-0290-00  
H.7 - 7921-0252-00  
H.8 - 7921-0319-00  
H.9 - 7918-0455-01  
H.10 - 7921-0108-00  
RCPH NOV 22, 21  
xc Planning,  
Land Development

**From:** Clerks Department Webmail  
**Subject:** FW: 2021 Tree Destruction for November 22, 2021 RCPH

---

**From:** R s. 22(1) Landale s. 22(1) [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** November 17, 2021 10:40 AM  
**To:** Ficocelli, Jennifer <[Jennifer.Ficocelli@surrey.ca](mailto:Jennifer.Ficocelli@surrey.ca)>; Patton, Allison <[Allison.Patton@surrey.ca](mailto:Allison.Patton@surrey.ca)>; Locke, Brenda <[Brenda.Locke@surrey.ca](mailto:Brenda.Locke@surrey.ca)>; Elford, Doug <[Doug.Elford@surrey.ca](mailto:Doug.Elford@surrey.ca)>; McCallum, Doug <[Doug.McCallum@surrey.ca](mailto:Doug.McCallum@surrey.ca)>; Hundial, Jack <[Jack.Hundial@surrey.ca](mailto:Jack.Hundial@surrey.ca)>; Guerra, Laurie <[Laurie.Guerra@surrey.ca](mailto:Laurie.Guerra@surrey.ca)>; Annis, Linda <[Linda.Annis@surrey.ca](mailto:Linda.Annis@surrey.ca)>; Nagra, Mandeep <[Mandeep.Nagra@surrey.ca](mailto:Mandeep.Nagra@surrey.ca)>; Pettigrew, Steven <[Steven.Pettigrew@surrey.ca](mailto:Steven.Pettigrew@surrey.ca)>  
**Cc:** [tom.zytaruk@surreynowleader.com](mailto:tom.zytaruk@surreynowleader.com)  
**Subject:** RE: 2021 Tree Destruction for November 22, 2021 RCPH  
**Importance:** High

Dear Council,

Please find the attached Excel Spreadsheet, to be **“Registered and Filed” in objection to 5 of 6 development applications, with concerns for 3 of 4 DVPs** on the agenda, coming to Council’s attention at the November 22<sup>nd</sup>.2021 Council meeting at 7:00pm. *Respectfully, I regret not being able to present this delegation in person.*

<https://www.surrey.ca/city-government/council-meetings-documents/current-meeting-agendas-notice-public-hearing-items>

Please review the attached Spreadsheet, I have added an extra graph on page two.

- **PLR 7921-0100-00** There is a great deal of environmental information missing in this DP & DVP Application Report, I wrote to Staff last November 11<sup>th</sup>, and await Staff reply with information.

Item 1: Very briefly, LOTs 4,5,6 &7 (see Schedule “A”) are the headwaters for “April Creek” a Natural Class B Yellow Coded creek, which passes through the Greenbelt #115L to the north of the property (See drawing in Appendix V). This development will significantly disturb, ruin or destroy the surrounding sub-surface grounds that established the headwaters. Appendix VI adds more alarm for the preservation of these headwaters “CHARACTER STUDY AND BUILDING GUIDELINES SUMMARY”, wherein the report indicates in paragraph 3 of Section 1.1 the property to East, address 16487-

28 Avenue, will “almost certainly be developed” along the same densification levels provided for in this DP & DVP application. The Arborist Drawing Appendix IV demonstrates the ground disturbances to the headwaters by the removal of the existing house foundations and the up-rooting of 19 mature trees on these 4 LOTs. This report does not address any of these issues to our city environment, parkland and the preservation of April Creek in its entirety.

**Before going onto Item 2., COSMOS indicates a Protected Park Specimen Tree “Gymnocladus” # 736717 planted 04/11/2018 on the 28 Avenue Boulevard that is in mortal danger to being cut down to facilitate LOT 7, Labeled either City 04 or City05 on the Arborist Drawing, without the actual Arborist Survey Report I cannot be more specific.**

The DP & DVP Report indicates 164A Street will be extended though the properties to connect with 28<sup>th</sup> Avenue. On the north boundary the City Planted Trees #770672 on 03/12/2020 and 776621 on 06/01/2021 These trees will require Construction Protection Zone Barriers, see Schedule “C” of the Bylaw.

Item 2: I brought to City Staff attention concerns in regards to the Cash-in-Lieu payment reported to be only \$550. **Based on the Tree Protection Bylaw 16100 - 01/11/21 Part 5 – Penalties and Part 8a - Securities,** I calculate the Cash-in-Lieu payment into the Green City Fund to be \$10,450. But even more concerning is the agreement between Parks & Rec and the developer on page 6, quote:

*“Parkland and/or Natural Area Considerations*

*To the northeast of the subject property located at 16463 – 28 Avenue, there is a "Natural" Class B (yellow-coded) watercourse located within a City owned greenbelt which runs north of the lot, flowing north through Park to 29A Avenue”.* Additionally the report indicates the developer will pay \$18,020 for 5% of unencumbered parkland, based on the Arborist Report, which is not available to the Public or Council. This unencumbered parkland is about 198 sq.metres (5%) of Greenbelt 115L, which is 3,961 sq.metres having a Gross Assessed Land value of \$1,925,000 according to COSMOS. 5% represents \$96,250, not \$18,020. How can Parks & Rec negotiate the gifting of City Parkland, **“MY LAND”** to the special interests of the developer without consultation to all Surrey Land owners and taxpayers ?, **who’s interests are City Staff representing ?**, certainly not mine. With respect to the Report

referencing the Arborist Report, Appendix IV drawing Notes 1,7 & 8 very clearly state, quote: “Note 1. The location of un-surveyed trees on this plan is approximate. Their location and ownership cannot be confirmed without being surveyed by a Registered BC Land Surveyor. Note 7. This plan is based on a topographic and tree location survey provided by the owners’ Registered British Columbia Land Surveyor (BCLS) and layout drawings provide by the owners’ Engineer (P Eng). Note 8. This plan is provided for context only, and is not certified as to the accuracy of the location of features or dimensions that are shown on this plan. Please refer to the original survey plan and engineering plans”. It is peculiar that Notes 7 & 8 have been added, and are an advisory to the reader as to the veracity of the information contained within the drawing.

Lastly Your Worship and Council to the west address 16441-28<sup>th</sup>.Avenue 7917-0310-00 received 3<sup>rd</sup>.Reading on December 18<sup>th</sup>.2017 to sub-divide into 4 LOTS. Therein 33 of 37 mature trees will be destroyed and the Green City Fund will grow by \$21,200 creating a tree deficit of 53 trees according to the report. And before long I count 18 City Boulevard trees will be up-rooted by additional developments on the south side of 28<sup>th</sup>.Avenue, all planted around 1991-2002.

This delegation to Council took me more than 6 hours of reading and research using the DP & DVP Application Report in concert with COSMOS.

- **PLR 7921-0044-00** This developer intends to subdivide his property into two lots and build on the new smaller LOT. There are 12 mature trees impacted by this development with only 3 trees to be removed, and pay \$1,100 into the Green City Fund. One of the 3 trees to be removed according to Huckleberry Landscape Design drawing is beside the already built driveway entrance (See COSMOS Street View), so I do not understand why this beautiful Douglas Fir needs to be removed. In reference to this Development Report and all the other reports on the agenda this evening, *Is it Councils Direction to no longer require City Staff to not declare the Service Agreement Fees (see Appendix II inter-office memo) applicable to each developments ? As this appears to be the new normal in relation to all other inter-office memos, hiding financial information from Council and the Public is not transparency.*
- **PLR 7920-0130-00** This developer is unforgivable, the report indicates all 104 mature trees will be clear cut to make space for 26 Townhouses, and

pay \$52,400 into the Green City Fund. Over and above that contribution the developer will pay more than \$78,000 in Tier 1 and Affordable Housing fees, adding more than \$5,000 onto any Townhouse resale price. COSMOS Fatal Injury Layer indicates 4 accidents at the intersection of 74<sup>th</sup> Ave @ 184<sup>th</sup> St, while the 2018 Surrey Average Daily Traffic Volume Map indicates in 2014 some 5,700 on 184<sup>th</sup> Street. Council should be aware between Fraser Hwy (145 accidents) and 80<sup>th</sup> Ave a total of 56 accidents are recorded on 184<sup>th</sup> Street, which is a quite a steep hill providing direct road access to Clayton Elementary and Ecole Salish Secondary Schools. Adding to the danger on 184<sup>th</sup> Street, Council can see on COSMOS Street View parents parked vehicle in the Clayton Elementary School jammed parking LOT and on the boulevard, the tree shadows inform the time as being in the afternoon, what a dangerous mess.!!

- **It is beyond understanding why Engineering is not requiring a Traffic Volume Impact Study ahead of all the surrounding developments currently in the “Initial Review Process” or have received “Conditional Approval” for 8 different applications representing a total of 516 Townhouses all within walking distance of these two schools. Heads Up somebody, need to address the traffic problem issues coming to 184<sup>th</sup> Street now! . (*Ostrich Syndrome*,. It is a form of avoidance coping that people use to manage uncomfortable feelings or rather, not deal with them).**
- **PLR 7921-0201-00** This developer also is doing a clear cut, all two trees to be destroyed, while paying Cash in Lieu into the Green City Fund in the amount of \$2,200. Council may not be aware that in this area of Newton throughout 2021 almost every development has clear cut their Mature Trees, I keep track of these things by using COSMOS Aerial Layer views.. While densification is not unique to Panorama Ridge, this development is unique, by splitting the existing small 904 sq metre Lot into 2 parcels. Three LOTS to the west PLR 7921-0237-00 awaits Councils approval, and further west PLR 7920-0222-00 is also in “Initial Review” awaiting Councils approval, barely a Mature Tree to be left in this 64<sup>th</sup> Avenue block. I took a drive through on COSMOS Street View (the back lane) to confirm my statements, barely a Tree left. Thank you for the environmental destruction approval process -- “ReZone”. Traffic volumes indicate 27,300 in 2014 pass by this property daily, with 28,500 in 2018 one block to the east. School children crossing the street to Panorama Ridge

Secondary School should be of paramount concern to Council, but nothing has been done to address this concern in the last few years as the community grows. The intersection of 132<sup>nd</sup>.St @ 64<sup>th</sup>.Avenue reports 128 fatal or injury accidents. When is enough, enough ?

- **PLR 7920-0104-00** No Concerns.
- **PLR 7920-0290-00** This is a terrible developer, they will destroy all 69 Mature Trees, and pay Cash-in-Lieu in the amount of \$28,000 into the Green City Fund, whose also is willing to pay for this development in Tier 1 and Affordable Housing Fees greater than \$744,000 money is no object. I wrote to Staff on August 8<sup>th</sup>.2021, and copied Council regarding the underground Asbestos Piping servicing the existing 6 LOTS, as remarked on page 12 of the DP report. From my understanding the City has turned its back on the problem by passing it onto the developer, underscored by the absence of direction from the Planning Department in their Inter-Office Memo Appendix II. Opposite this development is Kwantlen Park Secondary School on 132<sup>nd</sup>. Street, COSMOS reports 11 Fatal or Injury accidents, while the 2018 Surrey Average Daily Traffic Volume Map indicates in 2018 some 11,600 vehicles pass by through intersection. One can only hope the Traffic Impact Study Report (see Appendix II) has addressed these issues besides the impact of 248 Dwelling Units will have on the local area road network.

**DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMITS**

(No speaking opportunities, Comments on these permits must be received in writing for Council’s consideration).

- **PLR 7921-0252-00** Against: On December 2<sup>nd</sup>.2019 Council gave 3<sup>rd</sup>.Reading to 7919-0107-00 ( [https://www.surrey.ca/sites/default/files/planning-reports/PLR\\_7919-0107-00.pdf](https://www.surrey.ca/sites/default/files/planning-reports/PLR_7919-0107-00.pdf) ) carried unanimously RES.R19-2096, wherein the developer proposed to cut down 31 or 71 mature trees and pay \$21,600 into the Green City Fund (pages 7 & 8). On page 4 of the report the Parks Department advised Council, quote: *“Parks notes that there are City trees that could be impacted by this application. All efforts to retain City trees must be exhausted before removal will be considered.”* Naturally this current DVP report did not include the Arborist Report and drawings, so no one can identify the City trees being impacted. By going back to the minutes of that meeting, the address 2585-141 Street no longer exists according to COSMOS being now

numbered as 2577 & 2589. Within the Application Report Appendix V provides 3 pages of “Typical Character Study Photographs”, without any house plans, so Council at that time did not know what they were approving on these newly created ½ Acre LOTS. Now this current DVP proposes additional variances that infringe on property setbacks, again without architectural drawings for Council to review. If those drawings were available, Council would learn there is a Fire Hydrant #2909 now within 1.9 metres of the new property line “setback” if approved. I am very surprised the Fire Department has either not been consulted, or have not expressed concerns, (see Appendix I and Inter-Office Memo Appendix III). If Council were to enquire of COSMOS “Street View” there is much more to learn in this DVP application, such as the 26<sup>th</sup>-Avenue condition shadowed by the surrounding tree canopy, the property is encumbered with low lying ditching on the North and East boundaries, and the property in question is also heavily treed with mature trees, amongst other things.

- **PLR 7921-0319-00** No Concerns
- **PLR 7918-0455-00** No Concerns, beyond my previous delegation April 6<sup>th</sup>.2020 in regards to the loss of 42 of 44 Mature Trees, a ratio of 91.3%.
- **PLR 7921-0108-00** A place of “Welcome – Narthex” should include Trees, so I am very disappointed the Church feels it necessary to cut down 3 of 9 matures trees. I remain understanding, while concerned the Church has such little regard and value for these 3 magnificent mature trees. Go to COSMOS Street View, a sight to behold.

Respectfully,

**Rs. 22(1)** Landale

*Fleetwood Surrey Resident*



Virus-free. [www.avast.com](http://www.avast.com)

CLERKS DEPT  
NOV 22, 2021  
B.1 - 7921-0100-00  
B.2 - 7921-0044-00  
B.3 - 7920-0130-00  
B.4 - 7921-0201-00  
B.5 - 7920-0104-00  
B.6 - 7920-0290-00  
H.7 - 7921-0252-00  
H.8 - 7921-0319-00  
H.9 - 7918-0455-01  
H.10 - 7921-0108-00  
RCPH NOV 22, 21  
xc Planning,  
Land Development

**From:** Clerks Department Webmail  
**Subject:** FW: 2021 Tree Destruction for November 22, 2021 RCPH

---

**From:** R s. 22(1) Landale s. 22(1) [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** November 17, 2021 10:40 AM  
**To:** Ficocelli, Jennifer <[Jennifer.Ficocelli@surrey.ca](mailto:Jennifer.Ficocelli@surrey.ca)>; Patton, Allison <[Allison.Patton@surrey.ca](mailto:Allison.Patton@surrey.ca)>; Locke, Brenda <[Brenda.Locke@surrey.ca](mailto:Brenda.Locke@surrey.ca)>; Elford, Doug <[Doug.Elford@surrey.ca](mailto:Doug.Elford@surrey.ca)>; McCallum, Doug <[Doug.McCallum@surrey.ca](mailto:Doug.McCallum@surrey.ca)>; Hundial, Jack <[Jack.Hundial@surrey.ca](mailto:Jack.Hundial@surrey.ca)>; Guerra, Laurie <[Laurie.Guerra@surrey.ca](mailto:Laurie.Guerra@surrey.ca)>; Annis, Linda <[Linda.Annis@surrey.ca](mailto:Linda.Annis@surrey.ca)>; Nagra, Mandeep <[Mandeep.Nagra@surrey.ca](mailto:Mandeep.Nagra@surrey.ca)>; Pettigrew, Steven <[Steven.Pettigrew@surrey.ca](mailto:Steven.Pettigrew@surrey.ca)>  
**Cc:** [tom.zytaruk@surreynowleader.com](mailto:tom.zytaruk@surreynowleader.com)  
**Subject:** RE: 2021 Tree Destruction for November 22, 2021 RCPH  
**Importance:** High

Dear Council,

Please find the attached Excel Spreadsheet, to be **“Registered and Filed” in objection to 5 of 6 development applications, with concerns for 3 of 4 DVPs** on the agenda, coming to Council’s attention at the November 22<sup>nd</sup>.2021 Council meeting at 7:00pm. *Respectfully, I regret not being able to present this delegation in person.*

<https://www.surrey.ca/city-government/council-meetings-documents/current-meeting-agendas-notice-public-hearing-items>

Please review the attached Spreadsheet, I have added an extra graph on page two.

- **PLR 7921-0100-00** There is a great deal of environmental information missing in this DP & DVP Application Report, I wrote to Staff last November 11<sup>th</sup>, and await Staff reply with information.

Item 1: Very briefly, LOTs 4,5,6 &7 (see Schedule “A”) are the headwaters for “April Creek” a Natural Class B Yellow Coded creek, which passes through the Greenbelt #115L to the north of the property (See drawing in Appendix V). This development will significantly disturb, ruin or destroy the surrounding sub-surface grounds that established the headwaters. Appendix VI adds more alarm for the preservation of these headwaters “CHARACTER STUDY AND BUILDING GUIDELINES SUMMARY”, wherein the report indicates in paragraph 3 of Section 1.1 the property to East, address 16487-

28 Avenue, will “almost certainly be developed” along the same densification levels provided for in this DP & DVP application. The Arborist Drawing Appendix IV demonstrates the ground disturbances to the headwaters by the removal of the existing house foundations and the up-rooting of 19 mature trees on these 4 LOTs. This report does not address any of these issues to our city environment, parkland and the preservation of April Creek in its entirety.

**Before going onto Item 2., COSMOS indicates a Protected Park Specimen Tree “Gymnocladus” # 736717 planted 04/11/2018 on the 28 Avenue Boulevard that is in mortal danger to being cut down to facilitate LOT 7, Labeled either City 04 or City05 on the Arborist Drawing, without the actual Arborist Survey Report I cannot be more specific.**

The DP & DVP Report indicates 164A Street will be extended though the properties to connect with 28<sup>th</sup> Avenue. On the north boundary the City Planted Trees #770672 on 03/12/2020 and 776621 on 06/01/2021 These trees will require Construction Protection Zone Barriers, see Schedule “C” of the Bylaw.

Item 2: I brought to City Staff attention concerns in regards to the Cash-in-Lieu payment reported to be only \$550. **Based on the Tree Protection Bylaw 16100 - 01/11/21 Part 5 – Penalties and Part 8a - Securities,** I calculate the Cash-in-Lieu payment into the Green City Fund to be \$10,450. But even more concerning is the agreement between Parks & Rec and the developer on page 6, quote:

*“Parkland and/or Natural Area Considerations*

*To the northeast of the subject property located at 16463 – 28 Avenue, there is a “Natural” Class B (yellow-coded) watercourse located within a City owned greenbelt which runs north of the lot, flowing north through Park to 29A Avenue”.* Additionally the report indicates the developer will pay \$18,020 for 5% of unencumbered parkland, based on the Arborist Report, which is not available to the Public or Council. This unencumbered parkland is about 198 sq.metres (5%) of Greenbelt 115L, which is 3,961 sq.metres having a Gross Assessed Land value of \$1,925,000 according to COSMOS. 5% represents \$96,250, not \$18,020. How can Parks & Rec negotiate the gifting of City Parkland, **“MY LAND”** to the special interests of the developer without consultation to all Surrey Land owners and taxpayers ?, **who’s interests are City Staff representing ?**, certainly not mine. With respect to the Report



referencing the Arborist Report, Appendix IV drawing Notes 1,7 & 8 very clearly state, quote: “Note 1. The location of un-surveyed trees on this plan is approximate. Their location and ownership cannot be confirmed without being surveyed by a Registered BC Land Surveyor. Note 7. This plan is based on a topographic and tree location survey provided by the owners’ Registered British Columbia Land Surveyor (BCLS) and layout drawings provide by the owners’ Engineer (P Eng). Note 8. This plan is provided for context only, and is not certified as to the accuracy of the location of features or dimensions that are shown on this plan. Please refer to the original survey plan and engineering plans”. It is peculiar that Notes 7 & 8 have been added, and are an advisory to the reader as to the veracity of the information contained within the drawing.

Lastly Your Worship and Council to the west address 16441-28<sup>th</sup>.Avenue 7917-0310-00 received 3<sup>rd</sup>.Reading on December 18<sup>th</sup>.2017 to sub-divide into 4 LOTS. Therein 33 of 37 mature trees will be destroyed and the Green City Fund will grow by \$21,200 creating a tree deficit of 53 trees according to the report. And before long I count 18 City Boulevard trees will be up-rooted by additional developments on the south side of 28<sup>th</sup>.Avenue, all planted around 1991-2002.

This delegation to Council took me more than 6 hours of reading and research using the DP & DVP Application Report in concert with COSMOS.

- **PLR 7921-0044-00** This developer intends to subdivide his property into two lots and build on the new smaller LOT. There are 12 mature trees impacted by this development with only 3 trees to be removed, and pay \$1,100 into the Green City Fund. One of the 3 trees to be removed according to Huckleberry Landscape Design drawing is beside the already built driveway entrance (See COSMOS Street View), so I do not understand why this beautiful Douglas Fir needs to be removed. In reference to this Development Report and all the other reports on the agenda this evening, *Is it Councils Direction to no longer require City Staff to not declare the Service Agreement Fees (see Appendix II inter-office memo) applicable to each developments ? As this appears to be the new normal in relation to all other inter-office memos, hiding financial information from Council and the Public is not transparency.*
- **PLR 7920-0130-00** This developer is unforgivable, the report indicates all 104 mature trees will be clear cut to make space for 26 Townhouses, and

pay \$52,400 into the Green City Fund. Over and above that contribution the developer will pay more than \$78,000 in Tier 1 and Affordable Housing fees, adding more than \$5,000 onto any Townhouse resale price. COSMOS Fatal Injury Layer indicates 4 accidents at the intersection of 74<sup>th</sup> Ave @ 184<sup>th</sup> St, while the 2018 Surrey Average Daily Traffic Volume Map indicates in 2014 some 5,700 on 184<sup>th</sup> Street. Council should be aware between Fraser Hwy (145 accidents) and 80<sup>th</sup> Ave a total of 56 accidents are recorded on 184<sup>th</sup> Street, which is a quite a steep hill providing direct road access to Clayton Elementary and Ecole Salish Secondary Schools. Adding to the danger on 184<sup>th</sup> Street, Council can see on COSMOS Street View parents parked vehicle in the Clayton Elementary School jammed parking LOT and on the boulevard, the tree shadows inform the time as being in the afternoon, what a dangerous mess.!!

- **It is beyond understanding why Engineering is not requiring a Traffic Volume Impact Study ahead of all the surrounding developments currently in the “Initial Review Process” or have received “Conditional Approval” for 8 different applications representing a total of 516 Townhouses all within walking distance of these two schools. Heads Up somebody, need to address the traffic problem issues coming to 184<sup>th</sup> Street now! . (*Ostrich Syndrome*,. It is a form of avoidance coping that people use to manage uncomfortable feelings or rather, not deal with them).**
- **PLR 7921-0201-00** This developer also is doing a clear cut, all two trees to be destroyed, while paying Cash in Lieu into the Green City Fund in the amount of \$2,200. Council may not be aware that in this area of Newton throughout 2021 almost every development has clear cut their Mature Trees, I keep track of these things by using COSMOS Aerial Layer views.. While densification is not unique to Panorama Ridge, this development is unique, by splitting the existing small 904 sq metre Lot into 2 parcels. Three LOTS to the west PLR 7921-0237-00 awaits Councils approval, and further west PLR 7920-0222-00 is also in “Initial Review” awaiting Councils approval, barely a Mature Tree to be left in this 64<sup>th</sup> Avenue block. I took a drive through on COSMOS Street View (the back lane) to confirm my statements, barely a Tree left. Thank you for the environmental destruction approval process -- “ReZone”. Traffic volumes indicate 27,300 in 2014 pass by this property daily, with 28,500 in 2018 one block to the east. School children crossing the street to Panorama Ridge

Secondary School should be of paramount concern to Council, but nothing has been done to address this concern in the last few years as the community grows. The intersection of 132<sup>nd</sup>.St @ 64<sup>th</sup>.Avenue reports 128 fatal or injury accidents. When is enough, enough ?

- **PLR 7920-0104-00** No Concerns.
- **PLR 7920-0290-00** This is a terrible developer, they will destroy all 69 Mature Trees, and pay Cash-in-Lieu in the amount of \$28,000 into the Green City Fund, whose also is willing to pay for this development in Tier 1 and Affordable Housing Fees greater than \$744,000 money is no object. I wrote to Staff on August 8<sup>th</sup>.2021, and copied Council regarding the underground Asbestos Piping servicing the existing 6 LOTS, as remarked on page 12 of the DP report. From my understanding the City has turned its back on the problem by passing it onto the developer, underscored by the absence of direction from the Planning Department in their Inter-Office Memo Appendix II. Opposite this development is Kwantlen Park Secondary School on 132<sup>nd</sup>. Street, COSMOS reports 11 Fatal or Injury accidents, while the 2018 Surrey Average Daily Traffic Volume Map indicates in 2018 some 11,600 vehicles pass by through intersection. One can only hope the Traffic Impact Study Report (see Appendix II) has addressed these issues besides the impact of 248 Dwelling Units will have on the local area road network.

**DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMITS**

(No speaking opportunities, Comments on these permits must be received in writing for Council’s consideration).

- **PLR 7921-0252-00** Against: On December 2<sup>nd</sup>.2019 Council gave 3<sup>rd</sup>.Reading to 7919-0107-00 ( [https://www.surrey.ca/sites/default/files/planning-reports/PLR\\_7919-0107-00.pdf](https://www.surrey.ca/sites/default/files/planning-reports/PLR_7919-0107-00.pdf) ) carried unanimously RES.R19-2096, wherein the developer proposed to cut down 31 or 71 mature trees and pay \$21,600 into the Green City Fund (pages 7 & 8). On page 4 of the report the Parks Department advised Council, quote: *“Parks notes that there are City trees that could be impacted by this application. All efforts to retain City trees must be exhausted before removal will be considered.”* Naturally this current DVP report did not include the Arborist Report and drawings, so no one can identify the City trees being impacted. By going back to the minutes of that meeting, the address 2585-141 Street no longer exists according to COSMOS being now

numbered as 2577 & 2589. Within the Application Report Appendix V provides 3 pages of “Typical Character Study Photographs”, without any house plans, so Council at that time did not know what they were approving on these newly created ½ Acre LOTS. Now this current DVP proposes additional variances that infringe on property setbacks, again without architectural drawings for Council to review. If those drawings were available, Council would learn there is a Fire Hydrant #2909 now within 1.9 metres of the new property line “setback” if approved. I am very surprised the Fire Department has either not been consulted, or have not expressed concerns, (see Appendix I and Inter-Office Memo Appendix III). If Council were to enquire of COSMOS “Street View” there is much more to learn in this DVP application, such as the 26<sup>th</sup>-Avenue condition shadowed by the surrounding tree canopy, the property is encumbered with low lying ditching on the North and East boundaries, and the property in question is also heavily treed with mature trees, amongst other things.

- **PLR 7921-0319-00** No Concerns
- **PLR 7918-0455-00** No Concerns, beyond my previous delegation April 6<sup>th</sup>.2020 in regards to the loss of 42 of 44 Mature Trees, a ratio of 91.3%.
- **PLR 7921-0108-00** A place of “Welcome – Narthex” should include Trees, so I am very disappointed the Church feels it necessary to cut down 3 of 9 matures trees. I remain understanding, while concerned the Church has such little regard and value for these 3 magnificent mature trees. Go to COSMOS Street View, a sight to behold.

Respectfully,

**Rs. 22(1)** Landale

*Fleetwood Surrey Resident*



Virus-free. [www.avast.com](http://www.avast.com)

CLERKS DEPT  
NOV 22, 2021  
B.1 - 7921-0100-00  
B.2 - 7921-0044-00  
B.3 - 7920-0130-00  
B.4 - 7921-0201-00  
B.5 - 7920-0104-00  
B.6 - 7920-0290-00  
H.7 - 7921-0252-00  
H.8 - 7921-0319-00  
H.9 - 7918-0455-01  
H.10 - 7921-0108-00  
RCPH NOV 22, 21  
xc Planning,  
Land Development

**From:** Clerks Department Webmail  
**Subject:** FW: 2021 Tree Destruction for November 22, 2021 RCPH

---

**From:** R s. 22(1) Landale s. 22(1) [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** November 17, 2021 10:40 AM  
**To:** Ficocelli, Jennifer <[Jennifer.Ficocelli@surrey.ca](mailto:Jennifer.Ficocelli@surrey.ca)>; Patton, Allison <[Allison.Patton@surrey.ca](mailto:Allison.Patton@surrey.ca)>; Locke, Brenda <[Brenda.Locke@surrey.ca](mailto:Brenda.Locke@surrey.ca)>; Elford, Doug <[Doug.Elford@surrey.ca](mailto:Doug.Elford@surrey.ca)>; McCallum, Doug <[Doug.McCallum@surrey.ca](mailto:Doug.McCallum@surrey.ca)>; Hundial, Jack <[Jack.Hundial@surrey.ca](mailto:Jack.Hundial@surrey.ca)>; Guerra, Laurie <[Laurie.Guerra@surrey.ca](mailto:Laurie.Guerra@surrey.ca)>; Annis, Linda <[Linda.Annis@surrey.ca](mailto:Linda.Annis@surrey.ca)>; Nagra, Mandeep <[Mandeep.Nagra@surrey.ca](mailto:Mandeep.Nagra@surrey.ca)>; Pettigrew, Steven <[Steven.Pettigrew@surrey.ca](mailto:Steven.Pettigrew@surrey.ca)>  
**Cc:** [tom.zytaruk@surreynowleader.com](mailto:tom.zytaruk@surreynowleader.com)  
**Subject:** RE: 2021 Tree Destruction for November 22, 2021 RCPH  
**Importance:** High

Dear Council,

Please find the attached Excel Spreadsheet, to be **“Registered and Filed” in objection to 5 of 6 development applications, with concerns for 3 of 4 DVPs** on the agenda, coming to Council’s attention at the November 22<sup>nd</sup>.2021 Council meeting at 7:00pm. *Respectfully, I regret not being able to present this delegation in person.*

<https://www.surrey.ca/city-government/council-meetings-documents/current-meeting-agendas-notice-public-hearing-items>

Please review the attached Spreadsheet, I have added an extra graph on page two.

- **PLR 7921-0100-00** There is a great deal of environmental information missing in this DP & DVP Application Report, I wrote to Staff last November 11<sup>th</sup>, and await Staff reply with information.

Item 1: Very briefly, LOTs 4,5,6 &7 (see Schedule “A”) are the headwaters for “April Creek” a Natural Class B Yellow Coded creek, which passes through the Greenbelt #115L to the north of the property (See drawing in Appendix V). This development will significantly disturb, ruin or destroy the surrounding sub-surface grounds that established the headwaters. Appendix VI adds more alarm for the preservation of these headwaters “CHARACTER STUDY AND BUILDING GUIDELINES SUMMARY”, wherein the report indicates in paragraph 3 of Section 1.1 the property to East, address 16487-

28 Avenue, will “almost certainly be developed” along the same densification levels provided for in this DP & DVP application. The Arborist Drawing Appendix IV demonstrates the ground disturbances to the headwaters by the removal of the existing house foundations and the up-rooting of 19 mature trees on these 4 LOTs. This report does not address any of these issues to our city environment, parkland and the preservation of April Creek in its entirety.

**Before going onto Item 2., COSMOS indicates a Protected Park Specimen Tree “Gymnocladus” # 736717 planted 04/11/2018 on the 28 Avenue Boulevard that is in mortal danger to being cut down to facilitate LOT 7, Labeled either City 04 or City05 on the Arborist Drawing, without the actual Arborist Survey Report I cannot be more specific.**

The DP & DVP Report indicates 164A Street will be extended though the properties to connect with 28<sup>th</sup> Avenue. On the north boundary the City Planted Trees #770672 on 03/12/2020 and 776621 on 06/01/2021 These trees will require Construction Protection Zone Barriers, see Schedule “C” of the Bylaw.

Item 2: I brought to City Staff attention concerns in regards to the Cash-in-Lieu payment reported to be only \$550. **Based on the Tree Protection Bylaw 16100 - 01/11/21 Part 5 – Penalties and Part 8a - Securities,** I calculate the Cash-in-Lieu payment into the Green City Fund to be \$10,450. But even more concerning is the agreement between Parks & Rec and the developer on page 6, quote:

*“Parkland and/or Natural Area Considerations*

*To the northeast of the subject property located at 16463 – 28 Avenue, there is a "Natural" Class B (yellow-coded) watercourse located within a City owned greenbelt which runs north of the lot, flowing north through Park to 29A Avenue”.* Additionally the report indicates the developer will pay \$18,020 for 5% of unencumbered parkland, based on the Arborist Report, which is not available to the Public or Council. This unencumbered parkland is about 198 sq.metres (5%) of Greenbelt 115L, which is 3,961 sq.metres having a Gross Assessed Land value of \$1,925,000 according to COSMOS. 5% represents \$96,250, not \$18,020. How can Parks & Rec negotiate the gifting of City Parkland, **“MY LAND”** to the special interests of the developer without consultation to all Surrey Land owners and taxpayers ?, ***who’s interests are City Staff representing ?***, certainly not mine. With respect to the Report

referencing the Arborist Report, Appendix IV drawing Notes 1,7 & 8 very clearly state, quote: “Note 1. *The location of un-surveyed trees on this plan is approximate. Their location and ownership cannot be confirmed without being surveyed by a Registered BC Land Surveyor.* Note 7. *This plan is based on a topographic and tree location survey provided by the owners’ Registered British Columbia Land Surveyor (BCLS) and layout drawings provide by the owners’ Engineer (P Eng).* Note 8. *This plan is provided for context only, and is not certified as to the accuracy of the location of features or dimensions that are shown on this plan. Please refer to the original survey plan and engineering plans”.* It is peculiar that Notes 7 & 8 have been added, and are an advisory to the reader as to the veracity of the information contained within the drawing.

Lastly Your Worship and Council to the west address 16441-28<sup>th</sup>.Avenue 7917-0310-00 received 3<sup>rd</sup>.Reading on December 18<sup>th</sup>.2017 to sub-divide into 4 LOTS. Therein 33 of 37 mature trees will be destroyed and the Green City Fund will grow by \$21,200 creating a tree deficit of 53 trees according to the report. And before long I count 18 City Boulevard trees will be up-rooted by additional developments on the south side of 28<sup>th</sup>.Avenue, all planted around 1991-2002.

This delegation to Council took me more than 6 hours of reading and research using the DP & DVP Application Report in concert with COSMOS.

- **PLR 7921-0044-00** This developer intends to subdivide his property into two lots and build on the new smaller LOT. There are 12 mature trees impacted by this development with only 3 trees to be removed, and pay \$1,100 into the Green City Fund. One of the 3 trees to be removed according to Huckleberry Landscape Design drawing is beside the already built driveway entrance (See COSMOS Street View), so I do not understand why this beautiful Douglas Fir needs to be removed. In reference to this Development Report and all the other reports on the agenda this evening, *Is it Councils Direction to no longer require City Staff to not declare the Service Agreement Fees (see Appendix II inter-office memo) applicable to each developments ? As this appears to be the new normal in relation to all other inter-office memos, hiding financial information from Council and the Public is not transparency.*
- **PLR 7920-0130-00** This developer is unforgivable, the report indicates all 104 mature trees will be clear cut to make space for 26 Townhouses, and

pay \$52,400 into the Green City Fund. Over and above that contribution the developer will pay more than \$78,000 in Tier 1 and Affordable Housing fees, adding more than \$5,000 onto any Townhouse resale price. COSMOS Fatal Injury Layer indicates 4 accidents at the intersection of 74<sup>th</sup> Ave @ 184<sup>th</sup> St, while the 2018 Surrey Average Daily Traffic Volume Map indicates in 2014 some 5,700 on 184<sup>th</sup> Street. Council should be aware between Fraser Hwy (145 accidents) and 80<sup>th</sup> Ave a total of 56 accidents are recorded on 184<sup>th</sup> Street, which is a quite a steep hill providing direct road access to Clayton Elementary and Ecole Salish Secondary Schools. Adding to the danger on 184<sup>th</sup> Street, Council can see on COSMOS Street View parents parked vehicle in the Clayton Elementary School jammed parking LOT and on the boulevard, the tree shadows inform the time as being in the afternoon, what a dangerous mess.!!

- **It is beyond understanding why Engineering is not requiring a Traffic Volume Impact Study ahead of all the surrounding developments currently in the “Initial Review Process” or have received “Conditional Approval” for 8 different applications representing a total of 516 Townhouses all within walking distance of these two schools. Heads Up somebody, need to address the traffic problem issues coming to 184<sup>th</sup> Street now! . (*Ostrich Syndrome, It is a form of avoidance coping that people use to manage uncomfortable feelings or rather, not deal with them*).**
- **PLR 7921-0201-00** This developer also is doing a clear cut, all two trees to be destroyed, while paying Cash in Lieu into the Green City Fund in the amount of \$2,200. Council may not be aware that in this area of Newton throughout 2021 almost every development has clear cut their Mature Trees, I keep track of these things by using COSMOS Aerial Layer views.. While densification is not unique to Panorama Ridge, this development is unique, by splitting the existing small 904 sq metre Lot into 2 parcels. Three LOTS to the west PLR 7921-0237-00 awaits Councils approval, and further west PLR 7920-0222-00 is also in “Initial Review” awaiting Councils approval, barely a Mature Tree to be left in this 64<sup>th</sup> Avenue block. I took a drive through on COSMOS Street View (the back lane) to confirm my statements, barely a Tree left. Thank you for the environmental destruction approval process -- “ReZone”. Traffic volumes indicate 27,300 in 2014 pass by this property daily, with 28,500 in 2018 one block to the east. School children crossing the street to Panorama Ridge



Secondary School should be of paramount concern to Council, but nothing has been done to address this concern in the last few years as the community grows. The intersection of 132<sup>nd</sup>.St @ 64<sup>th</sup>.Avenue reports 128 fatal or injury accidents. When is enough, enough ?

- **PLR 7920-0104-00** No Concerns.
- **PLR 7920-0290-00** This is a terrible developer, they will destroy all 69 Mature Trees, and pay Cash-in-Lieu in the amount of \$28,000 into the Green City Fund, whose also is willing to pay for this development in Tier 1 and Affordable Housing Fees greater than \$744,000 money is no object. I wrote to Staff on August 8<sup>th</sup>.2021, and copied Council regarding the underground Asbestos Piping servicing the existing 6 LOTS, as remarked on page 12 of the DP report. From my understanding the City has turned its back on the problem by passing it onto the developer, underscored by the absence of direction from the Planning Department in their Inter-Office Memo Appendix II. Opposite this development is Kwantlen Park Secondary School on 132<sup>nd</sup>. Street, COSMOS reports 11 Fatal or Injury accidents, while the 2018 Surrey Average Daily Traffic Volume Map indicates in 2018 some 11,600 vehicles pass by through intersection. One can only hope the Traffic Impact Study Report (see Appendix II) has addressed these issues besides the impact of 248 Dwelling Units will have on the local area road network.

**DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMITS**

(No speaking opportunities, Comments on these permits must be received in writing for Council’s consideration).

- **PLR 7921-0252-00** Against: On December 2<sup>nd</sup>.2019 Council gave 3<sup>rd</sup>.Reading to 7919-0107-00 ( [https://www.surrey.ca/sites/default/files/planning-reports/PLR\\_7919-0107-00.pdf](https://www.surrey.ca/sites/default/files/planning-reports/PLR_7919-0107-00.pdf) ) carried unanimously RES.R19-2096, wherein the developer proposed to cut down 31 or 71 mature trees and pay \$21,600 into the Green City Fund (pages 7 & 8). On page 4 of the report the Parks Department advised Council, quote: *“Parks notes that there are City trees that could be impacted by this application. All efforts to retain City trees must be exhausted before removal will be considered.”* Naturally this current DVP report did not include the Arborist Report and drawings, so no one can identify the City trees being impacted. By going back to the minutes of that meeting, the address 2585-141 Street no longer exists according to COSMOS being now

numbered as 2577 & 2589. Within the Application Report Appendix V provides 3 pages of “Typical Character Study Photographs”, without any house plans, so Council at that time did not know what they were approving on these newly created ½ Acre LOTS. Now this current DVP proposes additional variances that infringe on property setbacks, again without architectural drawings for Council to review. If those drawings were available, Council would learn there is a Fire Hydrant #2909 now within 1.9 metres of the new property line “setback” if approved. I am very surprised the Fire Department has either not been consulted, or have not expressed concerns, (see Appendix I and Inter-Office Memo Appendix III). If Council were to enquire of COSMOS “Street View” there is much more to learn in this DVP application, such as the 26<sup>th</sup>-Avenue condition shadowed by the surrounding tree canopy, the property is encumbered with low lying ditching on the North and East boundaries, and the property in question is also heavily treed with mature trees, amongst other things.

- **PLR 7921-0319-00** No Concerns
- **PLR 7918-0455-00** No Concerns, beyond my previous delegation April 6<sup>th</sup>.2020 in regards to the loss of 42 of 44 Mature Trees, a ratio of 91.3%.
- **PLR 7921-0108-00** A place of “Welcome – Narthex” should include Trees, so I am very disappointed the Church feels it necessary to cut down 3 of 9 matures trees. I remain understanding, while concerned the Church has such little regard and value for these 3 magnificent mature trees. Go to COSMOS Street View, a sight to behold.

Respectfully,

**Rs. 22(1)** Landale

*Fleetwood Surrey Resident*



Virus-free. [www.avast.com](http://www.avast.com)

CLERKS DEPT  
NOV 22, 2021  
B.1 - 7921-0100-00  
B.2 - 7921-0044-00  
B.3 - 7920-0130-00  
B.4 - 7921-0201-00  
B.5 - 7920-0104-00  
B.6 - 7920-0290-00  
H.7 - 7921-0252-00  
H.8 - 7921-0319-00  
H.9 - 7918-0455-01  
H.10 - 7921-0108-00  
RCPH NOV 22, 21  
xc Planning,  
Land Development

**From:** Clerks Department Webmail  
**Subject:** FW: 2021 Tree Destruction for November 22, 2021 RCPH

---

**From:** R s. 22(1) Landale s. 22(1) [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** November 17, 2021 10:40 AM  
**To:** Ficocelli, Jennifer <[Jennifer.Ficocelli@surrey.ca](mailto:Jennifer.Ficocelli@surrey.ca)>; Patton, Allison <[Allison.Patton@surrey.ca](mailto:Allison.Patton@surrey.ca)>; Locke, Brenda <[Brenda.Locke@surrey.ca](mailto:Brenda.Locke@surrey.ca)>; Elford, Doug <[Doug.Elford@surrey.ca](mailto:Doug.Elford@surrey.ca)>; McCallum, Doug <[Doug.McCallum@surrey.ca](mailto:Doug.McCallum@surrey.ca)>; Hundial, Jack <[Jack.Hundial@surrey.ca](mailto:Jack.Hundial@surrey.ca)>; Guerra, Laurie <[Laurie.Guerra@surrey.ca](mailto:Laurie.Guerra@surrey.ca)>; Annis, Linda <[Linda.Annis@surrey.ca](mailto:Linda.Annis@surrey.ca)>; Nagra, Mandeep <[Mandeep.Nagra@surrey.ca](mailto:Mandeep.Nagra@surrey.ca)>; Pettigrew, Steven <[Steven.Pettigrew@surrey.ca](mailto:Steven.Pettigrew@surrey.ca)>  
**Cc:** [tom.zytaruk@surreynowleader.com](mailto:tom.zytaruk@surreynowleader.com)  
**Subject:** RE: 2021 Tree Destruction for November 22, 2021 RCPH  
**Importance:** High

Dear Council,

Please find the attached Excel Spreadsheet, to be **“Registered and Filed” in objection to 5 of 6 development applications, with concerns for 3 of 4 DVPs** on the agenda, coming to Council’s attention at the November 22<sup>nd</sup>.2021 Council meeting at 7:00pm. *Respectfully, I regret not being able to present this delegation in person.*

<https://www.surrey.ca/city-government/council-meetings-documents/current-meeting-agendas-notice-public-hearing-items>

Please review the attached Spreadsheet, I have added an extra graph on page two.

- **PLR 7921-0100-00** There is a great deal of environmental information missing in this DP & DVP Application Report, I wrote to Staff last November 11<sup>th</sup>, and await Staff reply with information.

Item 1: Very briefly, LOTs 4,5,6 &7 (see Schedule “A”) are the headwaters for “April Creek” a Natural Class B Yellow Coded creek, which passes through the Greenbelt #115L to the north of the property (See drawing in Appendix V). This development will significantly disturb, ruin or destroy the surrounding sub-surface grounds that established the headwaters. Appendix VI adds more alarm for the preservation of these headwaters “CHARACTER STUDY AND BUILDING GUIDELINES SUMMARY”, wherein the report indicates in paragraph 3 of Section 1.1 the property to East, address 16487-

28 Avenue, will “almost certainly be developed” along the same densification levels provided for in this DP & DVP application. The Arborist Drawing Appendix IV demonstrates the ground disturbances to the headwaters by the removal of the existing house foundations and the up-rooting of 19 mature trees on these 4 LOTs. This report does not address any of these issues to our city environment, parkland and the preservation of April Creek in its entirety.

**Before going onto Item 2., COSMOS indicates a Protected Park Specimen Tree “Gymnocladus” # 736717 planted 04/11/2018 on the 28 Avenue Boulevard that is in mortal danger to being cut down to facilitate LOT 7, Labeled either City 04 or City05 on the Arborist Drawing, without the actual Arborist Survey Report I cannot be more specific.**

The DP & DVP Report indicates 164A Street will be extended though the properties to connect with 28<sup>th</sup> Avenue. On the north boundary the City Planted Trees #770672 on 03/12/2020 and 776621 on 06/01/2021 These trees will require Construction Protection Zone Barriers, see Schedule “C” of the Bylaw.

Item 2: I brought to City Staff attention concerns in regards to the Cash-in-Lieu payment reported to be only \$550. **Based on the Tree Protection Bylaw 16100 - 01/11/21 Part 5 – Penalties and Part 8a - Securities,** I calculate the Cash-in-Lieu payment into the Green City Fund to be \$10,450. But even more concerning is the agreement between Parks & Rec and the developer on page 6, quote:

*“Parkland and/or Natural Area Considerations*

*To the northeast of the subject property located at 16463 – 28 Avenue, there is a "Natural" Class B (yellow-coded) watercourse located within a City owned greenbelt which runs north of the lot, flowing north through Park to 29A Avenue”.* Additionally the report indicates the developer will pay \$18,020 for 5% of unencumbered parkland, based on the Arborist Report, which is not available to the Public or Council. This unencumbered parkland is about 198 sq.metres (5%) of Greenbelt 115L, which is 3,961 sq.metres having a Gross Assessed Land value of \$1,925,000 according to COSMOS. 5% represents \$96,250, not \$18,020. How can Parks & Rec negotiate the gifting of City Parkland, **“MY LAND”** to the special interests of the developer without consultation to all Surrey Land owners and taxpayers ?, **who’s interests are City Staff representing ?**, certainly not mine. With respect to the Report

referencing the Arborist Report, Appendix IV drawing Notes 1,7 & 8 very clearly state, quote: "Note 1. The location of un-surveyed trees on this plan is approximate. Their location and ownership cannot be confirmed without being surveyed by a Registered BC Land Surveyor. Note 7. This plan is based on a topographic and tree location survey provided by the owners' Registered British Columbia Land Surveyor (BCLS) and layout drawings provide by the owners' Engineer (P Eng). Note 8. This plan is provided for context only, and is not certified as to the accuracy of the location of features or dimensions that are shown on this plan. Please refer to the original survey plan and engineering plans". It is peculiar that Notes 7 & 8 have been added, and are an advisory to the reader as to the veracity of the information contained within the drawing.

Lastly Your Worship and Council to the west address 16441-28<sup>th</sup>.Avenue 7917-0310-00 received 3<sup>rd</sup>.Reading on December 18<sup>th</sup>.2017 to sub-divide into 4 LOTS. Therein 33 of 37 mature trees will be destroyed and the Green City Fund will grow by \$21,200 creating a tree deficit of 53 trees according to the report. And before long I count 18 City Boulevard trees will be up-rooted by additional developments on the south side of 28<sup>th</sup>.Avenue, all planted around 1991-2002.

This delegation to Council took me more than 6 hours of reading and research using the DP & DVP Application Report in concert with COSMOS.

- **PLR 7921-0044-00** This developer intends to subdivide his property into two lots and build on the new smaller LOT. There are 12 mature trees impacted by this development with only 3 trees to be removed, and pay \$1,100 into the Green City Fund. One of the 3 trees to be removed according to Huckleberry Landscape Design drawing is beside the already built driveway entrance (See COSMOS Street View), so I do not understand why this beautiful Douglas Fir needs to be removed. In reference to this Development Report and all the other reports on the agenda this evening, *Is it Councils Direction to no longer require City Staff to not declare the Service Agreement Fees (see Appendix II inter-office memo) applicable to each developments ? As this appears to be the new normal in relation to all other inter-office memos, hiding financial information from Council and the Public is not transparency.*
- **PLR 7920-0130-00** This developer is unforgivable, the report indicates all 104 mature trees will be clear cut to make space for 26 Townhouses, and

pay \$52,400 into the Green City Fund. Over and above that contribution the developer will pay more than \$78,000 in Tier 1 and Affordable Housing fees, adding more than \$5,000 onto any Townhouse resale price. COSMOS Fatal Injury Layer indicates 4 accidents at the intersection of 74<sup>th</sup> Ave @ 184<sup>th</sup> St, while the 2018 Surrey Average Daily Traffic Volume Map indicates in 2014 some 5,700 on 184<sup>th</sup> Street. Council should be aware between Fraser Hwy (145 accidents) and 80<sup>th</sup> Ave a total of 56 accidents are recorded on 184<sup>th</sup> Street, which is a quite a steep hill providing direct road access to Clayton Elementary and Ecole Salish Secondary Schools. Adding to the danger on 184<sup>th</sup> Street, Council can see on COSMOS Street View parents parked vehicle in the Clayton Elementary School jammed parking LOT and on the boulevard, the tree shadows inform the time as being in the afternoon, what a dangerous mess.!!

- **It is beyond understanding why Engineering is not requiring a Traffic Volume Impact Study ahead of all the surrounding developments currently in the “Initial Review Process” or have received “Conditional Approval” for 8 different applications representing a total of 516 Townhouses all within walking distance of these two schools. Heads Up somebody, need to address the traffic problem issues coming to 184<sup>th</sup> Street now! . (*Ostrich Syndrome*,. It is a form of avoidance coping that people use to manage uncomfortable feelings or rather, not deal with them).**
- **PLR 7921-0201-00** This developer also is doing a clear cut, all two trees to be destroyed, while paying Cash in Lieu into the Green City Fund in the amount of \$2,200. Council may not be aware that in this area of Newton throughout 2021 almost every development has clear cut their Mature Trees, I keep track of these things by using COSMOS Aerial Layer views.. While densification is not unique to Panorama Ridge, this development is unique, by splitting the existing small 904 sq metre Lot into 2 parcels. Three LOTS to the west PLR 7921-0237-00 awaits Councils approval, and further west PLR 7920-0222-00 is also in “Initial Review” awaiting Councils approval, barely a Mature Tree to be left in this 64<sup>th</sup> Avenue block. I took a drive through on COSMOS Street View (the back lane) to confirm my statements, barely a Tree left. Thank you for the environmental destruction approval process -- “ReZone”. Traffic volumes indicate 27,300 in 2014 pass by this property daily, with 28,500 in 2018 one block to the east. School children crossing the street to Panorama Ridge

Secondary School should be of paramount concern to Council, but nothing has been done to address this concern in the last few years as the community grows. The intersection of 132<sup>nd</sup>.St @ 64<sup>th</sup>.Avenue reports 128 fatal or injury accidents. When is enough, enough ?

- **PLR 7920-0104-00** No Concerns.
- **PLR 7920-0290-00** This is a terrible developer, they will destroy all 69 Mature Trees, and pay Cash-in-Lieu in the amount of \$28,000 into the Green City Fund, whose also is willing to pay for this development in Tier 1 and Affordable Housing Fees greater than \$744,000 money is no object. I wrote to Staff on August 8<sup>th</sup>.2021, and copied Council regarding the underground Asbestos Piping servicing the existing 6 LOTS, as remarked on page 12 of the DP report. From my understanding the City has turned its back on the problem by passing it onto the developer, underscored by the absence of direction from the Planning Department in their Inter-Office Memo Appendix II. Opposite this development is Kwantlen Park Secondary School on 132<sup>nd</sup>. Street, COSMOS reports 11 Fatal or Injury accidents, while the 2018 Surrey Average Daily Traffic Volume Map indicates in 2018 some 11,600 vehicles pass by through intersection. One can only hope the Traffic Impact Study Report (see Appendix II) has addressed these issues besides the impact of 248 Dwelling Units will have on the local area road network.

**DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMITS**

(No speaking opportunities, Comments on these permits must be received in writing for Council’s consideration).

- **PLR 7921-0252-00** Against: On December 2<sup>nd</sup>.2019 Council gave 3<sup>rd</sup>.Reading to 7919-0107-00 ( [https://www.surrey.ca/sites/default/files/planning-reports/PLR\\_7919-0107-00.pdf](https://www.surrey.ca/sites/default/files/planning-reports/PLR_7919-0107-00.pdf) ) carried unanimously RES.R19-2096, wherein the developer proposed to cut down 31 or 71 mature trees and pay \$21,600 into the Green City Fund (pages 7 & 8). On page 4 of the report the Parks Department advised Council, quote: *“Parks notes that there are City trees that could be impacted by this application. All efforts to retain City trees must be exhausted before removal will be considered.”* Naturally this current DVP report did not include the Arborist Report and drawings, so no one can identify the City trees being impacted. By going back to the minutes of that meeting, the address 2585-141 Street no longer exists according to COSMOS being now

numbered as 2577 & 2589. Within the Application Report Appendix V provides 3 pages of “Typical Character Study Photographs”, without any house plans, so Council at that time did not know what they were approving on these newly created ½ Acre LOTS. Now this current DVP proposes additional variances that infringe on property setbacks, again without architectural drawings for Council to review. If those drawings were available, Council would learn there is a Fire Hydrant #2909 now within 1.9 metres of the new property line “setback” if approved. I am very surprised the Fire Department has either not been consulted, or have not expressed concerns, (see Appendix I and Inter-Office Memo Appendix III). If Council were to enquire of COSMOS “Street View” there is much more to learn in this DVP application, such as the 26<sup>th</sup>-Avenue condition shadowed by the surrounding tree canopy, the property is encumbered with low lying ditching on the North and East boundaries, and the property in question is also heavily treed with mature trees, amongst other things.

- **PLR 7921-0319-00** No Concerns
- **PLR 7918-0455-00** No Concerns, beyond my previous delegation April 6<sup>th</sup>.2020 in regards to the loss of 42 of 44 Mature Trees, a ratio of 91.3%.
- **PLR 7921-0108-00** A place of “Welcome – Narthex” should include Trees, so I am very disappointed the Church feels it necessary to cut down 3 of 9 matures trees. I remain understanding, while concerned the Church has such little regard and value for these 3 magnificent mature trees. Go to COSMOS Street View, a sight to behold.

Respectfully,

**Rs. 22(1)** Landale

*Fleetwood Surrey Resident*



Virus-free. [www.avast.com](http://www.avast.com)



CLERKS DEPT  
NOV 22, 2021  
B.1 - 7921-0100-00  
B.2 - 7921-0044-00  
B.3 - 7920-0130-00  
B.4 - 7921-0201-00  
B.5 - 7920-0104-00  
B.6 - 7920-0290-00  
H.7 - 7921-0252-00  
H.8 - 7921-0319-00  
H.9 - 7918-0455-01  
H.10 - 7921-0108-00  
RCPH NOV 22, 21  
xc Planning,  
Land Development

**From:** Clerks Department Webmail  
**Subject:** FW: 2021 Tree Destruction for November 22, 2021 RCPH

---

**From:** R s. 22(1) Landale s. 22(1) [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** November 17, 2021 10:40 AM  
**To:** Ficocelli, Jennifer <[Jennifer.Ficocelli@surrey.ca](mailto:Jennifer.Ficocelli@surrey.ca)>; Patton, Allison <[Allison.Patton@surrey.ca](mailto:Allison.Patton@surrey.ca)>; Locke, Brenda <[Brenda.Locke@surrey.ca](mailto:Brenda.Locke@surrey.ca)>; Elford, Doug <[Doug.Elford@surrey.ca](mailto:Doug.Elford@surrey.ca)>; McCallum, Doug <[Doug.McCallum@surrey.ca](mailto:Doug.McCallum@surrey.ca)>; Hundial, Jack <[Jack.Hundial@surrey.ca](mailto:Jack.Hundial@surrey.ca)>; Guerra, Laurie <[Laurie.Guerra@surrey.ca](mailto:Laurie.Guerra@surrey.ca)>; Annis, Linda <[Linda.Annis@surrey.ca](mailto:Linda.Annis@surrey.ca)>; Nagra, Mandeep <[Mandeep.Nagra@surrey.ca](mailto:Mandeep.Nagra@surrey.ca)>; Pettigrew, Steven <[Steven.Pettigrew@surrey.ca](mailto:Steven.Pettigrew@surrey.ca)>  
**Cc:** [tom.zytaruk@surreynowleader.com](mailto:tom.zytaruk@surreynowleader.com)  
**Subject:** RE: 2021 Tree Destruction for November 22, 2021 RCPH  
**Importance:** High

Dear Council,

Please find the attached Excel Spreadsheet, to be **“Registered and Filed” in objection to 5 of 6 development applications, with concerns for 3 of 4 DVPs** on the agenda, coming to Council’s attention at the November 22<sup>nd</sup>.2021 Council meeting at 7:00pm. *Respectfully, I regret not being able to present this delegation in person.*

<https://www.surrey.ca/city-government/council-meetings-documents/current-meeting-agendas-notice-public-hearing-items>

Please review the attached Spreadsheet, I have added an extra graph on page two.

- **PLR 7921-0100-00** There is a great deal of environmental information missing in this DP & DVP Application Report, I wrote to Staff last November 11<sup>th</sup>, and await Staff reply with information.

Item 1: Very briefly, LOTs 4,5,6 &7 (see Schedule “A”) are the headwaters for “April Creek” a Natural Class B Yellow Coded creek, which passes through the Greenbelt #115L to the north of the property (See drawing in Appendix V). This development will significantly disturb, ruin or destroy the surrounding sub-surface grounds that established the headwaters. Appendix VI adds more alarm for the preservation of these headwaters “CHARACTER STUDY AND BUILDING GUIDELINES SUMMARY”, wherein the report indicates in paragraph 3 of Section 1.1 the property to East, address 16487-

28 Avenue, will “almost certainly be developed” along the same densification levels provided for in this DP & DVP application. The Arborist Drawing Appendix IV demonstrates the ground disturbances to the headwaters by the removal of the existing house foundations and the up-rooting of 19 mature trees on these 4 LOTs. This report does not address any of these issues to our city environment, parkland and the preservation of April Creek in its entirety.

**Before going onto Item 2., COSMOS indicates a Protected Park Specimen Tree “Gymnocladus” # 736717 planted 04/11/2018 on the 28 Avenue Boulevard that is in mortal danger to being cut down to facilitate LOT 7, Labeled either City 04 or City05 on the Arborist Drawing, without the actual Arborist Survey Report I cannot be more specific.**

The DP & DVP Report indicates 164A Street will be extended though the properties to connect with 28<sup>th</sup> Avenue. On the north boundary the City Planted Trees #770672 on 03/12/2020 and 776621 on 06/01/2021 These trees will require Construction Protection Zone Barriers, see Schedule “C” of the Bylaw.

Item 2: I brought to City Staff attention concerns in regards to the Cash-in-Lieu payment reported to be only \$550. **Based on the Tree Protection Bylaw 16100 - 01/11/21 Part 5 – Penalties and Part 8a - Securities,** I calculate the Cash-in-Lieu payment into the Green City Fund to be \$10,450. But even more concerning is the agreement between Parks & Rec and the developer on page 6, quote:

*“Parkland and/or Natural Area Considerations*

*To the northeast of the subject property located at 16463 – 28 Avenue, there is a "Natural" Class B (yellow-coded) watercourse located within a City owned greenbelt which runs north of the lot, flowing north through Park to 29A Avenue”.* Additionally the report indicates the developer will pay \$18,020 for 5% of unencumbered parkland, based on the Arborist Report, which is not available to the Public or Council. This unencumbered parkland is about 198 sq.metres (5%) of Greenbelt 115L, which is 3,961 sq.metres having a Gross Assessed Land value of \$1,925,000 according to COSMOS. 5% represents \$96,250, not \$18,020. How can Parks & Rec negotiate the gifting of City Parkland, **“MY LAND”** to the special interests of the developer without consultation to all Surrey Land owners and taxpayers ?, ***who’s interests are City Staff representing ?***, certainly not mine. With respect to the Report

referencing the Arborist Report, Appendix IV drawing Notes 1,7 & 8 very clearly state, quote: "Note 1. The location of un-surveyed trees on this plan is approximate. Their location and ownership cannot be confirmed without being surveyed by a Registered BC Land Surveyor. Note 7. This plan is based on a topographic and tree location survey provided by the owners' Registered British Columbia Land Surveyor (BCLS) and layout drawings provide by the owners' Engineer (P Eng). Note 8. This plan is provided for context only, and is not certified as to the accuracy of the location of features or dimensions that are shown on this plan. Please refer to the original survey plan and engineering plans". It is peculiar that Notes 7 & 8 have been added, and are an advisory to the reader as to the veracity of the information contained within the drawing.

Lastly Your Worship and Council to the west address 16441-28<sup>th</sup>.Avenue 7917-0310-00 received 3<sup>rd</sup>.Reading on December 18<sup>th</sup>.2017 to sub-divide into 4 LOTS. Therein 33 of 37 mature trees will be destroyed and the Green City Fund will grow by \$21,200 creating a tree deficit of 53 trees according to the report. And before long I count 18 City Boulevard trees will be up-rooted by additional developments on the south side of 28<sup>th</sup>.Avenue, all planted around 1991-2002.

This delegation to Council took me more than 6 hours of reading and research using the DP & DVP Application Report in concert with COSMOS.

- **PLR 7921-0044-00** This developer intends to subdivide his property into two lots and build on the new smaller LOT. There are 12 mature trees impacted by this development with only 3 trees to be removed, and pay \$1,100 into the Green City Fund. One of the 3 trees to be removed according to Huckleberry Landscape Design drawing is beside the already built driveway entrance (See COSMOS Street View), so I do not understand why this beautiful Douglas Fir needs to be removed. In reference to this Development Report and all the other reports on the agenda this evening, *Is it Councils Direction to no longer require City Staff to not declare the Service Agreement Fees (see Appendix II inter-office memo) applicable to each developments ? As this appears to be the new normal in relation to all other inter-office memos, hiding financial information from Council and the Public is not transparency.*
- **PLR 7920-0130-00** This developer is unforgivable, the report indicates all 104 mature trees will be clear cut to make space for 26 Townhouses, and

pay \$52,400 into the Green City Fund. Over and above that contribution the developer will pay more than \$78,000 in Tier 1 and Affordable Housing fees, adding more than \$5,000 onto any Townhouse resale price. COSMOS Fatal Injury Layer indicates 4 accidents at the intersection of 74<sup>th</sup> Ave @ 184<sup>th</sup> St, while the 2018 Surrey Average Daily Traffic Volume Map indicates in 2014 some 5,700 on 184<sup>th</sup> Street. Council should be aware between Fraser Hwy (145 accidents) and 80<sup>th</sup> Ave a total of 56 accidents are recorded on 184<sup>th</sup> Street, which is a quite a steep hill providing direct road access to Clayton Elementary and Ecole Salish Secondary Schools. Adding to the danger on 184<sup>th</sup> Street, Council can see on COSMOS Street View parents parked vehicle in the Clayton Elementary School jammed parking LOT and on the boulevard, the tree shadows inform the time as being in the afternoon, what a dangerous mess.!!

- **It is beyond understanding why Engineering is not requiring a Traffic Volume Impact Study ahead of all the surrounding developments currently in the “Initial Review Process” or have received “Conditional Approval” for 8 different applications representing a total of 516 Townhouses all within walking distance of these two schools. Heads Up somebody, need to address the traffic problem issues coming to 184<sup>th</sup> Street now! . (*Ostrich Syndrome*,. It is a form of avoidance coping that people use to manage uncomfortable feelings or rather, not deal with them).**
- **PLR 7921-0201-00** This developer also is doing a clear cut, all two trees to be destroyed, while paying Cash in Lieu into the Green City Fund in the amount of \$2,200. Council may not be aware that in this area of Newton throughout 2021 almost every development has clear cut their Mature Trees, I keep track of these things by using COSMOS Aerial Layer views.. While densification is not unique to Panorama Ridge, this development is unique, by splitting the existing small 904 sq metre Lot into 2 parcels. Three LOTS to the west PLR 7921-0237-00 awaits Councils approval, and further west PLR 7920-0222-00 is also in “Initial Review” awaiting Councils approval, barely a Mature Tree to be left in this 64<sup>th</sup> Avenue block. I took a drive through on COSMOS Street View (the back lane) to confirm my statements, barely a Tree left. Thank you for the environmental destruction approval process -- “ReZone”. Traffic volumes indicate 27,300 in 2014 pass by this property daily, with 28,500 in 2018 one block to the east. School children crossing the street to Panorama Ridge

Secondary School should be of paramount concern to Council, but nothing has been done to address this concern in the last few years as the community grows. The intersection of 132<sup>nd</sup>.St @ 64<sup>th</sup>.Avenue reports 128 fatal or injury accidents. When is enough, enough ?

- **PLR 7920-0104-00** No Concerns.
- **PLR 7920-0290-00** This is a terrible developer, they will destroy all 69 Mature Trees, and pay Cash-in-Lieu in the amount of \$28,000 into the Green City Fund, whose also is willing to pay for this development in Tier 1 and Affordable Housing Fees greater than \$744,000 money is no object. I wrote to Staff on August 8<sup>th</sup>.2021, and copied Council regarding the underground Asbestos Piping servicing the existing 6 LOTS, as remarked on page 12 of the DP report. From my understanding the City has turned its back on the problem by passing it onto the developer, underscored by the absence of direction from the Planning Department in their Inter-Office Memo Appendix II. Opposite this development is Kwantlen Park Secondary School on 132<sup>nd</sup>. Street, COSMOS reports 11 Fatal or Injury accidents, while the 2018 Surrey Average Daily Traffic Volume Map indicates in 2018 some 11,600 vehicles pass by through intersection. One can only hope the Traffic Impact Study Report (see Appendix II) has addressed these issues besides the impact of 248 Dwelling Units will have on the local area road network.

**DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMITS**

(No speaking opportunities, Comments on these permits must be received in writing for Council’s consideration).

- **PLR 7921-0252-00** Against: On December 2<sup>nd</sup>.2019 Council gave 3<sup>rd</sup>.Reading to 7919-0107-00 ( [https://www.surrey.ca/sites/default/files/planning-reports/PLR\\_7919-0107-00.pdf](https://www.surrey.ca/sites/default/files/planning-reports/PLR_7919-0107-00.pdf) ) carried unanimously RES.R19-2096, wherein the developer proposed to cut down 31 or 71 mature trees and pay \$21,600 into the Green City Fund (pages 7 & 8). On page 4 of the report the Parks Department advised Council, quote: *“Parks notes that there are City trees that could be impacted by this application. All efforts to retain City trees must be exhausted before removal will be considered.”* Naturally this current DVP report did not include the Arborist Report and drawings, so no one can identify the City trees being impacted. By going back to the minutes of that meeting, the address 2585-141 Street no longer exists according to COSMOS being now

numbered as 2577 & 2589. Within the Application Report Appendix V provides 3 pages of “Typical Character Study Photographs”, without any house plans, so Council at that time did not know what they were approving on these newly created ½ Acre LOTS. Now this current DVP proposes additional variances that infringe on property setbacks, again without architectural drawings for Council to review. If those drawings were available, Council would learn there is a Fire Hydrant #2909 now within 1.9 metres of the new property line “setback” if approved. I am very surprised the Fire Department has either not been consulted, or have not expressed concerns, (see Appendix I and Inter-Office Memo Appendix III). If Council were to enquire of COSMOS “Street View” there is much more to learn in this DVP application, such as the 26<sup>th</sup>-Avenue condition shadowed by the surrounding tree canopy, the property is encumbered with low lying ditching on the North and East boundaries, and the property in question is also heavily treed with mature trees, amongst other things.

- **PLR 7921-0319-00** No Concerns
- **PLR 7918-0455-00** No Concerns, beyond my previous delegation April 6<sup>th</sup>.2020 in regards to the loss of 42 of 44 Mature Trees, a ratio of 91.3%.
- **PLR 7921-0108-00** A place of “Welcome – Narthex” should include Trees, so I am very disappointed the Church feels it necessary to cut down 3 of 9 matures trees. I remain understanding, while concerned the Church has such little regard and value for these 3 magnificent mature trees. Go to COSMOS Street View, a sight to behold.

Respectfully,

RS. 22(1) Landale

*Fleetwood Surrey Resident*



Virus-free. [www.avast.com](http://www.avast.com)

CLERKS DEPT  
NOV 22, 2021  
B.1 - 7921-0100-00  
B.2 - 7921-0044-00  
B.3 - 7920-0130-00  
B.4 - 7921-0201-00  
B.5 - 7920-0104-00  
B.6 - 7920-0290-00  
H.7 - 7921-0252-00  
H.8 - 7921-0319-00  
H.9 - 7918-0455-01  
H.10 - 7921-0108-00  
RCPH NOV 22, 21  
xc Planning,  
Land Development

**From:** Clerks Department Webmail  
**Subject:** FW: 2021 Tree Destruction for November 22, 2021 RCPH

---

**From:** R s. 22(1) Landale s. 22(1) [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** November 17, 2021 10:40 AM  
**To:** Ficocelli, Jennifer <[Jennifer.Ficocelli@surrey.ca](mailto:Jennifer.Ficocelli@surrey.ca)>; Patton, Allison <[Allison.Patton@surrey.ca](mailto:Allison.Patton@surrey.ca)>; Locke, Brenda <[Brenda.Locke@surrey.ca](mailto:Brenda.Locke@surrey.ca)>; Elford, Doug <[Doug.Elford@surrey.ca](mailto:Doug.Elford@surrey.ca)>; McCallum, Doug <[Doug.McCallum@surrey.ca](mailto:Doug.McCallum@surrey.ca)>; Hundial, Jack <[Jack.Hundial@surrey.ca](mailto:Jack.Hundial@surrey.ca)>; Guerra, Laurie <[Laurie.Guerra@surrey.ca](mailto:Laurie.Guerra@surrey.ca)>; Annis, Linda <[Linda.Annis@surrey.ca](mailto:Linda.Annis@surrey.ca)>; Nagra, Mandeep <[Mandeep.Nagra@surrey.ca](mailto:Mandeep.Nagra@surrey.ca)>; Pettigrew, Steven <[Steven.Pettigrew@surrey.ca](mailto:Steven.Pettigrew@surrey.ca)>  
**Cc:** [tom.zytaruk@surreynowleader.com](mailto:tom.zytaruk@surreynowleader.com)  
**Subject:** RE: 2021 Tree Destruction for November 22, 2021 RCPH  
**Importance:** High

Dear Council,

Please find the attached Excel Spreadsheet, to be **“Registered and Filed” in objection to 5 of 6 development applications, with concerns for 3 of 4 DVPs** on the agenda, coming to Council’s attention at the November 22<sup>nd</sup>.2021 Council meeting at 7:00pm. *Respectfully, I regret not being able to present this delegation in person.*

<https://www.surrey.ca/city-government/council-meetings-documents/current-meeting-agendas-notice-public-hearing-items>

Please review the attached Spreadsheet, I have added an extra graph on page two.

- **PLR 7921-0100-00** There is a great deal of environmental information missing in this DP & DVP Application Report, I wrote to Staff last November 11<sup>th</sup>, and await Staff reply with information.

Item 1: Very briefly, LOTs 4,5,6 &7 (see Schedule “A”) are the headwaters for “April Creek” a Natural Class B Yellow Coded creek, which passes through the Greenbelt #115L to the north of the property (See drawing in Appendix V). This development will significantly disturb, ruin or destroy the surrounding sub-surface grounds that established the headwaters. Appendix VI adds more alarm for the preservation of these headwaters “CHARACTER STUDY AND BUILDING GUIDELINES SUMMARY”, wherein the report indicates in paragraph 3 of Section 1.1 the property to East, address 16487-

28 Avenue, will “almost certainly be developed” along the same densification levels provided for in this DP & DVP application. The Arborist Drawing Appendix IV demonstrates the ground disturbances to the headwaters by the removal of the existing house foundations and the up-rooting of 19 mature trees on these 4 LOTs. This report does not address any of these issues to our city environment, parkland and the preservation of April Creek in its entirety.

**Before going onto Item 2., COSMOS indicates a Protected Park Specimen Tree “Gymnocladus” # 736717 planted 04/11/2018 on the 28 Avenue Boulevard that is in mortal danger to being cut down to facilitate LOT 7, Labeled either City 04 or City05 on the Arborist Drawing, without the actual Arborist Survey Report I cannot be more specific.**

The DP & DVP Report indicates 164A Street will be extended though the properties to connect with 28<sup>th</sup> Avenue. On the north boundary the City Planted Trees #770672 on 03/12/2020 and 776621 on 06/01/2021 These trees will require Construction Protection Zone Barriers, see Schedule “C” of the Bylaw.

Item 2: I brought to City Staff attention concerns in regards to the Cash-in-Lieu payment reported to be only \$550. **Based on the Tree Protection Bylaw 16100 - 01/11/21 Part 5 – Penalties and Part 8a - Securities,** I calculate the Cash-in-Lieu payment into the Green City Fund to be \$10,450. But even more concerning is the agreement between Parks & Rec and the developer on page 6, quote:

*“Parkland and/or Natural Area Considerations*

*To the northeast of the subject property located at 16463 – 28 Avenue, there is a "Natural" Class B (yellow-coded) watercourse located within a City owned greenbelt which runs north of the lot, flowing north through Park to 29A Avenue”.* Additionally the report indicates the developer will pay \$18,020 for 5% of unencumbered parkland, based on the Arborist Report, which is not available to the Public or Council. This unencumbered parkland is about 198 sq.metres (5%) of Greenbelt 115L, which is 3,961 sq.metres having a Gross Assessed Land value of \$1,925,000 according to COSMOS. 5% represents \$96,250, not \$18,020. How can Parks & Rec negotiate the gifting of City Parkland, **“MY LAND”** to the special interests of the developer without consultation to all Surrey Land owners and taxpayers ?, ***who’s interests are City Staff representing ?***, certainly not mine. With respect to the Report



referencing the Arborist Report, Appendix IV drawing Notes 1,7 & 8 very clearly state, quote: “Note 1. The location of un-surveyed trees on this plan is approximate. Their location and ownership cannot be confirmed without being surveyed by a Registered BC Land Surveyor. Note 7. This plan is based on a topographic and tree location survey provided by the owners’ Registered British Columbia Land Surveyor (BCLS) and layout drawings provide by the owners’ Engineer (P Eng). Note 8. This plan is provided for context only, and is not certified as to the accuracy of the location of features or dimensions that are shown on this plan. Please refer to the original survey plan and engineering plans”. It is peculiar that Notes 7 & 8 have been added, and are an advisory to the reader as to the veracity of the information contained within the drawing.

Lastly Your Worship and Council to the west address 16441-28<sup>th</sup>.Avenue 7917-0310-00 received 3<sup>rd</sup>.Reading on December 18<sup>th</sup>.2017 to sub-divide into 4 LOTS. Therein 33 of 37 mature trees will be destroyed and the Green City Fund will grow by \$21,200 creating a tree deficit of 53 trees according to the report. And before long I count 18 City Boulevard trees will be up-rooted by additional developments on the south side of 28<sup>th</sup>.Avenue, all planted around 1991-2002.

This delegation to Council took me more than 6 hours of reading and research using the DP & DVP Application Report in concert with COSMOS.

- **PLR 7921-0044-00** This developer intends to subdivide his property into two lots and build on the new smaller LOT. There are 12 mature trees impacted by this development with only 3 trees to be removed, and pay \$1,100 into the Green City Fund. One of the 3 trees to be removed according to Huckleberry Landscape Design drawing is beside the already built driveway entrance (See COSMOS Street View), so I do not understand why this beautiful Douglas Fir needs to be removed. In reference to this Development Report and all the other reports on the agenda this evening, *Is it Councils Direction to no longer require City Staff to not declare the Service Agreement Fees (see Appendix II inter-office memo) applicable to each developments ? As this appears to be the new normal in relation to all other inter-office memos, hiding financial information from Council and the Public is not transparency.*
- **PLR 7920-0130-00** This developer is unforgivable, the report indicates all 104 mature trees will be clear cut to make space for 26 Townhouses, and

pay \$52,400 into the Green City Fund. Over and above that contribution the developer will pay more than \$78,000 in Tier 1 and Affordable Housing fees, adding more than \$5,000 onto any Townhouse resale price. COSMOS Fatal Injury Layer indicates 4 accidents at the intersection of 74<sup>th</sup> Ave @ 184<sup>th</sup> St, while the 2018 Surrey Average Daily Traffic Volume Map indicates in 2014 some 5,700 on 184<sup>th</sup> Street. Council should be aware between Fraser Hwy (145 accidents) and 80<sup>th</sup> Ave a total of 56 accidents are recorded on 184<sup>th</sup> Street, which is a quite a steep hill providing direct road access to Clayton Elementary and Ecole Salish Secondary Schools. Adding to the danger on 184<sup>th</sup> Street, Council can see on COSMOS Street View parents parked vehicle in the Clayton Elementary School jammed parking LOT and on the boulevard, the tree shadows inform the time as being in the afternoon, what a dangerous mess.!!

- **It is beyond understanding why Engineering is not requiring a Traffic Volume Impact Study ahead of all the surrounding developments currently in the “Initial Review Process” or have received “Conditional Approval” for 8 different applications representing a total of 516 Townhouses all within walking distance of these two schools. Heads Up somebody, need to address the traffic problem issues coming to 184<sup>th</sup> Street now! . (*Ostrich Syndrome*,. It is a form of avoidance coping that people use to manage uncomfortable feelings or rather, not deal with them).**
- **PLR 7921-0201-00** This developer also is doing a clear cut, all two trees to be destroyed, while paying Cash in Lieu into the Green City Fund in the amount of \$2,200. Council may not be aware that in this area of Newton throughout 2021 almost every development has clear cut their Mature Trees, I keep track of these things by using COSMOS Aerial Layer views.. While densification is not unique to Panorama Ridge, this development is unique, by splitting the existing small 904 sq metre Lot into 2 parcels. Three LOTS to the west PLR 7921-0237-00 awaits Councils approval, and further west PLR 7920-0222-00 is also in “Initial Review” awaiting Councils approval, barely a Mature Tree to be left in this 64<sup>th</sup> Avenue block. I took a drive through on COSMOS Street View (the back lane) to confirm my statements, barely a Tree left. Thank you for the environmental destruction approval process -- “ReZone”. Traffic volumes indicate 27,300 in 2014 pass by this property daily, with 28,500 in 2018 one block to the east. School children crossing the street to Panorama Ridge

Secondary School should be of paramount concern to Council, but nothing has been done to address this concern in the last few years as the community grows. The intersection of 132<sup>nd</sup>.St @ 64<sup>th</sup>.Avenue reports 128 fatal or injury accidents. When is enough, enough ?

- **PLR 7920-0104-00** No Concerns.
- **PLR 7920-0290-00** This is a terrible developer, they will destroy all 69 Mature Trees, and pay Cash-in-Lieu in the amount of \$28,000 into the Green City Fund, whose also is willing to pay for this development in Tier 1 and Affordable Housing Fees greater than \$744,000 money is no object. I wrote to Staff on August 8<sup>th</sup>.2021, and copied Council regarding the underground Asbestos Piping servicing the existing 6 LOTS, as remarked on page 12 of the DP report. From my understanding the City has turned its back on the problem by passing it onto the developer, underscored by the absence of direction from the Planning Department in their Inter-Office Memo Appendix II. Opposite this development is Kwantlen Park Secondary School on 132<sup>nd</sup>. Street, COSMOS reports 11 Fatal or Injury accidents, while the 2018 Surrey Average Daily Traffic Volume Map indicates in 2018 some 11,600 vehicles pass by through intersection. One can only hope the Traffic Impact Study Report (see Appendix II) has addressed these issues besides the impact of 248 Dwelling Units will have on the local area road network.

**DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMITS**

(No speaking opportunities, Comments on these permits must be received in writing for Council’s consideration).

- **PLR 7921-0252-00** Against: On December 2<sup>nd</sup>.2019 Council gave 3<sup>rd</sup>.Reading to 7919-0107-00 ( [https://www.surrey.ca/sites/default/files/planning-reports/PLR\\_7919-0107-00.pdf](https://www.surrey.ca/sites/default/files/planning-reports/PLR_7919-0107-00.pdf) ) carried unanimously RES.R19-2096, wherein the developer proposed to cut down 31 or 71 mature trees and pay \$21,600 into the Green City Fund (pages 7 & 8). On page 4 of the report the Parks Department advised Council, quote: *“Parks notes that there are City trees that could be impacted by this application. All efforts to retain City trees must be exhausted before removal will be considered.”* Naturally this current DVP report did not include the Arborist Report and drawings, so no one can identify the City trees being impacted. By going back to the minutes of that meeting, the address 2585-141 Street no longer exists according to COSMOS being now

numbered as 2577 & 2589. Within the Application Report Appendix V provides 3 pages of “Typical Character Study Photographs”, without any house plans, so Council at that time did not know what they were approving on these newly created ½ Acre LOTS. Now this current DVP proposes additional variances that infringe on property setbacks, again without architectural drawings for Council to review. If those drawings were available, Council would learn there is a Fire Hydrant #2909 now within 1.9 metres of the new property line “setback” if approved. I am very surprised the Fire Department has either not been consulted, or have not expressed concerns, (see Appendix I and Inter-Office Memo Appendix III). If Council were to enquire of COSMOS “Street View” there is much more to learn in this DVP application, such as the 26<sup>th</sup>-Avenue condition shadowed by the surrounding tree canopy, the property is encumbered with low lying ditching on the North and East boundaries, and the property in question is also heavily treed with mature trees, amongst other things.

- **PLR 7921-0319-00** No Concerns
- **PLR 7918-0455-00** No Concerns, beyond my previous delegation April 6<sup>th</sup>.2020 in regards to the loss of 42 of 44 Mature Trees, a ratio of 91.3%.
- **PLR 7921-0108-00** A place of “Welcome – Narthex” should include Trees, so I am very disappointed the Church feels it necessary to cut down 3 of 9 matures trees. I remain understanding, while concerned the Church has such little regard and value for these 3 magnificent mature trees. Go to COSMOS Street View, a sight to behold.

Respectfully,

**Rs. 22(1)** Landale

*Fleetwood Surrey Resident*



Virus-free. [www.avast.com](http://www.avast.com)

CLERKS DEPT  
NOV 22, 2021  
B.1 - 7921-0100-00  
B.2 - 7921-0044-00  
B.3 - 7920-0130-00  
B.4 - 7921-0201-00  
B.5 - 7920-0104-00  
B.6 - 7920-0290-00  
H.7 - 7921-0252-00  
H.8 - 7921-0319-00  
H.9 - 7918-0455-01  
H.10 - 7921-0108-00  
RCPH NOV 22, 21  
xc Planning,  
Land Development

**From:** Clerks Department Webmail  
**Subject:** FW: 2021 Tree Destruction for November 22, 2021 RCPH

---

**From:** R s. 22(1) Landale s. 22(1) [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** November 17, 2021 10:40 AM  
**To:** Ficocelli, Jennifer <[Jennifer.Ficocelli@surrey.ca](mailto:Jennifer.Ficocelli@surrey.ca)>; Patton, Allison <[Allison.Patton@surrey.ca](mailto:Allison.Patton@surrey.ca)>; Locke, Brenda <[Brenda.Locke@surrey.ca](mailto:Brenda.Locke@surrey.ca)>; Elford, Doug <[Doug.Elford@surrey.ca](mailto:Doug.Elford@surrey.ca)>; McCallum, Doug <[Doug.McCallum@surrey.ca](mailto:Doug.McCallum@surrey.ca)>; Hundial, Jack <[Jack.Hundial@surrey.ca](mailto:Jack.Hundial@surrey.ca)>; Guerra, Laurie <[Laurie.Guerra@surrey.ca](mailto:Laurie.Guerra@surrey.ca)>; Annis, Linda <[Linda.Annis@surrey.ca](mailto:Linda.Annis@surrey.ca)>; Nagra, Mandeep <[Mandeep.Nagra@surrey.ca](mailto:Mandeep.Nagra@surrey.ca)>; Pettigrew, Steven <[Steven.Pettigrew@surrey.ca](mailto:Steven.Pettigrew@surrey.ca)>  
**Cc:** [tom.zytaruk@surreynowleader.com](mailto:tom.zytaruk@surreynowleader.com)  
**Subject:** RE: 2021 Tree Destruction for November 22, 2021 RCPH  
**Importance:** High

Dear Council,

Please find the attached Excel Spreadsheet, to be **“Registered and Filed” in objection to 5 of 6 development applications, with concerns for 3 of 4 DVPs** on the agenda, coming to Council’s attention at the November 22<sup>nd</sup>.2021 Council meeting at 7:00pm. *Respectfully, I regret not being able to present this delegation in person.*

<https://www.surrey.ca/city-government/council-meetings-documents/current-meeting-agendas-notice-public-hearing-items>

Please review the attached Spreadsheet, I have added an extra graph on page two.

- **PLR 7921-0100-00** There is a great deal of environmental information missing in this DP & DVP Application Report, I wrote to Staff last November 11<sup>th</sup>, and await Staff reply with information.

Item 1: Very briefly, LOTs 4,5,6 &7 (see Schedule “A”) are the headwaters for “April Creek” a Natural Class B Yellow Coded creek, which passes through the Greenbelt #115L to the north of the property (See drawing in Appendix V). This development will significantly disturb, ruin or destroy the surrounding sub-surface grounds that established the headwaters. Appendix VI adds more alarm for the preservation of these headwaters “CHARACTER STUDY AND BUILDING GUIDELINES SUMMARY”, wherein the report indicates in paragraph 3 of Section 1.1 the property to East, address 16487-

28 Avenue, will “almost certainly be developed” along the same densification levels provided for in this DP & DVP application. The Arborist Drawing Appendix IV demonstrates the ground disturbances to the headwaters by the removal of the existing house foundations and the up-rooting of 19 mature trees on these 4 LOTs. This report does not address any of these issues to our city environment, parkland and the preservation of April Creek in its entirety.

**Before going onto Item 2., COSMOS indicates a Protected Park Specimen Tree “Gymnocladus” # 736717 planted 04/11/2018 on the 28 Avenue Boulevard that is in mortal danger to being cut down to facilitate LOT 7, Labeled either City 04 or City05 on the Arborist Drawing, without the actual Arborist Survey Report I cannot be more specific.**

The DP & DVP Report indicates 164A Street will be extended though the properties to connect with 28<sup>th</sup> Avenue. On the north boundary the City Planted Trees #770672 on 03/12/2020 and 776621 on 06/01/2021 These trees will require Construction Protection Zone Barriers, see Schedule “C” of the Bylaw.

Item 2: I brought to City Staff attention concerns in regards to the Cash-in-Lieu payment reported to be only \$550. **Based on the Tree Protection Bylaw 16100 - 01/11/21 Part 5 – Penalties and Part 8a - Securities,** I calculate the Cash-in-Lieu payment into the Green City Fund to be \$10,450. But even more concerning is the agreement between Parks & Rec and the developer on page 6, quote:

*“Parkland and/or Natural Area Considerations*

*To the northeast of the subject property located at 16463 – 28 Avenue, there is a "Natural" Class B (yellow-coded) watercourse located within a City owned greenbelt which runs north of the lot, flowing north through Park to 29A Avenue”.* Additionally the report indicates the developer will pay \$18,020 for 5% of unencumbered parkland, based on the Arborist Report, which is not available to the Public or Council. This unencumbered parkland is about 198 sq.metres (5%) of Greenbelt 115L, which is 3,961 sq.metres having a Gross Assessed Land value of \$1,925,000 according to COSMOS. 5% represents \$96,250, not \$18,020. How can Parks & Rec negotiate the gifting of City Parkland, **“MY LAND”** to the special interests of the developer without consultation to all Surrey Land owners and taxpayers ?, **who’s interests are City Staff representing ?**, certainly not mine. With respect to the Report

referencing the Arborist Report, Appendix IV drawing Notes 1,7 & 8 very clearly state, quote: "Note 1. The location of un-surveyed trees on this plan is approximate. Their location and ownership cannot be confirmed without being surveyed by a Registered BC Land Surveyor. Note 7. This plan is based on a topographic and tree location survey provided by the owners' Registered British Columbia Land Surveyor (BCLS) and layout drawings provide by the owners' Engineer (P Eng). Note 8. This plan is provided for context only, and is not certified as to the accuracy of the location of features or dimensions that are shown on this plan. Please refer to the original survey plan and engineering plans". It is peculiar that Notes 7 & 8 have been added, and are an advisory to the reader as to the veracity of the information contained within the drawing.

Lastly Your Worship and Council to the west address 16441-28<sup>th</sup>.Avenue 7917-0310-00 received 3<sup>rd</sup>.Reading on December 18<sup>th</sup>.2017 to sub-divide into 4 LOTS. Therein 33 of 37 mature trees will be destroyed and the Green City Fund will grow by \$21,200 creating a tree deficit of 53 trees according to the report. And before long I count 18 City Boulevard trees will be up-rooted by additional developments on the south side of 28<sup>th</sup>.Avenue, all planted around 1991-2002.

This delegation to Council took me more than 6 hours of reading and research using the DP & DVP Application Report in concert with COSMOS.

- **PLR 7921-0044-00** This developer intends to subdivide his property into two lots and build on the new smaller LOT. There are 12 mature trees impacted by this development with only 3 trees to be removed, and pay \$1,100 into the Green City Fund. One of the 3 trees to be removed according to Huckleberry Landscape Design drawing is beside the already built driveway entrance (See COSMOS Street View), so I do not understand why this beautiful Douglas Fir needs to be removed. In reference to this Development Report and all the other reports on the agenda this evening, *Is it Councils Direction to no longer require City Staff to not declare the Service Agreement Fees (see Appendix II inter-office memo) applicable to each developments ? As this appears to be the new normal in relation to all other inter-office memos, hiding financial information from Council and the Public is not transparency.*
- **PLR 7920-0130-00** This developer is unforgivable, the report indicates all 104 mature trees will be clear cut to make space for 26 Townhouses, and

pay \$52,400 into the Green City Fund. Over and above that contribution the developer will pay more than \$78,000 in Tier 1 and Affordable Housing fees, adding more than \$5,000 onto any Townhouse resale price. COSMOS Fatal Injury Layer indicates 4 accidents at the intersection of 74<sup>th</sup> Ave @ 184<sup>th</sup> St, while the 2018 Surrey Average Daily Traffic Volume Map indicates in 2014 some 5,700 on 184<sup>th</sup> Street. Council should be aware between Fraser Hwy (145 accidents) and 80<sup>th</sup> Ave a total of 56 accidents are recorded on 184<sup>th</sup> Street, which is a quite a steep hill providing direct road access to Clayton Elementary and Ecole Salish Secondary Schools. Adding to the danger on 184<sup>th</sup> Street, Council can see on COSMOS Street View parents parked vehicle in the Clayton Elementary School jammed parking LOT and on the boulevard, the tree shadows inform the time as being in the afternoon, what a dangerous mess.!!

- **It is beyond understanding why Engineering is not requiring a Traffic Volume Impact Study ahead of all the surrounding developments currently in the “Initial Review Process” or have received “Conditional Approval” for 8 different applications representing a total of 516 Townhouses all within walking distance of these two schools. Heads Up somebody, need to address the traffic problem issues coming to 184<sup>th</sup> Street now! . (*Ostrich Syndrome*,. It is a form of avoidance coping that people use to manage uncomfortable feelings or rather, not deal with them).**
- **PLR 7921-0201-00** This developer also is doing a clear cut, all two trees to be destroyed, while paying Cash in Lieu into the Green City Fund in the amount of \$2,200. Council may not be aware that in this area of Newton throughout 2021 almost every development has clear cut their Mature Trees, I keep track of these things by using COSMOS Aerial Layer views.. While densification is not unique to Panorama Ridge, this development is unique, by splitting the existing small 904 sq metre Lot into 2 parcels. Three LOTS to the west PLR 7921-0237-00 awaits Councils approval, and further west PLR 7920-0222-00 is also in “Initial Review” awaiting Councils approval, barely a Mature Tree to be left in this 64<sup>th</sup> Avenue block. I took a drive through on COSMOS Street View (the back lane) to confirm my statements, barely a Tree left. Thank you for the environmental destruction approval process -- “ReZone”. Traffic volumes indicate 27,300 in 2014 pass by this property daily, with 28,500 in 2018 one block to the east. School children crossing the street to Panorama Ridge



Secondary School should be of paramount concern to Council, but nothing has been done to address this concern in the last few years as the community grows. The intersection of 132<sup>nd</sup>.St @ 64<sup>th</sup>.Avenue reports 128 fatal or injury accidents. When is enough, enough ?

- **PLR 7920-0104-00** No Concerns.
- **PLR 7920-0290-00** This is a terrible developer, they will destroy all 69 Mature Trees, and pay Cash-in-Lieu in the amount of \$28,000 into the Green City Fund, whose also is willing to pay for this development in Tier 1 and Affordable Housing Fees greater than \$744,000 money is no object. I wrote to Staff on August 8<sup>th</sup>.2021, and copied Council regarding the underground Asbestos Piping servicing the existing 6 LOTS, as remarked on page 12 of the DP report. From my understanding the City has turned its back on the problem by passing it onto the developer, underscored by the absence of direction from the Planning Department in their Inter-Office Memo Appendix II. Opposite this development is Kwantlen Park Secondary School on 132<sup>nd</sup>. Street, COSMOS reports 11 Fatal or Injury accidents, while the 2018 Surrey Average Daily Traffic Volume Map indicates in 2018 some 11,600 vehicles pass by through intersection. One can only hope the Traffic Impact Study Report (see Appendix II) has addressed these issues besides the impact of 248 Dwelling Units will have on the local area road network.

**DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMITS**

(No speaking opportunities, Comments on these permits must be received in writing for Council’s consideration).

- **PLR 7921-0252-00** Against: On December 2<sup>nd</sup>.2019 Council gave 3<sup>rd</sup>.Reading to 7919-0107-00 ( [https://www.surrey.ca/sites/default/files/planning-reports/PLR\\_7919-0107-00.pdf](https://www.surrey.ca/sites/default/files/planning-reports/PLR_7919-0107-00.pdf) ) carried unanimously RES.R19-2096, wherein the developer proposed to cut down 31 or 71 mature trees and pay \$21,600 into the Green City Fund (pages 7 & 8). On page 4 of the report the Parks Department advised Council, quote: *“Parks notes that there are City trees that could be impacted by this application. All efforts to retain City trees must be exhausted before removal will be considered.”* Naturally this current DVP report did not include the Arborist Report and drawings, so no one can identify the City trees being impacted. By going back to the minutes of that meeting, the address 2585-141 Street no longer exists according to COSMOS being now

numbered as 2577 & 2589. Within the Application Report Appendix V provides 3 pages of “Typical Character Study Photographs”, without any house plans, so Council at that time did not know what they were approving on these newly created ½ Acre LOTS. Now this current DVP proposes additional variances that infringe on property setbacks, again without architectural drawings for Council to review. If those drawings were available, Council would learn there is a Fire Hydrant #2909 now within 1.9 metres of the new property line “setback” if approved. I am very surprised the Fire Department has either not been consulted, or have not expressed concerns, (see Appendix I and Inter-Office Memo Appendix III). If Council were to enquire of COSMOS “Street View” there is much more to learn in this DVP application, such as the 26<sup>th</sup>-Avenue condition shadowed by the surrounding tree canopy, the property is encumbered with low lying ditching on the North and East boundaries, and the property in question is also heavily treed with mature trees, amongst other things.

- **PLR 7921-0319-00** No Concerns
- **PLR 7918-0455-00** No Concerns, beyond my previous delegation April 6<sup>th</sup>.2020 in regards to the loss of 42 of 44 Mature Trees, a ratio of 91.3%.
- **PLR 7921-0108-00** A place of “Welcome – Narthex” should include Trees, so I am very disappointed the Church feels it necessary to cut down 3 of 9 matures trees. I remain understanding, while concerned the Church has such little regard and value for these 3 magnificent mature trees. Go to COSMOS Street View, a sight to behold.

Respectfully,

**Rs. 22(1)** Landale

*Fleetwood Surrey Resident*



Virus-free. [www.avast.com](http://www.avast.com)

CLERKS DEPT  
NOV 22, 2021  
B.1 - 7921-0100-00  
B.2 - 7921-0044-00  
B.3 - 7920-0130-00  
B.4 - 7921-0201-00  
B.5 - 7920-0104-00  
B.6 - 7920-0290-00  
H.7 - 7921-0252-00  
H.8 - 7921-0319-00  
H.9 - 7918-0455-01  
H.10 - 7921-0108-00  
RCPH NOV 22, 21  
xc Planning,  
Land Development

**From:** Clerks Department Webmail  
**Subject:** FW: 2021 Tree Destruction for November 22, 2021 RCPH

---

**From:** R s. 22(1) Landale s. 22(1) [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** November 17, 2021 10:40 AM  
**To:** Ficocelli, Jennifer <[Jennifer.Ficocelli@surrey.ca](mailto:Jennifer.Ficocelli@surrey.ca)>; Patton, Allison <[Allison.Patton@surrey.ca](mailto:Allison.Patton@surrey.ca)>; Locke, Brenda <[Brenda.Locke@surrey.ca](mailto:Brenda.Locke@surrey.ca)>; Elford, Doug <[Doug.Elford@surrey.ca](mailto:Doug.Elford@surrey.ca)>; McCallum, Doug <[Doug.McCallum@surrey.ca](mailto:Doug.McCallum@surrey.ca)>; Hundial, Jack <[Jack.Hundial@surrey.ca](mailto:Jack.Hundial@surrey.ca)>; Guerra, Laurie <[Laurie.Guerra@surrey.ca](mailto:Laurie.Guerra@surrey.ca)>; Annis, Linda <[Linda.Annis@surrey.ca](mailto:Linda.Annis@surrey.ca)>; Nagra, Mandeep <[Mandeep.Nagra@surrey.ca](mailto:Mandeep.Nagra@surrey.ca)>; Pettigrew, Steven <[Steven.Pettigrew@surrey.ca](mailto:Steven.Pettigrew@surrey.ca)>  
**Cc:** [tom.zytaruk@surreynowleader.com](mailto:tom.zytaruk@surreynowleader.com)  
**Subject:** RE: 2021 Tree Destruction for November 22, 2021 RCPH  
**Importance:** High

Dear Council,

Please find the attached Excel Spreadsheet, to be **“Registered and Filed” in objection to 5 of 6 development applications, with concerns for 3 of 4 DVPs** on the agenda, coming to Council’s attention at the November 22<sup>nd</sup>.2021 Council meeting at 7:00pm. *Respectfully, I regret not being able to present this delegation in person.*

<https://www.surrey.ca/city-government/council-meetings-documents/current-meeting-agendas-notice-public-hearing-items>

Please review the attached Spreadsheet, I have added an extra graph on page two.

- **PLR 7921-0100-00** There is a great deal of environmental information missing in this DP & DVP Application Report, I wrote to Staff last November 11<sup>th</sup>, and await Staff reply with information.

Item 1: Very briefly, LOTs 4,5,6 &7 (see Schedule “A”) are the headwaters for “April Creek” a Natural Class B Yellow Coded creek, which passes through the Greenbelt #115L to the north of the property (See drawing in Appendix V). This development will significantly disturb, ruin or destroy the surrounding sub-surface grounds that established the headwaters. Appendix VI adds more alarm for the preservation of these headwaters “CHARACTER STUDY AND BUILDING GUIDELINES SUMMARY”, wherein the report indicates in paragraph 3 of Section 1.1 the property to East, address 16487-

28 Avenue, will “almost certainly be developed” along the same densification levels provided for in this DP & DVP application. The Arborist Drawing Appendix IV demonstrates the ground disturbances to the headwaters by the removal of the existing house foundations and the up-rooting of 19 mature trees on these 4 LOTs. This report does not address any of these issues to our city environment, parkland and the preservation of April Creek in its entirety.

**Before going onto Item 2., COSMOS indicates a Protected Park Specimen Tree “Gymnocladus” # 736717 planted 04/11/2018 on the 28 Avenue Boulevard that is in mortal danger to being cut down to facilitate LOT 7, Labeled either City 04 or City05 on the Arborist Drawing, without the actual Arborist Survey Report I cannot be more specific.**

The DP & DVP Report indicates 164A Street will be extended though the properties to connect with 28<sup>th</sup> Avenue. On the north boundary the City Planted Trees #770672 on 03/12/2020 and 776621 on 06/01/2021 These trees will require Construction Protection Zone Barriers, see Schedule “C” of the Bylaw.

Item 2: I brought to City Staff attention concerns in regards to the Cash-in-Lieu payment reported to be only \$550. **Based on the Tree Protection Bylaw 16100 - 01/11/21 Part 5 – Penalties and Part 8a - Securities,** I calculate the Cash-in-Lieu payment into the Green City Fund to be \$10,450. But even more concerning is the agreement between Parks & Rec and the developer on page 6, quote:

*“Parkland and/or Natural Area Considerations*

*To the northeast of the subject property located at 16463 – 28 Avenue, there is a "Natural" Class B (yellow-coded) watercourse located within a City owned greenbelt which runs north of the lot, flowing north through Park to 29A Avenue”.* Additionally the report indicates the developer will pay \$18,020 for 5% of unencumbered parkland, based on the Arborist Report, which is not available to the Public or Council. This unencumbered parkland is about 198 sq.metres (5%) of Greenbelt 115L, which is 3,961 sq.metres having a Gross Assessed Land value of \$1,925,000 according to COSMOS. 5% represents \$96,250, not \$18,020. How can Parks & Rec negotiate the gifting of City Parkland, **“MY LAND”** to the special interests of the developer without consultation to all Surrey Land owners and taxpayers ?, **who’s interests are City Staff representing ?**, certainly not mine. With respect to the Report

referencing the Arborist Report, Appendix IV drawing Notes 1,7 & 8 very clearly state, quote: "Note 1. The location of un-surveyed trees on this plan is approximate. Their location and ownership cannot be confirmed without being surveyed by a Registered BC Land Surveyor. Note 7. This plan is based on a topographic and tree location survey provided by the owners' Registered British Columbia Land Surveyor (BCLS) and layout drawings provide by the owners' Engineer (P Eng). Note 8. This plan is provided for context only, and is not certified as to the accuracy of the location of features or dimensions that are shown on this plan. Please refer to the original survey plan and engineering plans". It is peculiar that Notes 7 & 8 have been added, and are an advisory to the reader as to the veracity of the information contained within the drawing.

Lastly Your Worship and Council to the west address 16441-28<sup>th</sup>.Avenue 7917-0310-00 received 3<sup>rd</sup>.Reading on December 18<sup>th</sup>.2017 to sub-divide into 4 LOTS. Therein 33 of 37 mature trees will be destroyed and the Green City Fund will grow by \$21,200 creating a tree deficit of 53 trees according to the report. And before long I count 18 City Boulevard trees will be up-rooted by additional developments on the south side of 28<sup>th</sup>.Avenue, all planted around 1991-2002.

This delegation to Council took me more than 6 hours of reading and research using the DP & DVP Application Report in concert with COSMOS.

- **PLR 7921-0044-00** This developer intends to subdivide his property into two lots and build on the new smaller LOT. There are 12 mature trees impacted by this development with only 3 trees to be removed, and pay \$1,100 into the Green City Fund. One of the 3 trees to be removed according to Huckleberry Landscape Design drawing is beside the already built driveway entrance (See COSMOS Street View), so I do not understand why this beautiful Douglas Fir needs to be removed. In reference to this Development Report and all the other reports on the agenda this evening, *Is it Councils Direction to no longer require City Staff to not declare the Service Agreement Fees (see Appendix II inter-office memo) applicable to each developments ? As this appears to be the new normal in relation to all other inter-office memos, hiding financial information from Council and the Public is not transparency.*
- **PLR 7920-0130-00** This developer is unforgivable, the report indicates all 104 mature trees will be clear cut to make space for 26 Townhouses, and

pay \$52,400 into the Green City Fund. Over and above that contribution the developer will pay more than \$78,000 in Tier 1 and Affordable Housing fees, adding more than \$5,000 onto any Townhouse resale price. COSMOS Fatal Injury Layer indicates 4 accidents at the intersection of 74<sup>th</sup> Ave @ 184<sup>th</sup> St, while the 2018 Surrey Average Daily Traffic Volume Map indicates in 2014 some 5,700 on 184<sup>th</sup> Street. Council should be aware between Fraser Hwy (145 accidents) and 80<sup>th</sup> Ave a total of 56 accidents are recorded on 184<sup>th</sup> Street, which is a quite a steep hill providing direct road access to Clayton Elementary and Ecole Salish Secondary Schools. Adding to the danger on 184<sup>th</sup> Street, Council can see on COSMOS Street View parents parked vehicle in the Clayton Elementary School jammed parking LOT and on the boulevard, the tree shadows inform the time as being in the afternoon, what a dangerous mess.!!

- **It is beyond understanding why Engineering is not requiring a Traffic Volume Impact Study ahead of all the surrounding developments currently in the “Initial Review Process” or have received “Conditional Approval” for 8 different applications representing a total of 516 Townhouses all within walking distance of these two schools. Heads Up somebody, need to address the traffic problem issues coming to 184<sup>th</sup> Street now! . (*Ostrich Syndrome*,. It is a form of avoidance coping that people use to manage uncomfortable feelings or rather, not deal with them).**
- **PLR 7921-0201-00** This developer also is doing a clear cut, all two trees to be destroyed, while paying Cash in Lieu into the Green City Fund in the amount of \$2,200. Council may not be aware that in this area of Newton throughout 2021 almost every development has clear cut their Mature Trees, I keep track of these things by using COSMOS Aerial Layer views.. While densification is not unique to Panorama Ridge, this development is unique, by splitting the existing small 904 sq metre Lot into 2 parcels. Three LOTS to the west PLR 7921-0237-00 awaits Councils approval, and further west PLR 7920-0222-00 is also in “Initial Review” awaiting Councils approval, barely a Mature Tree to be left in this 64<sup>th</sup> Avenue block. I took a drive through on COSMOS Street View (the back lane) to confirm my statements, barely a Tree left. Thank you for the environmental destruction approval process -- “ReZone”. Traffic volumes indicate 27,300 in 2014 pass by this property daily, with 28,500 in 2018 one block to the east. School children crossing the street to Panorama Ridge

Secondary School should be of paramount concern to Council, but nothing has been done to address this concern in the last few years as the community grows. The intersection of 132<sup>nd</sup>.St @ 64<sup>th</sup>.Avenue reports 128 fatal or injury accidents. When is enough, enough ?

- **PLR 7920-0104-00** No Concerns.
- **PLR 7920-0290-00** This is a terrible developer, they will destroy all 69 Mature Trees, and pay Cash-in-Lieu in the amount of \$28,000 into the Green City Fund, whose also is willing to pay for this development in Tier 1 and Affordable Housing Fees greater than \$744,000 money is no object. I wrote to Staff on August 8<sup>th</sup>.2021, and copied Council regarding the underground Asbestos Piping servicing the existing 6 LOTS, as remarked on page 12 of the DP report. From my understanding the City has turned its back on the problem by passing it onto the developer, underscored by the absence of direction from the Planning Department in their Inter-Office Memo Appendix II. Opposite this development is Kwantlen Park Secondary School on 132<sup>nd</sup>. Street, COSMOS reports 11 Fatal or Injury accidents, while the 2018 Surrey Average Daily Traffic Volume Map indicates in 2018 some 11,600 vehicles pass by through intersection. One can only hope the Traffic Impact Study Report (see Appendix II) has addressed these issues besides the impact of 248 Dwelling Units will have on the local area road network.

**DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMITS**

(No speaking opportunities, Comments on these permits must be received in writing for Council’s consideration).

- **PLR 7921-0252-00** Against: On December 2<sup>nd</sup>.2019 Council gave 3<sup>rd</sup>.Reading to 7919-0107-00 ( [https://www.surrey.ca/sites/default/files/planning-reports/PLR\\_7919-0107-00.pdf](https://www.surrey.ca/sites/default/files/planning-reports/PLR_7919-0107-00.pdf) ) carried unanimously RES.R19-2096, wherein the developer proposed to cut down 31 or 71 mature trees and pay \$21,600 into the Green City Fund (pages 7 & 8). On page 4 of the report the Parks Department advised Council, quote: *“Parks notes that there are City trees that could be impacted by this application. All efforts to retain City trees must be exhausted before removal will be considered.”* Naturally this current DVP report did not include the Arborist Report and drawings, so no one can identify the City trees being impacted. By going back to the minutes of that meeting, the address 2585-141 Street no longer exists according to COSMOS being now

numbered as 2577 & 2589. Within the Application Report Appendix V provides 3 pages of “Typical Character Study Photographs”, without any house plans, so Council at that time did not know what they were approving on these newly created ½ Acre LOTS. Now this current DVP proposes additional variances that infringe on property setbacks, again without architectural drawings for Council to review. If those drawings were available, Council would learn there is a Fire Hydrant #2909 now within 1.9 metres of the new property line “setback” if approved. I am very surprised the Fire Department has either not been consulted, or have not expressed concerns, (see Appendix I and Inter-Office Memo Appendix III). If Council were to enquire of COSMOS “Street View” there is much more to learn in this DVP application, such as the 26<sup>th</sup>-Avenue condition shadowed by the surrounding tree canopy, the property is encumbered with low lying ditching on the North and East boundaries, and the property in question is also heavily treed with mature trees, amongst other things.

- **PLR 7921-0319-00** No Concerns
- **PLR 7918-0455-00** No Concerns, beyond my previous delegation April 6<sup>th</sup>.2020 in regards to the loss of 42 of 44 Mature Trees, a ratio of 91.3%.
- **PLR 7921-0108-00** A place of “Welcome – Narthex” should include Trees, so I am very disappointed the Church feels it necessary to cut down 3 of 9 matures trees. I remain understanding, while concerned the Church has such little regard and value for these 3 magnificent mature trees. Go to COSMOS Street View, a sight to behold.

Respectfully,

**Rs. 22(1)** Landale

*Fleetwood Surrey Resident*



Virus-free. [www.avast.com](http://www.avast.com)



CLERKS DEPT  
NOV 22, 2021  
B.1 - 7921-0100-00  
B.2 - 7921-0044-00  
B.3 - 7920-0130-00  
B.4 - 7921-0201-00  
B.5 - 7920-0104-00  
B.6 - 7920-0290-00  
H.7 - 7921-0252-00  
H.8 - 7921-0319-00  
H.9 - 7918-0455-01  
H.10 - 7921-0108-00  
RCPH NOV 22, 21  
xc Planning,  
Land Development

**From:** Clerks Department Webmail  
**Subject:** FW: 2021 Tree Destruction for November 22, 2021 RCPH

---

**From:** R s. 22(1) Landale s. 22(1) [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** November 17, 2021 10:40 AM  
**To:** Ficocelli, Jennifer <[Jennifer.Ficocelli@surrey.ca](mailto:Jennifer.Ficocelli@surrey.ca)>; Patton, Allison <[Allison.Patton@surrey.ca](mailto:Allison.Patton@surrey.ca)>; Locke, Brenda <[Brenda.Locke@surrey.ca](mailto:Brenda.Locke@surrey.ca)>; Elford, Doug <[Doug.Elford@surrey.ca](mailto:Doug.Elford@surrey.ca)>; McCallum, Doug <[Doug.McCallum@surrey.ca](mailto:Doug.McCallum@surrey.ca)>; Hundial, Jack <[Jack.Hundial@surrey.ca](mailto:Jack.Hundial@surrey.ca)>; Guerra, Laurie <[Laurie.Guerra@surrey.ca](mailto:Laurie.Guerra@surrey.ca)>; Annis, Linda <[Linda.Annis@surrey.ca](mailto:Linda.Annis@surrey.ca)>; Nagra, Mandeep <[Mandeep.Nagra@surrey.ca](mailto:Mandeep.Nagra@surrey.ca)>; Pettigrew, Steven <[Steven.Pettigrew@surrey.ca](mailto:Steven.Pettigrew@surrey.ca)>  
**Cc:** [tom.zytaruk@surreynowleader.com](mailto:tom.zytaruk@surreynowleader.com)  
**Subject:** RE: 2021 Tree Destruction for November 22, 2021 RCPH  
**Importance:** High

Dear Council,

Please find the attached Excel Spreadsheet, to be **“Registered and Filed” in objection to 5 of 6 development applications, with concerns for 3 of 4 DVPs** on the agenda, coming to Council’s attention at the November 22<sup>nd</sup>.2021 Council meeting at 7:00pm. *Respectfully, I regret not being able to present this delegation in person.*

<https://www.surrey.ca/city-government/council-meetings-documents/current-meeting-agendas-notice-public-hearing-items>

Please review the attached Spreadsheet, I have added an extra graph on page two.

- **PLR 7921-0100-00** There is a great deal of environmental information missing in this DP & DVP Application Report, I wrote to Staff last November 11<sup>th</sup>, and await Staff reply with information.

Item 1: Very briefly, LOTs 4,5,6 &7 (see Schedule “A”) are the headwaters for “April Creek” a Natural Class B Yellow Coded creek, which passes through the Greenbelt #115L to the north of the property (See drawing in Appendix V). This development will significantly disturb, ruin or destroy the surrounding sub-surface grounds that established the headwaters. Appendix VI adds more alarm for the preservation of these headwaters “CHARACTER STUDY AND BUILDING GUIDELINES SUMMARY”, wherein the report indicates in paragraph 3 of Section 1.1 the property to East, address 16487-

28 Avenue, will “almost certainly be developed” along the same densification levels provided for in this DP & DVP application. The Arborist Drawing Appendix IV demonstrates the ground disturbances to the headwaters by the removal of the existing house foundations and the up-rooting of 19 mature trees on these 4 LOTs. This report does not address any of these issues to our city environment, parkland and the preservation of April Creek in its entirety.

**Before going onto Item 2., COSMOS indicates a Protected Park Specimen Tree “Gymnocladus” # 736717 planted 04/11/2018 on the 28 Avenue Boulevard that is in mortal danger to being cut down to facilitate LOT 7, Labeled either City 04 or City05 on the Arborist Drawing, without the actual Arborist Survey Report I cannot be more specific.**

The DP & DVP Report indicates 164A Street will be extended though the properties to connect with 28<sup>th</sup> Avenue. On the north boundary the City Planted Trees #770672 on 03/12/2020 and 776621 on 06/01/2021 These trees will require Construction Protection Zone Barriers, see Schedule “C” of the Bylaw.

Item 2: I brought to City Staff attention concerns in regards to the Cash-in-Lieu payment reported to be only \$550. **Based on the Tree Protection Bylaw 16100 - 01/11/21 Part 5 – Penalties and Part 8a - Securities,** I calculate the Cash-in-Lieu payment into the Green City Fund to be \$10,450. But even more concerning is the agreement between Parks & Rec and the developer on page 6, quote:

*“Parkland and/or Natural Area Considerations*

*To the northeast of the subject property located at 16463 – 28 Avenue, there is a "Natural" Class B (yellow-coded) watercourse located within a City owned greenbelt which runs north of the lot, flowing north through Park to 29A Avenue”.* Additionally the report indicates the developer will pay \$18,020 for 5% of unencumbered parkland, based on the Arborist Report, which is not available to the Public or Council. This unencumbered parkland is about 198 sq.metres (5%) of Greenbelt 115L, which is 3,961 sq.metres having a Gross Assessed Land value of \$1,925,000 according to COSMOS. 5% represents \$96,250, not \$18,020. How can Parks & Rec negotiate the gifting of City Parkland, **“MY LAND”** to the special interests of the developer without consultation to all Surrey Land owners and taxpayers ?, **who’s interests are City Staff representing ?**, certainly not mine. With respect to the Report

referencing the Arborist Report, Appendix IV drawing Notes 1,7 & 8 very clearly state, quote: “Note 1. The location of un-surveyed trees on this plan is approximate. Their location and ownership cannot be confirmed without being surveyed by a Registered BC Land Surveyor. Note 7. This plan is based on a topographic and tree location survey provided by the owners’ Registered British Columbia Land Surveyor (BCLS) and layout drawings provide by the owners’ Engineer (P Eng). Note 8. This plan is provided for context only, and is not certified as to the accuracy of the location of features or dimensions that are shown on this plan. Please refer to the original survey plan and engineering plans”. It is peculiar that Notes 7 & 8 have been added, and are an advisory to the reader as to the veracity of the information contained within the drawing.

Lastly Your Worship and Council to the west address 16441-28<sup>th</sup>.Avenue 7917-0310-00 received 3<sup>rd</sup>.Reading on December 18<sup>th</sup>.2017 to sub-divide into 4 LOTS. Therein 33 of 37 mature trees will be destroyed and the Green City Fund will grow by \$21,200 creating a tree deficit of 53 trees according to the report. And before long I count 18 City Boulevard trees will be up-rooted by additional developments on the south side of 28<sup>th</sup>.Avenue, all planted around 1991-2002.

This delegation to Council took me more than 6 hours of reading and research using the DP & DVP Application Report in concert with COSMOS.

- **PLR 7921-0044-00** This developer intends to subdivide his property into two lots and build on the new smaller LOT. There are 12 mature trees impacted by this development with only 3 trees to be removed, and pay \$1,100 into the Green City Fund. One of the 3 trees to be removed according to Huckleberry Landscape Design drawing is beside the already built driveway entrance (See COSMOS Street View), so I do not understand why this beautiful Douglas Fir needs to be removed. In reference to this Development Report and all the other reports on the agenda this evening, *Is it Councils Direction to no longer require City Staff to not declare the Service Agreement Fees (see Appendix II inter-office memo) applicable to each developments ? As this appears to be the new normal in relation to all other inter-office memos, hiding financial information from Council and the Public is not transparency.*
- **PLR 7920-0130-00** This developer is unforgivable, the report indicates all 104 mature trees will be clear cut to make space for 26 Townhouses, and

pay \$52,400 into the Green City Fund. Over and above that contribution the developer will pay more than \$78,000 in Tier 1 and Affordable Housing fees, adding more than \$5,000 onto any Townhouse resale price. COSMOS Fatal Injury Layer indicates 4 accidents at the intersection of 74<sup>th</sup> Ave @ 184<sup>th</sup> St, while the 2018 Surrey Average Daily Traffic Volume Map indicates in 2014 some 5,700 on 184<sup>th</sup> Street. Council should be aware between Fraser Hwy (145 accidents) and 80<sup>th</sup> Ave a total of 56 accidents are recorded on 184<sup>th</sup> Street, which is a quite a steep hill providing direct road access to Clayton Elementary and Ecole Salish Secondary Schools. Adding to the danger on 184<sup>th</sup> Street, Council can see on COSMOS Street View parents parked vehicle in the Clayton Elementary School jammed parking LOT and on the boulevard, the tree shadows inform the time as being in the afternoon, what a dangerous mess.!!

- **It is beyond understanding why Engineering is not requiring a Traffic Volume Impact Study ahead of all the surrounding developments currently in the “Initial Review Process” or have received “Conditional Approval” for 8 different applications representing a total of 516 Townhouses all within walking distance of these two schools. Heads Up somebody, need to address the traffic problem issues coming to 184<sup>th</sup> Street now! . (*Ostrich Syndrome, It is a form of avoidance coping that people use to manage uncomfortable feelings or rather, not deal with them*).**
- **PLR 7921-0201-00** This developer also is doing a clear cut, all two trees to be destroyed, while paying Cash in Lieu into the Green City Fund in the amount of \$2,200. Council may not be aware that in this area of Newton throughout 2021 almost every development has clear cut their Mature Trees, I keep track of these things by using COSMOS Aerial Layer views.. While densification is not unique to Panorama Ridge, this development is unique, by splitting the existing small 904 sq metre Lot into 2 parcels. Three LOTS to the west PLR 7921-0237-00 awaits Councils approval, and further west PLR 7920-0222-00 is also in “Initial Review” awaiting Councils approval, barely a Mature Tree to be left in this 64<sup>th</sup> Avenue block. I took a drive through on COSMOS Street View (the back lane) to confirm my statements, barely a Tree left. Thank you for the environmental destruction approval process -- “ReZone”. Traffic volumes indicate 27,300 in 2014 pass by this property daily, with 28,500 in 2018 one block to the east. School children crossing the street to Panorama Ridge

Secondary School should be of paramount concern to Council, but nothing has been done to address this concern in the last few years as the community grows. The intersection of 132<sup>nd</sup>.St @ 64<sup>th</sup>.Avenue reports 128 fatal or injury accidents. When is enough, enough ?

- **PLR 7920-0104-00** No Concerns.
- **PLR 7920-0290-00** This is a terrible developer, they will destroy all 69 Mature Trees, and pay Cash-in-Lieu in the amount of \$28,000 into the Green City Fund, whose also is willing to pay for this development in Tier 1 and Affordable Housing Fees greater than \$744,000 money is no object. I wrote to Staff on August 8<sup>th</sup>.2021, and copied Council regarding the underground Asbestos Piping servicing the existing 6 LOTS, as remarked on page 12 of the DP report. From my understanding the City has turned its back on the problem by passing it onto the developer, underscored by the absence of direction from the Planning Department in their Inter-Office Memo Appendix II. Opposite this development is Kwantlen Park Secondary School on 132<sup>nd</sup>. Street, COSMOS reports 11 Fatal or Injury accidents, while the 2018 Surrey Average Daily Traffic Volume Map indicates in 2018 some 11,600 vehicles pass by through intersection. One can only hope the Traffic Impact Study Report (see Appendix II) has addressed these issues besides the impact of 248 Dwelling Units will have on the local area road network.

**DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMITS**

(No speaking opportunities, Comments on these permits must be received in writing for Council’s consideration).

- **PLR 7921-0252-00** Against: On December 2<sup>nd</sup>.2019 Council gave 3<sup>rd</sup>.Reading to 7919-0107-00 ( [https://www.surrey.ca/sites/default/files/planning-reports/PLR\\_7919-0107-00.pdf](https://www.surrey.ca/sites/default/files/planning-reports/PLR_7919-0107-00.pdf) ) carried unanimously RES.R19-2096, wherein the developer proposed to cut down 31 or 71 mature trees and pay \$21,600 into the Green City Fund (pages 7 & 8). On page 4 of the report the Parks Department advised Council, quote: *“Parks notes that there are City trees that could be impacted by this application. All efforts to retain City trees must be exhausted before removal will be considered.”* Naturally this current DVP report did not include the Arborist Report and drawings, so no one can identify the City trees being impacted. By going back to the minutes of that meeting, the address 2585-141 Street no longer exists according to COSMOS being now

numbered as 2577 & 2589. Within the Application Report Appendix V provides 3 pages of “Typical Character Study Photographs”, without any house plans, so Council at that time did not know what they were approving on these newly created ½ Acre LOTS. Now this current DVP proposes additional variances that infringe on property setbacks, again without architectural drawings for Council to review. If those drawings were available, Council would learn there is a Fire Hydrant #2909 now within 1.9 metres of the new property line “setback” if approved. I am very surprised the Fire Department has either not been consulted, or have not expressed concerns, (see Appendix I and Inter-Office Memo Appendix III). If Council were to enquire of COSMOS “Street View” there is much more to learn in this DVP application, such as the 26<sup>th</sup>-Avenue condition shadowed by the surrounding tree canopy, the property is encumbered with low lying ditching on the North and East boundaries, and the property in question is also heavily treed with mature trees, amongst other things.

- **PLR 7921-0319-00** No Concerns
- **PLR 7918-0455-00** No Concerns, beyond my previous delegation April 6<sup>th</sup>.2020 in regards to the loss of 42 of 44 Mature Trees, a ratio of 91.3%.
- **PLR 7921-0108-00** A place of “Welcome – Narthex” should include Trees, so I am very disappointed the Church feels it necessary to cut down 3 of 9 matures trees. I remain understanding, while concerned the Church has such little regard and value for these 3 magnificent mature trees. Go to COSMOS Street View, a sight to behold.

Respectfully,

**Rs. 22(1)** Landale

*Fleetwood Surrey Resident*



Virus-free. [www.avast.com](http://www.avast.com)