

**Present:**

Councillor Patton, Chair  
Councillor Elford  
M. Lamont  
S. Rai  
S. Van Keulen

**Regrets:**

Councillor Nagra  
Shannon Lambie, Agriculture Land  
Commission  
Mikayla Roberts, Ministry of Agriculture

**Staff Present:**

Y. Yohannes, Manager, Utilities  
N. Aven, Manager of Parks  
P. Zevit, Planner  
S. Clark, Planner  
S. Hayer, Assistant City Clerk

---

**A. ADOPTIONS****1. Adoption of the Agenda**

It was Moved by S. Rai  
Seconded by Councillor Elford  
That the Agriculture, Environment, and  
Investment Advisory Committee meeting agenda held March 9, 2022, be adopted.  
Carried

**2. Adoption of the Minutes – March 9, 2022**

It was Moved by S. Rai  
Seconded by Councillor Elford  
That the minutes of the Agriculture, Environment,  
and Investment Advisory Committee meeting held February 9, 2022, be adopted.  
Carried

**B. DELEGATIONS****1. Pamela Zevit, Planner  
City of Surrey**

Pamela Zevit, Planner, provided a PowerPoint presentation regarding Conserving Species at Risk in Surrey. The following information was highlighted:

- Canada's Species at Risk Act or "SARA" is a result of the implementation of the Canadian Biodiversity Strategy, which is in response to the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity.
- The Act provides federal legislation to prevent Canadian indigenous species, subspecies, and distinct populations from becoming extirpated or extinct, to provide for the recovery of endangered or threatened species and encourage the management of other species to prevent them from becoming at risk.

- Three Government of Canada departments are responsible for SARA: Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Parks Canada and Environment Canada.
- Only Threatened and Endangered species under SARA receive recovery strategies with critical habitat and eventually action plans. Special concern species only receive management plans.
- A recovery strategy outlines what is scientifically required for the successful recovery of a species at risk. This includes an identification of its critical habitat and what needs should be addressed. Approximately one-half of listed Threatened and Endangered species in Canada currently have final recovery documents in place. Work is underway to complete most recovery documents over the next couple of years.
- Management Plans (also developed by the Province first), have the objective to prevent species from being uplisted. After 20 years, no species have been deemed recovered as there has been a lag in species recovery plans.
- Provinces have responsibility for species at risk through bilateral agreements which delegate responsibility for actions like developing draft recovery plans and draft critical habitat mapping.
- Since 2004 only four species were legally designated as endangered or threatened in BC: sea otter, the American white pelican, burrowing owl and Vancouver Island marmot.
- BC also has a conservation classification system (the Red-Blue lists), administered and updated through the BC Conservation Data Centre, as well as a conservation framework and tools such as Develop With Care which is designed to help guide conservation approaches across the BC landscape. Red-Blue listing does not equate to the protection of a species or its habitat.
- The responsibilities and authority of municipalities in BC are delegated by the Province through the *Local Government Act* and/or the *Community Charter*. Without any enactment of explicit regulation, or stand-alone legislation like a *BC SAR Act*, local governments do not currently have explicit legislated responsibilities for the conservation of species at risk. This creates a grey area for local governments when it comes to land use issues and critical habitat. However, local governments must ensure they do not violate provincial and federal legislation themselves and must consider due diligence for actions and decisions that may facilitate violations by other parties.
- BC is often referred to as the Amazon of the north, competing with Ontario for the greatest number of species at risk in Canada. Of the 622 SARA-listed Schedule 1 species in Canada, BC has 7 extirpated, 108 endangered, 47 threatened, and 76 special concern species.

- Surrey has guidance for addressing the protection of species at risk and critical habitats on private land (e.g., the City's Sensitive Ecosystem Development Permit Area guidelines), as well as acknowledging mitigation responsibilities internally (e.g., Engineering projects). While the City has had to deal with high-profile development issues due to species at risk protection responsibilities (e.g., Pacific Water Shrew), Surrey does not have any dedicated Standard Operating Procedures or Best Management Processes (BMPs) around species at risk or critical habitat effective protection.
- As further species are listed, and additional recovery strategies, action and management plans are proposed and finalized, Surrey is considering a more comprehensive approach to addressing SARA and critical habitat responsibilities on City lands. Such an approach will reduce potential liability issues and ensure due diligence and public interest responsibilities are met while providing an ongoing opportunity for cross-departmental collaboration and coordination of activities affecting Surrey's natural assets.

In response to questions from the Committee, Ms. Zevit provided the following information:

- Conversations have been had dealing with critical habitat issues, a lot of critical habitats is on private land. Critical habitats are automatically protected on federal lands and at the municipality level, the City is trying to develop BMPs for City Lands. Under the Sensitive Ecosystem Development guidelines, there is a component that addresses species at risk and critical habitat. Developers and their Qualified Environmental Professionals (QEP) are required to ensure that the appropriate skills are being applied to avoid mitigation.
- Effective Protection refers to requirements on private lands or lands that are not federal lands to effectively protect critical habitat under the *SAR Act*. In the history of SARA, there have been three court cases that have triggered responses from the Federal Government around protecting critical habitat.
- On the private lands, the City depends on the developer's QEP to provide the necessary mitigation plans for effective protection.
- The City has held back from issuing Development Permits because effective protection is not being adequately addressed in the mitigation plans provided by the developer's QEP. The City has not established a decision framework for effective protection, more so a site-to-site related issue.
- Madrone Consultants have been retained to provide updated assessments for the South Campbell Heights area.

2. **Neal Aven, Manager of Parks  
City of Surrey**

Neal Aven, Manager of Parks, provided a committee report regarding Lymantria moth. The following information was highlighted:

- Lymantria moth was formally called Gypsey moth.
- The Province will be treating an area centred on the Kensington Prairie Community Centre (32 Avenue and 168 Street), with a biological insecticide this spring in response to trappings of the moth that were discovered during the trapping season.
- The Province is in the process of obtaining an insecticide permit from the Ministry of Environment.
- The treatment is an aerial spray program and is set to begin in May which entails 3 to 4 treatments, about 7 to 10 days apart. The treatment is weather and temperature dependent as the program needs to target exactly when the Lymantria moth larvae are turning into caterpillars.
- The City has had other treatments in recent years, including North Surrey and Cloverdale. This is the first treatment in this area.

In response to questions from the Committee, Mr. Aven confirmed the last three years of treatments were in the Fraser Heights area, east of the Port Mann Bridge. This area was repeatedly treated as the ground spray was ineffective and it took a few years of aerial sprays to eradicate the infestation.

C. **NEW BUSINESS**

1. **Development Application 7921-0293-00**  
Stephen Clark, Planner  
Address: 17137 – 48 Avenue

Stephen Clark, Planner, summarized the report dated February 8, 2022, regarding Development Application No. 7921-0293-00 which proposes to reduce the side yard (east) setback of a proposed barn from 15 metres to 7.32 metres. The following information was highlighted:

- The subject property is approximately 13.3 acres in area and is located within the Agricultural Land Reserve.
- In 2018 an application was submitted, as a requirement for issuing the building permit, an assessment was conducted according to the Ministry of Agriculture's Riparian Factsheet and Erosion Sediment Control Bylaw to provide best management practices in order to protect a Class AO ditch on the south side of the property. The application has been finalized and a house has been built on the subject property.

- There is a stop work order on the property as a result of an unpermitted driveway on the east side of the property.
- The site must be remediated prior to issuance of any building permit on the property. The applicant has been working with the Engineering Department to remediate the site. The Engineering Department has indicated that the applicants are on track to complete the required remediation and are satisfied with the work that has been completed to date.
- The proposed setback variance allows the applicant to construct an adequately sized barn for their operations. A Green Infrastructure Network (GIN) corridor runs along the western side of the property, and existing blueberry farmland is located to the north, restricting barn construction to the eastern portion of the property.
- There is a septic field on the subject site in between the house and the proposed barn, due to the space constraints it has resulted in the requirement for the proposed 7.32 metre setback. The site constraints, including the existing home and the GIN Corridor, help to minimize the impact on the farmland. Planning is supportive of this variance.
- The proposed barn will be used for storing produce during harvest, farm machinery storage, chemical and fertilizer storage and be used for workers' lunch and restroom area.
- The productive farming area is approximately 9 acres.

In response to questions from the Committee, Mr. Clark provided the following information:

- The GIN corridor is on private property, however, there is a municipal right-of-way.
- Staff confirmed the applicant is building a barn, there is no dwelling.
- The GIN corridor is on the west side of the property and as the driveway is on the east side of the property, there will be no impact to the GIN corridor.
- Restoration works along the GIN corridor may not be possible as there is limited space between the existing house and the corridor and Staff would like to maintain the setback distance.
- The barn was established prior to the establishment of the GIN corridor.

The Committee suggested the applicant utilize the area behind the existing barn and beside the GIN corridor as a productive farming area to avoid truck parking from occurring.

**D. OUTSTANDING BUSINESS**

**1. Verbal Updates**

No updates were provided.

**E. ITEMS REFERRED BY COUNCIL**

This section had no items to consider.

**F. CORRESPONDENCE**

This section had no items to consider.

**G. OTHER BUSINESS**

This section had no items to consider.

**H. NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Agriculture, Environment, and Investment Advisory Committee is scheduled for Wednesday, April 13, 2022, at 6:00 p.m.

**I. ADJOURNMENT**

It was  
Investment Advisory Committee meeting adjourn.

Moved by S. Van Keulen  
Seconded by M. Lamont  
That the Agriculture, Environment, and

Carried

The Agriculture, Environment, and Investment Advisory Committee adjourned at 6:50 p.m.

---

Jennifer Ficocelli, City Clerk

---

Councillor Allison Patton, Chair