



# City of Surrey

## Regular Council - Public Hearing

### Minutes

Council Chamber  
City Hall  
14245 - 56 Avenue  
Surrey, B.C.  
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 19, 2005  
Time: 7:00 p.m.

#### Present:

Chairperson - Mayor McCallum  
Councillor Villeneuve  
Councillor Tymoschuk  
Councillor Steele  
Councillor Priddy  
Councillor Bose  
Councillor Watts  
Councillor Hunt  
Councillor Higginbotham

#### Absent:

#### Councillors Entering Meeting as Indicated:

#### Staff Present:

City Manager  
City Clerk  
General Manager, Planning &  
Development  
General Manager, Engineering  
Manager, Area Planning &  
Development Division  
Manager, North Surrey Section  
Manager, South Surrey Section  
Manager, Land Development,  
Engineering

#### A. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

#### B. DELEGATIONS

##### 1. Surrey Official Community Plan By-law, 1996, No. 12900 Text No. 47 Amendment By-law, 2004, No. 15583

APPLICANT: City of Surrey, Council Initiative  
14245 - 56 Avenue  
Surrey, B.C. V3X 3A2

PROPOSAL: "Surrey Official Community Plan By-law, 1996,  
No. 12900" as amended, is hereby further amended as  
follows:

- (a) Division A is amended by replacing Figure 27 -  
Map Showing Recently Approved Secondary Plans;  
and
- (b) Division A, Schedule C. Development Permit Area  
Guidelines is amended under Designated  
Development Permit Areas by deleting the period at  
the end of 3(c) and inserting "; or" in its place, and  
adding new sub-section 3(d) as follows:  
"(d) which is located within the boundary of the  
Highway 99 Corridor Secondary Plan area as  
illustrated on Figure 27."

These amendments are necessary to add the Highway 99 Corridor  
Local Area Plan area to Figure 27 and to designate the entire

Highway 99 Corridor Local Area Plan as a Development Permit Area pursuant to the provisions of the Official Community Plan.

The Notice of the Public Hearing was read by the City Clerk.

**Surrey Official Community Plan By-law, 1996, No. 12900  
No. 107 Amendment By-law, 2004, No. 15584**

**Official Community Plan Application: 7904-0112-00 and 7904-0312-00**

CIVIC ADDRESS: 15862, 15876, 15948 (also shown as 2233 - 160 Street), and 16087 - 24 Avenue, 2441, 2457, 2493, 2527 - 160 Street, Portion of 2500 - 160 Street, and Portion of 16129 - 24 Avenue 2342 - 160 Street, 16106 and 16134 - 24 Avenue, 2284, 2290, 2316 and 2340 - 161 Street, Portion of 161 Street

APPLICANT: Edward Holden, George and Jean Lechleiter, Surrey South Shopping Centres Limited, Rita and Gerhard Krause, City of Surrey, Derrick Schonke, Briska Porcher, Marian Porcher, Gurdip S. and Amarjit K. Mundi, Jang S. and Devinder K. Mundi, Balbir K. Atwal, Sukhdev K. and Raminder Randhawa, Bhinder S. and Niranjan K. Mundi, Anni and Emanuel Lange, Luise Hartstock  
c/o First Professional Management (West) Inc.  
(Michael Nygren)  
Unit 201 - 11120 Horseshoe Way  
Richmond, B.C. V7A 5H7  
Loblaw Properties West Inc., Kenichi and Reiko Matsuo, City of Surrey, Edward and Josephine Stephen  
c/o Loblaw Properties West Inc. (Glen Carlberg)  
3189 Grandview Highway  
Vancouver, B.C. V5M 2E9

PURPOSE OF OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN BY-LAW AMENDMENT: The purpose of the Official Community Plan by-law amendment is to change the designation of the lands shown outlined on the map attached as Appendix I from "Suburban (SUB)" to "Commercial (COM)". The existing Suburban designation is characterized by a range of larger sized lots intended to support a semi-rural and suburban transition between towns, and urban and agricultural uses. Businesses may be permitted in a Suburban designation. The redesignation of the lands would allow for the development of large format commercial buildings, and a gas bar with car wash, along with small-scale commercial buildings in a comprehensive design at the four corners of 24 Avenue and 160 Street permitting buildings of approximately 94,970 square metres [1,022,300 square feet].

The Notice of the Public Hearing, except the legal description, was read by the City Clerk. The location of the properties was indicated to the Public Hearing.

**Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000,  
Amendment By-law, 2004, No. 15610**

**Rezoning Application: 7904-0112-00**

**CIVIC ADDRESS:** 15862, 15876, 15948 (also shown as 2233 - 160 Street),  
and 16087 - 24 Avenue, 2441, 2457, 2493,  
2527 - 160 Street, Portion of 2500 - 160 Street, and Portion  
of 16129 - 24 Avenue

**APPLICANT:** Edward Holden, George and Jean Lechleiter, Surrey South  
Shopping Centres Limited, Rita and Gerhard Krause,  
City of Surrey, Derrick Schonke, Briska Porcher, Marian  
Porcher, Gurdip S. and Amarjit K. Mundi, Jang S. and  
Devinder K. Mundi, Balbir K. Atwal, Sukhdev K. and  
Raminder Randhawa, Bhinder S. and Niranjana K. Mundi,  
Anni and Emanuel Lange, Luise Hartstock  
c/o First Professional Management (West) Inc.  
(Michael Nygren)  
Unit 201 - 11120 Horseshoe Way  
Richmond, B.C. V7A 5H7

**PURPOSE OF  
ZONING  
BY-LAW  
AMENDMENT:** The purpose of the zoning by-law amendment is to change the  
zoning of the lands shown outlined on the map attached as  
Appendix I which have been divided into Blocks A, B-1, B-2 and  
C from single family housing on lots of 1 acre or larger, golf course  
and driving range uses and general and intensive agricultural uses to  
allow for the development of large format commercial buildings  
along with small-scale commercial buildings in a comprehensive  
design at the southwest, northwest and northeast corner of  
24 Avenue and 160 Street permitting buildings of approximately  
62,600 square metres [673,700 square feet] with the Permitted Uses  
more particularly described in Appendix II and generally described  
as follows:

**Block A**

To rezone the southwest corner of 24 Avenue and  
160 Street, consisting of 15948 - 24 Avenue from  
"One-Acre Residential Zone (RA)" and "Golf Course Zone  
(CPG)" to "Comprehensive Development Zone (CD)", and  
15862, 15876 - 24 Avenue from "One-Acre Residential  
Zone (RA)" to "Comprehensive Development Zone (CD)",  
to permit:

- uses including retail stores and office uses, eating establishment uses, neighbourhood pub and liquor store uses, parking facilities uses, indoor recreational facilities and entertainment uses, community service uses, childcare centres provided that only one individual business may have a gross floor area of more than 4,645 square metres [50,000 square feet];

- a maximum floor area ratio, excluding the gross floor area used or intended to be used for parking facilities, of 0.40, which is equivalent to approximately 29,000 square metres [312,500 square feet];

- a building height not to exceed 12 metres [40 feet];

- lot coverage not to exceed 50%;

- outdoor storage or display ancillary to a retail store having a gross floor area of more than 4,645 square metres [50,000 square feet], as long as the total area shall not exceed 8% of the gross floor area of the associated retail store; and

- a maximum of 3 surface parking spaces for every 100 square metres of gross floor area, excluding the gross floor area used or intended to be used for parking facilities.

### **Blocks B-1 and B-2**

To rezone the northwest corner of 24 Avenue and 160 Street, consisting of 2493 , 2527, 2457 and 2441 - 160 Street from "Intensive Agriculture Zone (A-2)" and "One-Acre Residential Zone (RA)" to "Comprehensive Development Zone (CD)", to permit:

- on Block B-1 uses including retail stores and office uses, eating establishment uses, neighbourhood pub and liquor store uses, parking facilities uses, indoor recreational facilities and entertainment uses, community service uses, childcare centres provided that only one individual business may have a gross floor area of more than 4,645 square metres [50,000 square feet];

- on Block B-2 uses including retail stores and office uses, eating establishment uses, neighbourhood pub and liquor store uses, parking facilities uses, indoor recreation facilities and entertainment uses, community service uses, childcare centres, excluding automotive service uses provided that no individual business may have a gross floor area of more than 4,645 square metres [50,000 square feet];

- on Block B-1 a maximum floor area ratio, excluding the gross floor area used or intended to be used for parking facilities, of 0.39, which is equivalent in total to approximately 11,600 square metres [124,500 square feet];
- on Block B-2 a maximum floor area ratio, excluding the gross floor area used or intended to be used for parking facilities, of 0.44, which is equivalent in total to approximately 4,900 square metres [52,300 square feet];
- on Blocks B-1 and B-2, a building height not to exceed 12 metres [40 feet];
- on Blocks B-1 and B-2 lot coverage not to exceed 50%;
- on Block B-1, outdoor storage or display ancillary to a retail store having a gross floor area of more than 4,645 square metres [50,000 square feet], as long as the total area shall not exceed 1,737 square metres [18,700 square feet]; of which at least 50% of this outdoor area shall be covered;
- on Block B-2, no outdoor storage or display; and
- on Blocks B-1 and B-2, a maximum of 3 surface parking spaces for every 100 square metres of gross floor area excluding the gross floor area used or intended to be used for parking facilities.

### **Block C**

To rezone the northeast corner of 24 Avenue and 160 Street, consisting of 16087 - 24 Avenue, portion of 2500 - 160 Street and portion of 16129 - 24 Avenue from "One-Acre Residential Zone (RA)" to "Comprehensive Development Zone (CD)", to permit:

- uses including retail stores and office uses, eating establishment uses, neighbourhood pub and liquor store uses, parking facilities uses, indoor recreational facilities, community service uses, childcare centres, excluding automotive service uses provided that no individual business may have a gross floor area of more than 4,645 square metres [50,000 square feet]; with the further restrictions that no more than two individual businesses may have a gross floor area of more than 1,858 square metres [20,000 square feet]; and no more than one of the two individual businesses may have a gross floor area of more than 2,787 square metres [30,000 square feet]; and the total square footage of all individual businesses with a

gross floor area more than 1,115 square metres [12,000 square feet] shall not exceed 7,432 square metres [80,000 square feet];

- a maximum floor area ratio, excluding the gross floor area used or intended to be used for parking facilities, of 0.32, which is equivalent to approximately 17,100 square metres [184,400 square feet];

- a building height not to exceed 12 metres [40 feet];

- lot coverage not to exceed 50%;

- no outdoor storage or display; and

- a maximum of 3 surface parking spaces for every 100 square metres of gross floor area excluding the gross floor area used or intended to be used for parking facilities.

The Notice of the Public Hearing, except the legal description, was read by the City Clerk. The location of the properties was indicated to the Public Hearing.

**Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000,  
Amendment By-law, 2004, No. 15611**

**Rezoning Application: 7904-0312-00**

**CIVIC ADDRESS:** 2342 - 160 Street, 16106 and 16134 - 24 Avenue, 2284, 2290, 2316 and 2340 - 161 Street, Portion of 161 Street

**APPLICANT:** Loblaw Properties West Inc., Kenichi and Reiko Matsuo, City of Surrey, Edward and Josephine Stephen c/o Loblaw Properties West Inc. (Glen Carlberg) 3189 Grandview Highway Vancouver, B.C. V5M 2E9

**PURPOSE OF ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT:** The purpose of the zoning by-law amendment is to change the zoning of the lands shown outlined on the map attached as Appendix I which have been divided into Blocks D and E from single family housing on lots of 1 acre or larger to allow for the development of large format commercial buildings and a gas bar with car wash along with small-scale commercial buildings in a comprehensive design at the southeast corner of 24 Avenue and 160 Street permitting buildings of approximately 32,370 square metres [348,600 square feet] with the Permitted Uses more particularly described in Appendix II and generally described as follows:

**Block D**

To rezone the southeast corner of 24 Avenue and 160 Street, consisting of 16134, 16106 – 24 Avenue, 2340, 2316, 2290, 2284 – 161 Street, portion of 2342 – 160 Street and portion of 161 Street Road Right-of-Way from "One-Acre Residential Zone (RA)" to "Comprehensive Development Zone (CD)", to permit:

- uses including retail stores and office uses, eating establishment uses, neighbourhood pub and liquor store uses, parking facilities uses, indoor recreational facilities and entertainment uses, community service uses, childcare centres provided that only one individual business may have a gross floor area of more than 4,645 square metres [50,000 square feet];
- a maximum floor area ratio, excluding the gross floor area used or intended to be used for parking facilities, of 0.54, which is equivalent to approximately 32,000 square metres [344,600 square feet];
- a building height not to exceed 12 metres [40 feet];
- lot coverage, excluding the gross floor area used or intended to be used for parking facilities, not to exceed 52%;
- outdoor storage or display ancillary to a retail store having a gross floor area of more than 4,645 square metres [50,000 square feet], as long as the total area shall not exceed 8% of the gross floor area of the associated retail store; and
- a maximum of 3 surface parking spaces for every 100 square metres of gross floor area excluding the gross floor area used or intended to be used for parking facilities.

**Block E**

To rezone a portion of the land at the southeast corner of 24 Avenue and 160 Street, consisting of a portion of 2342 - 160 Street from "One-Acre Residential Zone (RA)" to "Comprehensive Development Zone (CD)", to permit:

- a combined service gas station and car wash;
- a maximum floor area ratio, excluding the gross floor area used or intended to be used for parking facilities, of 0.10, which is equivalent to approximately 370 square metres [4,000 square feet];

- principal building and pump island canopy height not to exceed 6 metres [20 feet];
- lot coverage, excluding the gross floor area used or intended to be used for parking facilities, not to exceed 50%;
- no outdoor storage or display; and
- a maximum of 3 surface parking spaces for every 100 square metres of gross floor area excluding the gross floor area used or intended to be used for parking facilities.

The Notice of the Public Hearing, except the legal description, was read by the City Clerk. The location of the properties was indicated to the Public Hearing.

There was correspondence on table from the following persons and as indicated in Appendices A, B, C, D as attached:

NAME	FOR	AGAINST	UNDECIDED	CONCERNS
R. Zelinka				Various
N. Carmichael		X		
P. Kulavec		X		
J. Pierce	X			
L. McBain		X		
C. and S. Ricci	X			
N. & J. Kennedy	X			
A. & P. Ezzy	X			
G. Sutton		X		
L. & G. Miller	X			
B. Lambert		X		
D. Bessex	X			
P. and L. McIsaac	X			
M. Lechleiter	X			
C. Robarts		X		
B. Bruyns	X			
J. Myring	X			
N. and R. Deakin		X		
E. Simerl		X		
R. Delage		X		
E. Sabaliauskas		X		
V. Minnis				Concerns
J. & C. Borgersen		X		
J. Watkins		X		
R. Grubb		X		
M. & T. Bell		X		
S. Watkins		X		



NAME	FOR	AGAINST	UNDECIDED	CONCERNS
4 signatures (illegible)	X			
B. Cohen				Concerns
L. Vance		X		
S. Taylor		X		
A. Ward		X		
R. Post		X		
T. Smith			X	
D. Field		X		
L. Bazso		X		
C. Moh		X		
K. Erhardt		X		
D. Moffatt		X		
G. Savard		X		
L. Claremont	X			
J. Welch	X			
P. Selnes	X			
B. Copp	X			
D. Robertson	X			
J. Welsh	X			
R. Cuming	X			
I. Polley	X			

The Mayor noted that the following persons had expressed an opinion in writing and not wishing to speak.

NAME	FOR	AGAINST	UNDECIDED	CONCERNS
D. Svab	X			
G. Blattmann	X			
K. Lechleiter	X			
M. Lechleiter	X			
S. Van Dam	X			
L. Sandhoff	X			
L. Meggitt	X			
T. Lechleiter	X			
M. Hertwell		X		
F. Deakin		X		
A. Lappi		X		
N. Zielke	X			
F. Haas	X			
J. Fons	X			
G. Young	X			
J. Keon	X			
J. Song			X	
J. Song			X	
E. Schulz	X			
M. Worthing		X		

NAME	FOR	AGAINST	UNDECIDED	CONCERNS
D. Sammon	X			
M. Tinck		X		
T. Yamaura	X			
S. Yamaura	X			
G. Krause	X			
R. Krause	X			
W. Sandhoff	X			
K. LeMay	X			
N. Meggitt	X			
T. Dilworth	X			
T. Cox	X			
C. Svab	X			
R. Gessaroli	X			
L. Sandhoff	X			
F. Old		X		
A. Sandhoff	X			
P. Young	X			
H. Mika	X			
E. Mika	X			
M. Keddis		X		
E. Champion	X			
J. Lewis	X			
G. Lee	X			
A.B. Boutaleb	X			
M. Tinck		X		
J. Taylor		X		
B. Schabes		X		
R. Smitherman	X			
S. Deakin		X		
F. Schwab	X			
A. Schwab	X			
S. Irving	X			
J. Mackenzie		X		
Dr. D. Worthing		X		
K. Hall		X		
M. McIntyre			X	
R. Matsuo	X			
K. Matsuo	X			
J. Fuller	X			
J. Sinclair		X		
L. Minion	X			
L. Mitchell	X			
S. Scott	X			
P. Oyama		X		
K. Roath		X		
D. Moffatt		X		
W. Sellars		X		

NAME	FOR	AGAINST	UNDECIDED	CONCERNS
E. Day	X			
C. Glutyk		X		
J. Glutyk		X		
M. Smitherman	X			
P. Pieron		X		
H. Pieron		X		
R. Irving	X			
K.A. Bailey		X		
G. von Loersel		X		
S. Richardson		X		
L. M. Vance		X		
D. Rode	X			
M. Porcher	X			
B. Porcher	X			
L. Layton		X		
H. Bailey		X		
P. Humphries	X			
P. Kim	X			
J. Charter	X			
A. Boldt	X			
R. Davis		X		
M. Goldberg		X		
A. Denness		X		
J. Castle	X			
K. Murray	X			
D. Denny-Levitsky	X			
D. White		X		
C. Mainwaring		X		
T. Turu	X			
J. Murray	X			
M. Geddert		X		
J. McBeth		X		
B. McBeth		X		
M. Kooner	X			
J. Chorbajian		X		
D. Gallaher	X			
J. Breckenridge	X			
G. Erhardt		X		
J. Munro		X		
R. Morris		X		
M. Munro		X		
J. Kwak		X		
L. Breckenridge	X			
A. Levitsky	X			
N. Tucker		X		
M. Martens		X		
R. Goldberg		X		

NAME	FOR	AGAINST	UNDECIDED	CONCERNS
A. Mainwaring		X		
H. Wellmeier	X			
P. Branigan		X		
M. Gagan		X		
S. Muirhead		X		
K. Jones		X		
B. Fowler		X		
M. Marko		X		
B. Edwards	X			
Y. Gallaha	X			
K. Dyck	X			
K. Ross		X		
J. Chorbajian		X		
N. Fleenor	X			
D. Lank		X		
P. Morris		X		
P. A. Logie		X		
J.W.A. Morris		X		
V. Dominelli	X			
M. Bains		X		
H. Bains		X		
K. Riddoch		X		
J. Challoner		X		
I. Pokorny		X		
T. Waterfield		X		
S. Watkins		X		
G. Schmidt	X			

There were 210 letters indicating support submitted by West Grandview Heights Residents' Association; 625 letters of support submitted by Loblaw Properties West Inc.; 461 forms indicating support submitted by R. Krause. There was correspondence and a 3,236 signature petition expressing opposition to the proposed project as submitted by South Surrey Together; and correspondence from J. Melody, South Surrey Together, stating concerns regarding the public hearing process.

Rosemary Zelinka, 12 – 14065 Nico Wynd Place, was in attendance and commented that she is a Community Planner in various areas. She noted she is speaking on her own volition, as a resident, and not being paid as a consultant. She continued that some more retail space is warranted in South Surrey; the question at issue is, how much, what type, where and when and it was her intention to show that the proposed power mall is very poor planning and should be returned for further study. She added that the OCP is good, comprehensive and thorough, but she did have reservations about parts of it. She added one part is the revisions the City made three years ago in which business opportunities became emphasized over everything else. She noted that the first goal of the OCP was to manage growth for orderly and economical development. This is the goal

that actually comes first in most OCP's in B.C., but in 2001, the first goal changed to accelerate business investment and development. She added that these changes, however laudable their intentions, are being pursued so zealously that an unbalanced plan is being produced which favours business development over the quality of life of the residents and protection of the environment. She stated that Grandview Corners, as now proposed, fits into this category. She spoke to the OCP amendment by-laws noting that the basic structure and commercial policies of the OCP are well founded and clear that Surrey would be developed as a series of town nodes, each with only one town centre and a with a City Centre in Whalley.

She continued that the town centre of South Surrey is clearly defined as the Semiahmoo Mall 152 Street area and there is also a policy in the OCP to ensure the functional effectiveness of each town center and neighbourhood center by protecting its respective trade areas. She added that there is a guideline that major shopping centres are to be located in town centres, so this proposal contravenes, in her view, several OCP policies regarding urban structure and commercial hierarchy because it is not in South Surrey's designated town centre, too close to other centers and of such a large scale, 1,000,000 sq. ft. that it would be more than twice the size of the South Surrey's town center. She added that most professional planners would consider that this development would be usurping the position of South Surrey's town centre and would have considerable impact on the existing commercial areas is inevitable as has happened in Langley.

Ms. Zelinka noted that these inconsistencies were also pointed out by GVRD staff in their letter dated December 16, 2004, and they were not, in her opinion, adequately responded to in Surrey's response to this letter. She continued that if it is the wish of the majority of Council that this proposal proceed, and there would seem to be some indication that this is the case, then she suggested they make a number of additional changes to the OCP, otherwise the OCP would be in conflict with itself and therefore illegal. She added that Council should make changes to the OCP redesignation of the proposal site as commercial, but the current commercial definition applies to small scale mixed use centers such as neighbourhood centres and highway commercial areas. She stated that this was recognized in the Secondary Plan when large format commercial was added to the large format retail definition for commercial use. She added that for this proposal to fit with the commercial definition being proposed, Council needs to add large format retail to the OCP designation as well as consider the consequences of any neighbourhood center having the potential for a big box retail. She suggested that Council not put in too wide a range of commercial and that Council recognize the size of this development and its position in the hierarchy and have it either designated as a town center or create a new regional shopping centre designation for this development.

She added that there is a need to make major amendments to policies in Section 2.2(a)-1 "Managed Growth for Compact Communities" to explain this new form of development and how the whole nodal pattern of the urban structure would be changed. She asked why the shopping center may no longer only be located in a town center.

She added that amendments should be made to Section 2.2(c) 2.4 regarding building complete communities to add civic focus guidelines for a commercial centre which is not a not Town of Neighbourhood Centre and to Section 2.2(c) 2.5 to remove the statement, "There shall be only one designated and functional town center within each town". She continued that there is a need to make amendment to these policies relating to complete communities and seems to contradict the argument presented in Surrey's response to the GVRD letter which states that this proposal fully complies with the goals of a complete community.

She added that the following two maps need to be amended: Community Structures Map and Neighbourhood Centres Map to show the location of this development as a commercial area or as a new designation for a regional shopping center.

She opined that this proposal is a complete departure from existing OCP urban structural and commercial policies and should not be permitted without a major review of these policies, as to do otherwise, produces an OCP is in conflict with itself and it is also very poor planning. She continued that with respect to compliance with the Liveable Regional Strategic Plan, it would appear that some exception been taken to the GVRD planner's professional opinion, that the proposal does not comply with Liveable Regional Strategic Plan and Surrey's OCP. She discussed the disclosure of the GVRD letter and continued that the City should have consulted with the GVRD as soon as the proposal was received last March.

She noted that Section 879 of the *Local Government Act* states that municipalities are required to consider if they wish to provide opportunities for early and ongoing consultation with agencies which it deems to be affected. She added that it seems Surrey did not do this as evidenced because of a resolution in November 2004 for first and second reading, after consultation had taken place, stating that the consultation that was done had satisfied requirements of Section 879 of the *Local Government Act*, and may not be legal. She continued that this is not how a number of other municipalities interpret this section of the *Act*. She advised that she was pleased that GVRD planning staff did speak up because other it shows other professional planners, not working for Surrey, have the same feelings that she has; that it contravenes the Liveable Regional Strategic Plan and the Surrey OCP. She stated that the development is not justified because the development is too large, in the wrong place, in the wrong form, and is poor planning.

She added there is doubt as to whether the proposal complies with the Secondary Plan, which is a plan never actually approved by by-law and subject to a public hearing, and intended to provide additional flexibility. She noted it would provide flexibility favouring developers only and not the residents. She continued that the Highway 99 Corridor Secondary Plan has one of its goals and objectives to ensure the development of corridor does not significantly compromise the viability of other existing and planned businesses in the larger South Surrey area.

She continued that Section 2.2(b) 3.2 of the OCP states that development, particularly commercial projects, should complement the local market catchment area and not significantly compromise the viability of existing businesses. She added that to satisfy the Secondary Plan requirement, Surrey has chosen to rely on a consortium's retail market analysis carried out three years ago. She added that she had correspondence with Surrey relating to validity of the retail findings of the study and the use staff made of it. She asked what is the true total existing floor space in the Peninsula by type. She added that the consultant makes his forecast on the basis of there being only 400,000 sq. ft of department store type merchandise, which is one form of retail and excludes the 100 or more stores around 152 Street and the White Rock Town Centre. She stated that this is because the 400,000 sq. ft. only relates to the Semiahmoo Mall, South Point and Peninsula Village.

She added that counting this extra floor space into his calculations could considerably reduce his estimates for pent up demand and if the consultant's DSTM figures are added to take into account the total retailing, it works out to be 750,000 sq. ft. of retailing for Surrey and White Rock. She asked how do the figures relate to estimates made by Surrey staff in their response to the GVRD where they estimate that the current commercial space per capital for South Surrey is 29 sq. ft. per capita. She added that using the consultant's estimates for existing population, this translates into 1.5 million sq. ft. of retail space, twice what the consultant is estimating. She noted that if those figures are used and applied to estimates for demand – there is no additional demand and represents a serious problem. She stated that the two figures are different and require an explanation before a decision is made.

She continued with concerns as to whether the sales per sq. ft. estimate by the consultant where he used B.C. average figures are in fact not too low for those in the area. She also stated concerns on whether the additional 1.2 million sq. ft. that he forecast for 2006, which is for whole trade area, how much would apply to this site. She noted that the consultant stated this was because when there was to be an interchange that would be 55% to 65% of those figures and in fact those figures have not changed, which means that demand on this side would be 660,000 sq. ft. not the nearly 1 million sq. ft. that is proposed within the next few years.

She noted that if the question was if there was no interchange, the consultant was assuming much lower trade figures and stated that lately this is only differing absorption rates. She questioned if the consultant had changed his mind, in which case, how much reliance can be placed on his other findings.

She continued that the consultant now believes the drawing power of the power mall would attract an inflow of more than 20% originally forecast, yet he believes this would have no or hardly any impact on existing commercial areas. She stated that she finds the conclusion difficult to believe and inconsistent with Surrey's own statement in their letter to the GVRD where it states that it recognizes there may be some market-based impacts to existing commercial centres, for example Semiahmoo Town Centre and the White Rock Town Centre. She added that as a

result, Surrey seems to be trying to increase the resident population in the area and has their consultant doing repositioning studies in order to help the town centre to survive. She concluded that this admission by the City is contradictory to the Secondary Plan's objective that there be no significant compromising to the viability of existing businesses.

She added that it has not been proven beyond a reasonable doubt, that this huge proposal will not significantly compromise the viability of existing businesses and as such the proposal does not comply with the OCP or Secondary Plan. She recommended that Council have fresh market studies carried out now that the composition of much of the proposal is known, and should include consumer and market studies in order to do the best possible to ensure the project will not significantly impact existing retailers and bring stores to South Surrey that residents want. She added that we owe it to retailers to do everything we can so they are not adversely affected before commitments are broken and inherent in the OCP.

She then addressed the development permit area by-laws and noted that the proposed by-law under consideration makes Highway 99 Corridor Secondary Plan subject to the OCP for city wide permit guidelines and she advised that she supported this, but questioned whether it was enough in a case where commitment to design excellence and sustainability principles have been made.

She continued that the Secondary Plan contains design guidelines that states these guidelines would be used in conjunction with OCP development permit guidelines and noted that Secondary Plans are flexible. She indicated that because of the importance of this site, she would like to see a site layout and design principles by by-law either in the Zoning By-law or development permit guidelines in the OCP amendment. She added that the public hearing would result rather than current situation where there is little opportunity for public input regarding project design. She noted that because of public interest, Council could agree to hold a public meeting regarding the development permit which would be needed for this site. She added that she had met with the developer to come up with a process to improve the design and sustainability of the project and that she does support these efforts. She thanked Councillor Watts for her attempts to bring everyone together, however, as hard as the developer and the public tries, the issues of the project being too big, with buildings dispersed around the site, too car-oriented, on four corners instead of a block, and in the wrong location will not be overcome.

She then spoke to the Zoning By-laws, which she stated are intended to integrate large format and small-scale commercial buildings in a comprehensive design. She stated there is no comprehensive design in the by-laws and the Zoning By-law amendment is far too general to exercise any degree of control over the development. She noted this is Surrey's only opportunity to manage land use and density. She added that any development permits, which follow would only control landscaping, building location, and building design and would not be subject to a public hearing and cannot in the end be refused. She suggested by-laws be made more specific in their allocation of land uses with a general site plan



included, and indicate the chosen location of anchor stores and blocks where smaller stores would go. She added that the conservation area with pond should also be specifically zoned and not left to chance. She noted the argument that these additions are too specific and would require a public hearing at each change is not the case as they would be a variation to site plan would be minor variance matters processed at the same time as the development permits.

She continued that the by-law sets the standard of 3 parking spaces for 1,000 sq. ft. for outdoor parking. She added that it is left to the developer to provide an additional 2 spaces for 1,000 sq. ft. in parking structures and there is no requirement in the by-laws that he provide these 2 spaces. She noted that it is commonly known that a mall of this size should require 5 spaces per 1000 sq. ft. and suggested that the by-law state the requirement for 5 spaces per 1,000 sq. ft., 3 of which may be outside. She commented that there should be some degree of management, as the parking issue could become a complete disaster in this area if there are only 3 spaces per 1,000 sq. ft. She added that even if there is justification by market analyst for this proposal, this situation is so uncertain that the zoning should be phased by only rezoning a part of the site at the present time; perhaps one or two quadrants, to serve as an extra safeguard in protecting the viability of existing commercial areas.

She then spoke to the traffic plan and the elaborate and expensive road widening, turn lanes, and signalization just confirm that building such a massive car-oriented shopping centre on four corners is just not good planning.

She added that the population for the northeast corner development has not yet appeared, noting that 20,000 to 30,000 people are intended to be in the Grandview Heights area. She noted that currently there are 5,000 to 6,000 people and there is not a need for such a big mall.

She stated that the developer claimed in his presentation to Council the need to build the whole project now in order to recoup profits due to the \$11 million spent on infrastructure especially making the 24th Avenue overpass over Highway 99 into five lanes. She added that developer expediency should not override good planning as a reason for allowing this development to proceed. She added that to go forward without a phasing plan is poor planning.

She continued that from a planning perspective, if 20,000 to 30,000 people are going into the Grandview Heights area, there is an opportunity to create a new town there and to provide one that is centrally located and suits the community. She added that it seems that the very oddly shaped Highway 99 Corridor Plan with hydro rights-of-way that don't provide any boundaries and, in fact, the shopping centres have extended well beyond that now. She suggested Council look at that again in cooperation with looking at the whole area east of Highway 99, for a population of 20,000 to 30,000 with a good industrial and business parks and good shopping, of the type that people want. She stated that the project should be separated from South Surrey by a greenbelt.

She summarized that there are inconsistencies between existing and proposed OCP policies which need to be resolved if it is not to be in conflict with itself; there is a possibility that Surrey has not fulfilled the requirements of Section 879 of the *Local Government Act*; it has not been sufficiently proven that the scale of development will not significantly compromise the viability of existing retail; the site plan and design elements should be put in a by-law, subject to public hearing so we can have good public input; zoning bylaw amendments be made more specific to development and include a site plan and design criteria; the location is too close to existing shopping centres and too car oriented requiring expensive traffic solutions because it is on four corners; and the whole development needs to be phased over a number of years to minimize impact on existing commercial .

She added there is an opportunity to rethink things to develop a new town center in the area, which we can be proud of and which would be an example of good planning. She advised that time be taken to look at market studies, idea of new town, define design criteria. She concluded that we owe a commitment to hundreds of business people who have invested their capital and futures in Surrey on the basis of the commercial hierarchy of the OCP in the last 20 years and we need to be sure right we are developing in the right place, at the right time.

She discussed that the greatest criticism of Surrey's planning is the blending of one community with the next resulting in urban sprawl and a sea of housing, lacking in character and identity. She stated there is the opportunity to do something new and special here.

It was Moved by Councillor Bose  
 Seconded by Councillor Villeneuve  
 That Rosemary Zelinka's written submission  
 be formally received into the record.

RES.R05-108

Carried

**\*Note:** Ms. Zelinka did not submit her notes to the City Clerk or Council at the Public Hearing of January 19, 2005.

Jim McMurtry, 5784 – 167 Street, was in attendance and commented that he is a member of the Surrey Civic Coalition and that he opposes the proposed development. He expressed concerns regarding Surrey's plans to develop the Highway 99 corridor and noted that the City paid for the market studies, which served as large rubber stamps to commercial interest. He noted the size of properties developed over 1,000,000 sq. ft. such as Guildford Mall had a devastating impact on existing and planned businesses. He added that land speculators have already benefited. He stated that Council is pro-development and in favour of urbanization in the form of huge subsidies to developers. Mr. McMurtry handed in a written submission.

Jenny Tamas, 2104 - 168 Street, was in attendance and commented on paved roads and street lighting. She noted that the shopping centre is needed. Ms. Tamas handed in a written submission.

David Hawkins, 1702 King George Highway, was in attendance and commented that he was a forensic economist working on government and non-government projects. He added that there is an appearance of insider trading by investors in Grandview Heights, noting a joint meeting with the B.C. Securities Commission and Ron Gamble, Leader of the Reform B.C. party, where it was revealed that major developers and investors are signing joint venture financing agreements. He commented that B.C. Hydro and municipal employees are rewarded through public pension funds for giving provincial rights-of-way by rezoning the land away from suburban to commercial.. He continued that economic viability is the only way developers and investors will make money and significant profits in this area by taking land underneath the B.C. Hydro transmission lines for free. He stated that his concern is that investors are participating in a pool of \$60 million of public investment funds through B.C. Investment Corporation Mortgage using \$7 million placing staff working on rezoning and offices of B.C. Hydro granting rights-of-way under transmission lines in a position of conflict of interest. He noted these organizations have \$4 million shares-in-principle and the beneficiaries are WalMart, Home Depot and Loblaws. He stated that \$8 million is the likely source of project financing from Royal Bank of Canada. He added that public servants are vulnerable to accusations on charges of expediting rezoning of a piece of land. He stated that his recommendation to Ron Gamble when the candidates of Reform B.C. run in provincial election on May 17, 2005, they actually insist on public disclosure and public delivery of joint venture financing agreements which must have been signed by investors in the Grandview development.

Francois Perreault, 2147 – 156 Street, was in attendance and commented that South Surrey is growing very quickly and noted that the proposed site would be a good site for commercial development as it is situated along the highway and would have good exposure. He noted the benefit to one intersection being developed and discussed traffic concerns.

It was Moved by Councillor Watts  
 Seconded by Councillor Villeneuve  
 That the 35 signature petition in support of  
 the proposed developed with traffic impact consideration submitted by  
 Francois Perreault be received.

RES.R05-109

Carried

Rod Deakin, 16756 – 20 Avenue, was in attendance and commented that he is opposed to the proposed amendment to the OCP for the proposed development. He continued that big box development does not meet regional guidelines and conflicts with the Highway 99 Corridor plan. He noted that the B.C. Hydro right-of-way is now more than two thirds of the proposal and commented on the lack of consultation. He added that one of the developments would take place on City land stating that this would represent a conflict of interest with the inclusion of this property with the proposal. He then discussed issues around sustainability, part-time jobs, little benefits, minimum wage, effect on existing smaller retailers, run-off contamination, run-off contamination, and environmental concerns.

Mike Burton-Brown, Partner, Abbarch Partnership Architects, 675 West Hastings Street, Vancouver, B.C., was in attendance and commented that the proposed project would consist of 900,000 sq. ft. over a 78 acre site and is proposed to be built around the intersection of 24 Avenue and 160 Street in South Surrey, as recommended in the Highway 99 Corridor Local Area Plan. He continued that the proposed development is consistent with the Highway 99 Plan adopted by Council in February, 2004 and the policies of the OCP, which calls for the development of complete communities and sustainable local economies. He added that the Grandview Corners project is a unique development of large format retail stores featuring reduced surface parking, significant landscaping, main street design, pedestrian links and varied architecture for each quadrant and distinct clusters. He added that extensive consultation had been undertaken with the public, stakeholders, Southridge School, West Grandview Heights Residents Association, South Surrey Together, Little Campbell Watershed, Surrey Environmental Partners, Sunnyside Acres Partners, Elgin Ratepayers Association, and Grandview Heights area.

He noted that major issues and concerns raised by the community have been addressed such as: the parking ratio across the development would conform strictly to 3 spaces per 100 sq. m.; additional parking would be provided and located below WalMart and Superstore buildings; corporate colours would be greatly subdued; buildings would be located to avoid environmentally sensitive areas or compensation provided through an environmental compensation program; the village style concept would be incorporated with sidewalks, pedestrian scale lighting, landscaping, connections to open spaces, public art, shuttle buses as alternative to moving pedestrians from one quadrant to another, road improvements such as widening of 24 Avenue, turning lanes, widening of freeway overpass, landscaping of medians and boulevards, multipurpose pathways, signalized crossings, traffic calming, and working with TransLink to bring transit to central Semiahmoo. He noted that extensive features to promote environmental sustainability would be put in place such as stormwater detention and parking lots that drain to a designed network of vegetated swales to filter oil and debris.

Mr. Burton-Brown expressed willingness to work with community groups and staff to assess further sustainable development and enhancement of natural habitats.

Klaus Oehr, 1940 – 180 Street, was in attendance and commented that he is a long time resident. He expressed concerns regarding the size and viability of the project, increasing population, competition on local businesses.

It was

Moved by Councillor Bose  
Seconded by Councillor Villeneuve  
That the information as submitted by

Klaus Orr be received.

Carried

RES.R05-110

Cam Scott, 16072 – 13 Avenue, was in attendance and commented that he supports the proposed mall. He continued that currently he has to travel to Richmond, Langley for shopping.

It was

Moved by Councillor Hunt

Seconded by Councillor Watts

That 12 form letters in support of the

proposed project as submitted by Cam Scott be received.

RES.R05-111

Carried

Judith Woods, 17260 – 26A Avenue, was in attendance and commented that she was opposed to the proposal as it would infringe and erode the lifestyle of the area. She continued that the Regional Context Statement plan accepted by the GVRD in November 2003 indicated that commercial development would be accommodated within existing town centres. She noted concerns regarding transportation and lack of public access to information.

Kathy Booth, 12633 – 26 Avenue, was in attendance and commented that she is a public health nurse. She continued that she is strongly opposed to the proposed rezoning application because the 1700 jobs promised would be low-paying retail. She added that there is little affordable housing in South Surrey and an abundance of existing retail jobs in the community.

Sally Wassall, 16226 – 24 Avenue, was in attendance and commented that the community has changed over the years. She continued that Council approved plans for the Grandview Highway 99 Corridor plan. She requested Council vote yes to the rezoning change, adding that 24 Avenue has always had commercial activity. She noted that there are many businesses on 24 Avenue, which is a busy arterial road, and there is no quiet living there. She added that the corner of 24 Avenue and 160 Street is a great location for commercial development as it is adjacent to Highway 99 and situated under the hydro power lines, making for good use of the property. She noted that Surrey needs the resulting jobs from construction, sales, and business park, as well as the tax revenue.

Nowell Hinch, 16490 – 28 Avenue, was in attendance and supports the proposed project. He continued that Council has been elected to develop Surrey and develop required services.

Sharlene Lazin, 16272 – 20 Avenue, was in attendance and commented that she lives under the hydro right of way. She continued that she believes the project to be a good use for land and related concerns regarding current drainage. She added that local businesses have lost business due to lack of choice and low prices and she travels to Langley for her shopping needs. She then noted that the development would bring in \$4.5 million tax dollars and noted that part time jobs would assist those persons in finding first-time work. She added there has been adequate planning and consultation since the project's inception.

It was Moved by Councillor Hunt  
Seconded by Councillor Watts  
That the 700 signed forms indicating support  
for the project, as submitted by Sharlene Lazin, be received.  
RES.R05-112 Carried

Maria Hong, 16790 – 24 Avenue, was in attendance and submitted correspondence in opposition to the proposed project.

It was Moved by Councillor Hunt  
Seconded by Councillor Watts  
That correspondence from Paul and Helen  
Hong, as submitted by Maria Hong be received.  
RES.R05-113 Carried

Albert Svab, 2660 Croyden Drive, was in attendance and commented that he moved to the area for its rural character. He noted development is part of progress and added that he supports the proposed project. He advised he drives to Langley for shopping needs.

Alan Ryder, 16272 – 20 Avenue, was in attendance and commented that he supports the proposed rezoning application. He advised that staff have done a good job informing the public relative to the project. He continued that the Highway 99 Corridor Plan was well conceived as the land is marginal in terms of usage and noted concerns regarding drainage. He noted a scaled back development would not be able to demonstrate care and quality that the developer is undertaking. He advised that he supported the proposed project.

Councillor Hunt left the meeting at 8:55 p.m. and returned at 9:01 p.m.  
Councillor Watts left the meeting at 9:03 p.m. and returned at 9:08 p.m.

Ferne Van Den Broek, 17345 – 23 Avenue, was in attendance and commented that she is not opposed to change, but noted the scope and size of the proposed shopping centre would result in harm to environmentally sensitive lands. She raised concerns regarding adverse affects on Burns Bog, ice cap melting and lack of environmental studies. She stated that 84% people are opposed to the size of the proposed development. She urged Council to defer approval until comprehensive studies are undertaken by unbiased professionals to deal with concerns regarding the environment, traffic, crime, libraries, police, fire and hospitals connected with increasing populations. She noted the proposed shopping centre would provide tax dollars that would have to go back into the system to build and maintain infrastructure.

Carol Blacklaws, 13842 Coldicutt Avenue, White Rock, B.C., was in attendance and commented that she is a resident of White Rock and related concerns regarding communication with stakeholders, responsibility in undertaking responsibility in maintaining healthy environments. She added that she is opposed to big box stores and urban sprawl. She noted the 3,500 signature

petition submitted expressing opposition to the proposed rezoning application. She requested commercial development be scaled down and no big box retailers.

Janice Melody, 16651 – 19 Avenue, was in attendance and commented that she is the Co-chair of South Surrey Together and that she is opposed to the proposed rezoning application.

It was

Moved by Councillor Hunt

Seconded by Councillor Villeneuve

That the 401 signature petition as submitted

by Janice Melody be received.

RES.R05-114

Carried

She noted that these signatures are in addition to the previous petition submitted and the total signatures now total 3,637 in opposition to the proposed rezoning. She referenced correspondence from the GVRD advising the scale of the development would be contradictory of the OCP town centre designation, and includes new information that should have been disclosed to the public. She asked why the GVRD was not consulted earlier in the process. She added that the staff report indicated 71.23% of the community would prefer a low density land use plan and indicated overwhelming support for maintaining large sized lots. She urged Council to delay third and fourth reading until plans are reviewed and finalized, as South Surrey is a jewel of a community, built on principles of sustainable environmental values.

Barb Justason, 1465 Comox Street, Vancouver, B.C., was in attendance and commented that she had undertaken an independent opinion research pool conducted in the South Surrey area. She continued that this research project was requested by First Pro Shopping Centres to learn the priorities and choices for shopping opportunities in the South Surrey and White Rock areas. She added that the telephone survey was conducted with 301 South Surrey and White Rock residents between October 28 and November 1, 2004. She advised that digital phone calls were random and included unlisted phone numbers. She noted that the survey was sampled in proportion to natural geographical and demographic distribution, featuring other language interviewers (Cantonese, Mandarin and Punjabi) even though the need for other languages was comparatively small. She added that there was random selection of household, of individuals within the household and multiple attempts were made to reach each individual selected for research. She noted that the survey indicated that 72% of South Surrey and White Rock residents shopped outside the area within the last month and these numbers increased to 80% for shopping outside the area within the last three months.

She noted that 85% of those surveyed indicated they shopped outside the area for wider selection and the variety of lower prices, and advised that this level increases with decreasing income. She continued that survey results indicate that store definitions were listed as discount shopping stores, large home improvement stores, and member only warehouse stores, followed by speciality stores. She advised that survey results indicated overall support for the proposed project with 62% indicating support, 8% neutral and 30% opposed.

Ward Prystay, 5815 Carson Street, Burnaby, B.C., was in attendance and commented that he is a professional biologist for Jakes Whitford Ltd., an independent consulting firm retained by First Pro Development and the provincial and federal governments with respect to environmental issues associated with the project. He described habitat features being incorporated into the project design and noted that the current land use includes a golf course and fallow, abandoned agricultural lands under the hydro right-of-way. He added that fish and wildlife is limited and there is currently no large patch of forest to support rare or endangered life species. He advised there is currently no fish in the local watercourses flowing into Fergus Creek. He noted these ditches would be relocated and stated he is working closely with the Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO) to address changes as part of the Federal Fisheries Act. He noted, that in working with the DFO, the outcome results in no loss of fish habitat associated with the development. He stated that First Pro would build two new streams to replace ditches along Highway 99 with a mixed creek and wetland complex at the southeast corner, planted with native trees and shrubs consistent with native landscaping buffer around the site. He added this would enhance fish and wildlife habitats and protect water quality in Fergus Creek incorporating stormwater facility with a bio swale in the parking lot, filtering oil and sediment from run off underneath the bio swale in three areas under Highway 99.

Councillor Tymoschuk left the meeting at 9:20 p.m. and returned at 9:29 p.m.

He advised that each quadrant would feature oil and water separators not captured by swales for stormwater from the northeast, northwest, and southeast drainage detention ponds for further treatments.

He discussed run off rates, storm flows, stormwater management, roof top detention of base flow, infiltration galleries, protection of habitat, and greenspace. He noted that restrictive covenants would be placed on areas of fish habitat under the federal Fisheries Act over and above the acres protected under the Highway 99 Corridor Study. He added that the development would be the most environmentally responsible development in Surrey and likely the province. He stated that the developers would continue to work through the environmental issues.

He clarified a statement made earlier with respect to Burns Bog, advising that the proposed development would have no affect on that area.

Mayor McCallum left the meeting at 9:28 p.m. and Councillor Higginbotham assumed the Chair.

Michael Proskow, 2696 Country Woods Drive, was in attendance and commented that he is a member of the Grandview Heights Citizen Advisory Committee. He added that he supports well-planned development but is opposed to this rezoning application as it currently stands. He requested Council delay the project until complete, public disclosure has been made and stated concerns regarding process and timelines employed by the stakeholders concern. He added



that the applicant had met with community groups only after public pressure and that there has been insufficient time to properly review the proposal. He noted that the general public has not had the opportunity to review the project.

Mayor McCallum returned to the meeting at 9:30 p.m. and assumed the Chair.

He advised of concerns regarding the Highway 99 Corridor plan noting there has been significant opposition to massive development, which would impact the character and liveability of the community. He added that it was not until September 13 and October 13, 2004 that opportunities arose for community input with the developer through two public open houses, which raised more concerns and questions rather than solutions. He advised that the architectural model was not provided at the public open houses and it was not until after the November 2004 Council meetings that they were provided. He continued that the staff report specifically included traffic concerns, pedestrian safety and general unhappiness with the process and lack of information from the developer. He noted that the official traffic study undertaken by the City was not made available to the public until it appeared on the City's website on November 29, 2004. He stated that 88% of residents submitting letters and petitions indicated opposition to the application and 12% supported the proposed project. He referenced a letter from the GVRD to the City of Surrey expressing significant concerns regarding the application of the Liveable Regional Strategic Plan, which was not presented to the public.

Councillor Priddy left the meeting at 9:41 p.m. and returned at 9:45 p.m.

He discussed the direct negative effect of big box development on small existing retail, noted that the proposal is a town centre and would have a negative impact on transportation and would not strengthen normal development in Surrey. He advised that more time is required to address concerns regarding process and information to assure public confidence, adding that no one is against development. He recommended that the application needs to reach out to the community to engage the public in a meaningful two-way dialogue, through more community workshops, drawing a variety of residents and community groups. He added that the development needs to follow the village concept theme and be more pedestrian friendly. He raised concern regarding greenspace, open asphalt parking lots, small business impact, and environmental issues and added that the proposal should not be finalized before completion of the Grandview Heights Land Use project.

He concluded that through dialogue and planning between the applicant and the residents is required, as the proposed project would have a significant impact on the entire population of the South Surrey peninsula area. He requested Council not approve this application at this time and asked the City Solicitor to rule as to whether the public hearing should be adjourned as fresh information has been presented to Council that is meaningful, substantial, and was not made available to the public.

It was Moved by Councillor Bose  
Seconded by Councillor Villeneuve  
That the information submitted by  
Michael Proskow be received.  
RES.R05-115 Carried

Gary Scott, 2721 – 164 Street, was in attendance and commented that he is in favour of the proposed rezoning application and that he speaks on behalf of the West Grandview Heights Community Association. He noted that this organization represents the owners of 375 properties and 1,300 acres across the Grandview Heights area, who are all in favour of new services in the area. He noted his association invited the proponents to their meetings over the last year and sought out the information and had no difficulty getting the information. He advised that the association developed a website “citizenstation.com”. He summarized that the land use is perfect for this location as the economic spin-offs and sustainability of the community are vital to the city, and the architectural designs are impressive and fresh.

John Blackwell, 14749 – 16A Avenue, was in attendance and commented that he is a long time resident. He added that the facilities as provided by the City are excellent and noted the lack of variety and shopping in South Surrey. He advised they drive to Vancouver, Richmond and Bellingham to enjoy a greater variety of shopping. He noted that he and his family support the proposed project.

Murray Weisenberger, 12785 Crescent Road, was in attendance and commented that he opposed the proposed project. He noted that he was not able to attend most meetings regarding the proposal as he was out of town.

Councillor Hunt left the meeting at 9:53 p.m. and returned at 9:57 p.m.

He expressed concerns regarding project timing, traffic, and the residents’ appetite for the project. He expressed further concerns regarding traffic in the Cloverdale and Pacific Highway areas, proposed commercial development in those areas, and its impact on the South Surrey area.

Councillor Watts left the meeting at 10:02 p.m. and returned at 10:07 p.m.

He noted Section 6.6-1 from the Campbell Heights Local Area Plan relative to accessibility as a prime consideration for development in the Campbell Heights area. He asked what road has been selected for major connectors, east-west connectors, truck routes, and the major connector attached to the freeway in the Grandview Heights corridor. He noted concerns regarding increased traffic congestion along 24 Avenue, which would negatively impact existing businesses in the area.

Councillor Higginbotham left the meeting at 10:03 p.m. and returned at 10:08 p.m.

He advised of concerns regarding part-time jobs, low wages, few or no benefits, big box development, community social amenities contributions, maintenance of

landscaping buffers and medians, police and fire service costs, preservation of habitat lands, and NCP consultation process. He requested the project be delayed for proper planning of road network.

George Lechleiter, 15876 – 24 Avenue, was in attendance and commented that he supported the proposed project. He noted that residents are looking forward to a wider variety of shopping and services close to home.

Sybil Row, 17267 – 20 Avenue, was in attendance and commented that she assisted in the gathering of over 3,000 signatures on a petition previously submitted. She advised that she is not anti-development but is opposed to the size of the proposed project. She advised that the residents petitioned had concerns regarding existing businesses in the area, appearance of the proposed development, and requested that compromise be exercised. She continued that residents are concerned with rampant development in the area, sustainability of Fraser River Basin, lifestyle and food sources of the masses. She urged Council to take control of development and consider a lower-scaled project.

Peter Tilbury, 17240 – 26A Avenue, was in attendance and commented that he opposes the proposed project. He added that he is a member of the Country Woods Residents Association comprised of 93 homeowners in the area and that he is a Block Watch captain. He added that the scale of the proposed project is too large and does not allow for the village concept. He noted no dimensions or model were presented at the public open house and there was a lack of public consultation. He commented on concerns regarding the proposed 12 to 14 acres of parking lot, pedestrian-friendliness, and preservation of trees.

Councillor Priddy left the meeting at 10:40 p.m. and returned at 10:43 p.m.

Marilyn Hirsekorn, 17182 – 21 Avenue, was in attendance and commented that she had concerns regarding the proposed development under the hydro 500 kV towers, which is a health concern to tenants, employees and customers. She discussed the effects of daily exposure to high levels of electricity.

Heidi Greco, 15823 Tulip Drive, was in attendance and commented that she asked the City to consider acquiring the property where the golf course is currently located as future parkland. She related concerns regarding tree preservation. She noted the large attendance to the public hearing adding that there is much disagreement on the proposed project. She requested Council postpone the proposed application for one year to allow further public consultation.

Alisa Wilson, 17008 – 20 Avenue, was in attendance and commented concern that concerns raised by the GVRD were provided too late for Board review of the proposal. She continued that the proposed development had negative connotations for competing small businesses, the lack of village concept, pedestrian orientation and connectivity, and increased traffic.

It was Moved by Councillor Bose  
Seconded by Councillor Watts  
That the written brief as submitted by Alisa  
Wilson be received.

RES.R05-116 Carried

Councillor Villeneuve left the meeting at 10:51 p.m. and returned at 10:54 p.m.

Naty King, 1859 – 184 Street, was in attendance and commented that she had concerns regarding project scale, social impact, ethics and environmental impact. She advised that big box development is not suitable and raised concerns regarding lack of transportation, increased traffic, increased greenhouse emissions, wastefulness of land, contributing to urban sprawl, single use, and need for required new infrastructure. She advises she is not anti-development or opposed to change but has concerns regarding the proposed use of the land.

J.P. White, Potters Nursery, 3231 – 152 Street, was in attendance and commented that he is in support of the proposed rezoning application.

It was Moved by Councillor Watts  
Seconded by Councillor Steele  
That the 1,782-signature petition indicating  
support for the proposed project as submitted by J.P. White be received.

RES.R05-117 Carried

Councillors Hunt and Tymoschuk left the meeting at 11:18 p.m. and returned at 11:23 p.m.

David Sellars, 16877 – 30A Avenue, was in attendance and commented that he is a professional engineer and hydrologist performing environmental impact assessments and hydrology around the world. He added that he is the President of the Grandview Heights Residents Association and is a member of South Surrey Together. He stated that he had concerns regarding the lack of an environmental impact assessment, as the project is located within the watershed of Fergus Creek, mitigation measures on Fergus Creek, and salmon habitat. He noted that the statement was made earlier that the DFO would carry out the EIS, when, in actuality, it would only carry out an environmental screening for the project. He noted that the City of Surrey should carry out an Environmental Impact Statement and the GVRD Liveable Regional Strategy.

He continued that local commercial development should be curtailed to existing commercial town centre areas, and expressed concern regarding the size and location of the development and lack of public support. He added that comment sheet responses were 2 to 1 against the size and scale of proposed development and a recent staff report dated December 2004 indicated that the total respondents, pre-notification, living in Surrey stand at 88% opposed to the application. He referenced a petition of over 3,600 signatures requesting the size and scale of the development be reduced. He noted that he is not opposed to the location of the

shopping centre, but that Council should listen and respond to citizens' objections to this type of development in the community.

He stated that the purpose of an environmental impact study is to determine whether proposed mitigation measures are adequate, and there is a need to recognize the GVRD's Liveable Regional Strategy and impact on the existing town centre. He requested Council defer approval of the application until all the issues are adequately expressed.

He noted the survey information provided earlier had no statistical meaning and is not an indication that people want big box development within the community. He referenced a Court of Appeal decision regarding a case with Pitt Polder and insufficient time to review. He requested Council ask the City Solicitor to rule if this public hearing should now be adjourned as fresh information has been provided by the developer, which was not made available prior to the public hearing.

David Sellars continued that the survey information was brought forward by the developer and is germane to land use but cannot be considered as opinion, and was brought forward as an independent professional survey, and presented as factual.

Mark Worthing, 13061 – 15A Avenue, was in attendance and commented that he is a member of the Council of Canadians, Elgin Park Solutions Society, and Market Thought. He expressed concerns regarding big box development such as WalMart, its effect on local businesses, increased traffic congestion, maximization of capital, and long-term effects on future generations.

Deb Jack, Chair, Surrey Environmental Partners, 7680 – 143 Street, was in attendance and commented that they are concerned regarding loss of open field habitat, impact on wild bird population, preservation of trees and numbers to be planted, would like to see more conifers, construction waste management and monitoring, lighting impact on wildlife, green roof construction, and building methods and standards to at least the LEEDS Silver level. She expressed concern regarding global warming, destruction of the environment and associated health concerns.

It was Moved by Councillor Watts  
 Seconded by Councillor Steele  
 That the letter from Surrey Environmental  
 Partners Society as submitted by Deb Jack be received.

RES.R05-118

Carried

Councillor Watts left the meeting at 11:42 p.m. and returned at 11:45 p.m.

Allen Aubert, 1045 – 165 Street, was in attendance and commented that notwithstanding what members of the community have stated, the project is too large, and would not incorporate sustainable principles, and has potential to disrupt existing shopping centres.

Councillor Higginbotham left the meeting at 11:53 p.m. and returned at 11:59 p.m.

He expressed concerns regarding the lack of community dialogue, environmental impact, market demand study, increased traffic, architectural project and design, and protection of the natural environment. He advised that he does not support the proposed project.

Councillor Tymoschuk left the meeting at 11:59 p.m. and returned at 12:01 p.m.

Dr. Roy Strang, 2456 – 141 Street, was in attendance and commented that he wished to correct an error stated earlier in the public hearing by the architect speaking for the developer. He continued that the speaker had stated that Sunnyside Acres Society had been approached and had expressed support. Dr. Strang noted that there is no such body, but there is the Sunnyside Acres Heritage Society; and it had not been approached by any proponent nor expressed any opinion either for or against. He stated there must be an environmental impact assessment before work proceeds. He expressed concerns regarding groundwater, run off, environmentally sustainable communities, environmentally friendly transport, and drainage. He added that the proposed project would have a major impact on the local environment.

Winston Leckie, 17355 – 27A Avenue was in attendance and commented that the City Architect, at an Advisory Design Panel meeting, expressed concern regarding the siting of the WalMart store. He added that concerns were also raised relative to long, blank walls, and greening of development. He noted that some areas in the United States have been successful in forcing WalMart to achieve high-level LEEDS standards. He suggested that this be further explored by staff. With respect to the statement that there was community support of 3 to 1 in favour, he added that a staff report had stated that 80% are opposed to this development. He suggested Council view this as an opportunity for quality development and ensure ample opportunity for public input in a public forum relative to design and siting.

It was

Moved by Councillor Hunt  
Seconded by Councillor Watts  
That the information as submitted by

Winston Leckie be received.

RES.R05-119

Carried

L.W. Friesen, 1536 Royal Avenue, White Rock, B.C. was in attendance and commented on concerns regarding the potential impact on small, independent businesses by the proposed development, and lack of full time jobs.

Councillor Steele left the meeting at 12:08 a.m. and returned to the meeting at 12:09 a.m.

Mayor McCallum left the meeting at 12:09 a.m. and Councillor Higginbotham assumed the Chair.

Anna Luczynski, 16279 – 30B Avenue, was in attendance and commented that she opposed the proposed rezoning application. She requested Council defer decision for public consultation and community involvement on design and transportation details, corridor issues, and reconsideration of size of development.

Frank Spanevello, 16355 – 20 Avenue, was in attendance and commented that he supported the proposed rezoning application.

Donna Maher, 12626 – 21A Avenue, was in attendance and commented that she had concerns regarding the proposed development and process, siting of gas bar, impact on local school, safety of children, safety, increased traffic, road width, lack of community support, and lack of environmental impact assessment. She requested Council defer approval of the project until a proper environmental impact study has been undertaken.

Mayor McCallum returned to the meeting at 12:14 a.m. and assumed the Chair.

Mark Devitt, 17090 – 23 Avenue, was in attendance and commented that he had concerns regarding traffic and the 24 Avenue bridge. He discussed traffic ratings, and noted that 160 Street should be built to arterial standard, including left turn bays, future truck route designation, and traffic infrastructure for all four corners of the proposed development.

Jane Manning, 16218 – 29 Avenue, was in attendance and commented that she had concerns regarding the size and long-term sustainability of the proposed development.

Mohamed Chelali, 1314 – 128 Street, was in attendance and commented that he is opposed to the proposed project. He raised concerns regarding lack of public consultation, effect of mega development on local small businesses, increased traffic, noise, pollution, increased low-end minimum wage jobs, and impact on quality of life.

Ilna Horvath, 18056 – 59 Avenue, was in attendance and commented that she is opposed to the size and location of the proposed development. She continued that such shopping centres should be developed on the north side of the Nicomekl River. She added that South Surrey and White Rock are very unique communities and residents do not want this type of shopping in the area. She questioned petitioning processes and agreed with a referendum in this matter.

Councillor Hunt left the meeting at 12:56 a.m. and returned to the meeting at 1:00 a.m.

Jim Crawford, 14664 Bellevue Crescent, was in attendance and commented that he supports the proposed rezoning application. He noted concerns regarding sanitary sewers and his own proposed development in the area.

Kay Sinclair, 2428 – 156 Street, was in attendance and commented that she opposed the concept and scale of the proposed development. She noted development should encourage smaller scale, environmentally friendly

commercial development and added concerns regarding increased traffic, road widening, the proposed WalMart, and lack of environment assessment.

Kay Sinclair advised that Wendy and Martin McGillivray of 15532 – 32 Avenue had forwarded an email providing permission to her to speak on their behalf.

E. Simerl, 16858 – 20 Avenue, was in attendance and commented on concerns regarding salmon habitat, drainage, traffic, pedestrian friendliness, detention ponds, bio filtration swales, tree retention and scale, and light pollution. She stated she was opposed to the proposed development.

Doug Neil, #3 – 3225 Morgan Creek Way, was in attendance and commented that he is opposed to the proposed development. He stated concerns regarding traffic congestion, architecture of big box stores, windows, rooflines, acres of parking lots, traffic lights, lack of community input, lack of impact studies on market and environment, and impact on smaller existing businesses.

Mayor McCallum left the meeting at 1:13 a.m. and Councillor Higginbotham assumed the Chair.

David Van den Broek, 17345 – 23 Avenue, was in attendance and commented that he is opposed to the size and scale of the proposed development, the impact on smaller existing businesses, and part-time jobs.

Mayor McCallum returned to the meeting at 1:15 a.m. and assumed the Chair.

Michael Barthel, 17185 – 26 Avenue, was in attendance and commented that big box stores require populations of upwards to 200,000 to sustain them. He pointed out that the population of Surrey is pushing 400,000 and expressed concern regarding increased traffic.

Carole Hecht, 14006 Beachview Avenue, White Rock, B.C. was in attendance and commented that she is opposed to the proposed development. She stated concerns regarding the lack of village concept, surveys, lack of public awareness, demographics, need for rejuvenation in other parts of Surrey, and the environment.

Andrew Schulz, 16487 – 23 Avenue, was in attendance and commented that the development is lacking imagination and spoke to a village concept. He expressed concern regarding increased traffic, and improper planning. He stated concerns that WalMart is not environmentally, economically or socially responsible.

Nancy Smith, 12777 Ocean Cliff Drive, was in attendance and commented that she is opposed to the proposed development. She expressed concerns regarding safety of children, buffer zone, and long-term view for quality of life.

Lisa Layton, 16650 Edgewood Drive, was in attendance and commented that Cloverdale may be a better location for this type of development. She stated that housing should be built along 24 Avenue and commercial developed along the



Highway 99 corridor. She expressed concerns regarding wildlife habitat and environmental protection and requested high quality, unique shopping centers.

Mark Layton, 16650 Edgewood Drive, was in attendance and commented that he is a professional engineer. He discussed the importance of being Canadian and not mimicking the American way of life.

Councillors Villeneuve and Steele left the meeting at 1:55 a.m. and returned to the meeting at 1:57 a.m.

Barbara Paton, on behalf of Anna Erhardt, 13868 - 28 Avenue, was in attendance and commented that Mrs. Anna Erhardt had given permission to her to speak on Mrs. Erhardt's behalf. She stated that she opposed the proposed development. She raised concerns regarding lack of transit, lack of police, WalMart, and scheduling of public hearing. She noted that WalMart must not have 24 hour grocery service.

Ms. Paton then commented that she lives at 3417 - 148 Street and that she had concerns regarding map boundaries, development permit area, design guidelines, movie theatre, open house method of consultation, lack of interactive dialogue, permitted uses, overnight RV parking, development permits, and Formosa Brook. Ms. Paton requested that \$4.5 million in tax revenue be referred to the neighbourhood community to offset the impact of development.

It was Moved by Councillor Hunt  
Seconded by Councillor Higginbotham  
That the information as submitted by

Ms. Paton be received.

RES.R05-120

Carried

Bill Bishop, 1520 - Blackwood Street, White Rock, was in attendance and commented that the proposed development would be a mistake that will forever change the nature of the South Surrey community. He expressed concern regarding smaller businesses.

Bob Edwards, 16682 - 27 Avenue, was in attendance and commented that he supports the proposed project. He expressed concern regarding the lack of shopping variety, the lack of jobs, anchor tenants, and availability of commercial space.

Darren Kwiatkowski, First Professional Management (West) Inc., was in attendance and commented that the development is in compliance with the Highway 99 Corridor plan. He continued that Grandview Corners would be unique in a more human style, providing extensive landscaping, main street design, and distinctive neighbourhood and clusters would be realized. He discussed the public consultation process and noted professional engineers from all disciplines were in attendance. He also noted that many meetings had been held with vocal opponents to the plan. He advised that the community was kept aware of the work being undertaken. He continued that traffic improvements

would be constructed and completed prior to development. He added that professionals are in attendance to answer questions and they are committed to a high quality development.

**C. COMMITTEE REPORTS**

**D. BOARD/COMMISSION REPORTS**

**E. MAYOR'S REPORT**

**F. COUNCILLORS' REPORTS**

**G. CORPORATE REPORTS**

**H. BY-LAWS**

1. "Surrey Official Community Plan By-law, 1996, No. 12900, Text No. 47 Amendment By-law, 2004, No. 15583"

3900-20-15583 (Highway 99 Corridor) Council Initiated Text Amendment

"Surrey Official Community Plan By-law, 1996, No. 12900" as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

- (a) Division A is amended by replacing Figure 27 - Map Showing Recently Approved Secondary Plans; and
- (b) Division A, Schedule C. Development Permit Area Guidelines is amended under Designated Development Permit Areas by deleting the period at the end of 3(c) and inserting "; or" and adding new sub-section 3(d) as follows:

"(d) which is located within the boundary of the Highway 99 Corridor Secondary Plan area as illustrated on Figure 27."

These amendments are necessary to add the Highway 99 Corridor Local Area Plan area to Figure 27 and to designate the entire Highway 99 Corridor Local Area Plan as a Development Permit Area pursuant to the provisions of the Official Community Plan.

Approved by Council: November 22, 2004

It was Moved by Councillor Hunt  
Seconded by Councillor Tymoschuk  
That "Surrey Official Community Plan  
By-law, 1996, No. 12900, Text No. 47 Amendment By-law, 2004, No. 15583"  
pass its third reading.

RES.R05-121

Carried with Councillors Villeneuve, Bose,  
Watts and Priddy against.

"Surrey Official Community Plan By-law, 1996, No. 12900, No. 107 Amendment  
By-law, 2004, No. 15584"

7904-0112-00/7904-0312-00 - Edward Holden, George and Jean Lechleiter,  
Surrey South Shopping Centres Limited, Gerhard and Rita Krause,  
Briska Porcher, Marian Porcher, Derrick Schonke, Gurdip and Amarjit Mundi,  
Jang and Devinder Mundi, Balbir Atwal, Sukhdev and Raminder Randhawa,  
Bhinder and Niranjan Mundi, Anni and Emanuel Lange, Luise Hartstock,  
Loblaw Properties West Inc., Kenichi and Reiko Matsuo, City of Surrey,  
Edward and Josephine Stephen, c/o First Professional Management (West) Inc.  
(Michael Nygren) and Loblaw Properties West Inc. (Glen Carlberg)

To authorize the redesignation of the properties located at 15862, 15876, 15948,  
and 16087 - 24 Avenue, 2441, 2457, 2493, 2527 - 160 Street, Portion of 2500 -  
160 Street, Portion of 16129 - 24 Avenue, 2342 - 160 Street, 16106 and 16134 -  
24 Avenue, 2284, 2290, 2316 and 2340 - 161 Street, Portion of 161 Street from  
Suburban (SUB) to Commercial (COM).

Approved by Council: November 22, 2004

This by-law is proceeding in conjunction with By-laws 15610 & 15611.

It was Moved by Councillor Hunt  
Seconded by Councillor Tymoschuk  
That "Surrey Official Community Plan  
By-law, 1996, No. 12900, No. 107 Amendment By-law, 2004, No. 15584" pass  
its third reading.

RES.R05-122

Carried with Councillors Bose, Villeneuve,  
Priddy and Watts against.

"Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000, Amendment By-law, 2004, No. 15610"

7904-0112-00 - Edward Holden, George and Jean Lechleiter, Surrey South  
Shopping Centres Limited, Gerhard and Rita Krause, Briska Porcher,  
Marian Porcher, Derrick Schonke, Gurdip and Amarjit Mundi, Jang and  
Devinder Mundi, Balbir Atwal, Sukhdev and Raminder Randhawa, Bhinder and



**J. CORRESPONDENCE**

**K. NOTICE OF MOTION**

**L. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

**M. ADJOURNMENT**

It was

Moved by Councillor Hunt  
Seconded by Councillor Higginbotham  
That the Regular Council - Public Hearing

meeting do now adjourn.

RES.R05-125

Carried

The Regular Council- Public Hearing adjourned at 3:03 a.m.

Certified correct:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
City Clerk

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor