

Present:

Chairperson - Mayor McCallum
Councillor Annis
Councillor Elford
Councillor Guerra
Councillor Hundial
Councillor Locke
Councillor Nagra
Councillor Patton
Councillor Pettigrew

Absent:**Staff Present:**

City Manager
City Clerk
General Manager, Corporate Services
General Manager, Engineering
General Manager, Finance
General Manager, Parks, Recreation & Culture
General Manager, Planning & Development
City Solicitor
Manager, Area Planning & Development, North Division
Manager, Area Planning & Development, South Division
Land Development Engineer

Mayor McCallum spoke to the recent discovery of mass unmarked burial sites at the former Marieval Indian Residential School in Saskatchewan and Kamloops Indian Residential School in Kamloops, BC and expressed condolences to the Cowessess and Tk'emlúps te Secwépemc First Nations.

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

It was Moved by Councillor Guerra
Seconded by Councillor Elford
That the agenda of the June 28, 2021, Regular
Council Public Hearing meeting be adopted.

RES.R21-1230

Carried**2. Adoption of the Minutes****a. Council-in-Committee - June 14, 2021**

It was Moved by Councillor Guerra
Seconded by Councillor Patton
That the minutes of the
Council-in-Committee meeting held on June 14, 2021, be received.

RES.R21-1231

Carried

C. Markwart, Cloverdale: The delegation expressed concerns regarding the lack of financial information regarding the Surrey Police Services transition and noted an error in the gross taxes collected, as it appears to be \$10 million more than it should.

A. Kaps, Surrey: The delegation spoke to the Mayor's car allowance as outlined in the Statement of Financial Information and tax increases.

D. Johnstone, Surrey: The delegation spoke to increased taxes during a pandemic period, new hospital, 84th Avenue extension, committee restructuring, lack of cooling and misting stations and warming centres, and the outhouses in Newton Athletic Park.

L. Ypenberg, Fleetwood: The delegation spoke to increased taxes that could be spent on infrastructure, vulnerable populations and public safety, and the proposed Surrey Police Services referendum.

L. Prassat, Cloverdale: The delegation spoke to the lack of cooling and misting stations, tax increases, development on agricultural land and lack of a business plan and financial information for the Surrey Police Services.

B. DELEGATIONS - PUBLIC HEARING

1. "Surrey Zoning Bylaw, 1993, No. 12000, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20370" Application: 7916-0442-00

CIVIC ADDRESS: 13102 - 112A Avenue; 13105 and 13151 - 112 Avenue

APPLICANT: Owner: City of Surrey
Agent: City of Surrey (Avril Wright)

PURPOSE: The applicant is requesting to rezone the site from Single Family Residential Zone to Single Family Residential (13) Zone in order to subdivide the site into 3 single family small lots and 1 open space lot.

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

D. Jack, Surrey Environmental Partners: The delegation spoke to climate change, the removal of trees from the subject site and the inclusion of open space, riparian area setback and biodiversity on the site.

L. Aitch, Boundary Park: The delegation advised that she had wished to speak to the Annual Municipal (Financial) Report but was disconnected.

A. Kaps, Surrey: The delegation spoke to the proposed setbacks and the removal of trees from the subject site.

Written submissions were received as follows:

- Email dated June 22, 2021, R. Landale expressing opposition for the proposal citing exchange of land, environment and trees.
- Email dated June 28, 2021, R. Spelay expressing concern for the proposal citing building height, access and environment.

2. **"Surrey Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2013, No. 18020, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20368"**

"Surrey Zoning Bylaw, 1993, No. 12000, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20369"

Application: 7919-0123-00

CIVIC ADDRESS: 10814 – 139A Street (13957 – 108 Avenue); 10824 and 10834 - 139A Street; 10827 and 10837 - 140 Street; 13965, 13975 and 13987 - 108 Avenue

APPLICANT: Owner: 1174267 B.C. Ltd. (Director Information: Kulwinder Grewal, Hardev Grewal, Paramdeep Kooner, Rupinder Kooner
Agent: DF Architecture (Jessie Arora)

PURPOSE: The applicant is requesting an amendment to the Official Community Plan to redesignate the site from Urban to Multiple Residential. In addition, the proposal includes rezoning the site from Single Family Residential Zone to Comprehensive Development Zone. The proposal also includes the development of two 6-storey apartment buildings in City Centre.

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

D. Jack, Surrey Environmental Partners: The delegation spoke to the removal of trees from the subject site and outdoor amenity space.

T. Louie, Whalley: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing the need for housing.

Written submissions were received as follows:

- Email dated June 17, 2021, C. Lin expressing opposition for the proposal citing densification.
- Email dated June 22, 2021, R. Landale expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighborhood, traffic and infrastructure.
- Email dated June 28, 2021, M. Chen expressing concern for the proposal citing affordability.
- Email dated June 28, 2021, Y. Chen expressing support for the proposal.

3. "Surrey Zoning Bylaw, 1993, No. 12000, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20378"
Application: 7921-0124-00

CIVIC ADDRESS: 16613 Bell Road

APPLICANT: Owner: The Parish of Christ the Redeemer (Surrey), 51
Agent: Aplin & Martin Consultants Ltd. (Samira Khayambashi)

PURPOSE: The applicant is requesting to rezone the southern portion of the site from Assembly Hall 1 Zone to Single Family Residential Zone in order to subdivide the site into six single family residential lots and one remainder institutional lot to retain an existing church.

In addition, the proposal includes a Development Variance Permit:

- (a) to reduce the minimum lot width of the RF Zone from 15.0 metres to 13.5 metres for proposed Lot 5;
- (b) to reduce the minimum southwest side yard setback of the PA-1 Zone from 10.8 metres to 6.1 metres to the principal building face of the existing church on proposed Lot 7 (remainder lot);
- (c) to reduce the minimum required on-site parking spaces for the existing church from 93 spaces to 53 spaces on proposed Lot 7 (remainder lot); and
- (d) to reduce the minimum landscaped strip width requirement of the PA-1 Zone from 3 metres to 1 metre along the southwest property line of proposed Lot 7 (remainder lot).

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

D. Jack, Surrey Environmental Partners: The delegation spoke to the removal of trees from the subject site.

Written submissions were received as follows:

- Email dated June 22, 2021, R. Landale expressing opposition for the proposal citing trees and drainage.
- Email dated June 27, 2021, E. and D. Christoffersen expressing concern for the proposal citing traffic and parking.

4. "Surrey Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2013, No. 18020, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20371"
"Surrey Zoning Bylaw, 1993, No. 12000, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20372"
Application: 7915-0442-00

CIVIC ADDRESS: 10245 and 10267 - 176 Street

APPLICANT: Owner: T. Nguyen, 1001696 B.C. Ltd.
(Director Information: Hiep Khoa Luu)
Agent: Pacific Land Group Ltd. (Laura Jones)

PURPOSE: The applicant is requesting an amendment to the Official Community Plan to redesignate the site from Suburban to Urban. In addition, the proposal includes rezoning the site from One-Acre Residential Zone to Single Family Residential Gross Density Zone and Single Family Residential Zone in order to subdivide the site into eight single family lots, four single family gross density lots, and three lots to be conveyed to the City for riparian protection purposes in Abbey Ridge.

In addition, the proposal includes a Development Variance Permit:

- (a) to reduce the minimum front (south) yard setback of the RF Zone from 7.5 metres to 6.5 metres for an attached garage and 4.0 metres for the remaining portion of the principal building face on proposed Lots 9-12; and
- (b) to reduce the minimum side (east and west) yard setbacks of the RF Zone from 1.8 metres to 1.2 metres for proposed Lot 9.

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

D. Jack, Surrey Environmental Partners: The delegation spoke to the removal of trees from the subject site and the designation of riparian area setbacks as open spaces.

Written submissions were received as follows:

- Email dated June 22, 2021, R. Landale expressing opposition for the proposal citing trees and transparency.
- Email dated June 28, 2021, J. Cho expressing concern for the proposal citing density.

5. **"Surrey Zoning Bylaw, 1993, No. 12000, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20373"**
Application: 7917-0551-00

CIVIC ADDRESS: 10207 – 153 Street; 10221 – 153 Street (10233 – 153 Street)

APPLICANT: Owner: Remond Holdings Corp.
Agent: Atelier Pacific Architecture Inc. (Gordon You)

PURPOSE: The applicant is requesting to rezone the site from Town Centre Commercial Zone and Single Family Residential Zone to Comprehensive Development Zone to allow the development of a 6-storey mixed use building on the west portion of the consolidated site.

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

D. Jack, Surrey Environmental Partners: The delegation spoke to the removal of trees from the subject site, the outdoor amenity space and lack of trees on the flat roof.

Written submissions were received as follows:

- Email dated June 22, 2021, R. Landale expressing opposition for the proposal citing trees, traffic, parking, emergency access and schools.
- Email dated June 25, 2021, H. Kim expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 27, 2021, J. Choi expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 28, 2021, B. Park expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 28, 2021, D. Keum expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 28, 2021, J. Kim expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 28, 2021, J. Lee expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 25, 2021, J. Park expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 28, 2021, L. Han expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 28, 2021, M. Miller expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 28, 2021, S. Park expressing support for the proposal.

6. **"Surrey Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2013, No. 18020, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20380"**
"Surrey Zoning Bylaw, 1993, No. 12000, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20381"
Application: 7919-0036-00

CIVIC ADDRESS: 9746 - 179 Street

Applicant: Owner: Core Group Properties Ltd.
Agent: Hub Engineering Inc. (Mike Kompter)

PURPOSE: The applicant is requesting an amendment to the Official Community Plan to redesignate the site from Suburban to Urban. In addition, the proposal includes rezoning the site from One-Acre Residential Zone to Single Family Residential (13) Zone and to Single Family Residential Zone in order to subdivide the site into three single family small lots and four single family lots in Abbey Ridge.

In addition, the proposal includes a Development Variance Permit:

- (a) to increase the front (south) yard setbacks of the RF-13 Zone from 6.0 metres to 6.5 metres for 50% of the building face, 7.5 metres for the remaining portion of the building face and 4.5 metres for up to 50% of the building face for an attached deck on proposed Lots 1-3;
- (b) to vary the basement access and basement well requirements of both the RF-13 Zone and RF Zone to permit a basement access and basement well between the principal building and the front (south) lot line on proposed Lots 1-5;
- (c) to vary the minimum front (south) yard setback for an accessory building or structure in the RF Zone from 18.0 metres to 1.0 metre for proposed Lots 4-5; and
- (d) to vary the RF-13 Zone to permit an accessory building or structure in the front (south) yard and set the minimum setback to 1.0 metre on proposed Lots 1-3.

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

D. Jack, Surrey Environmental Partners: The delegation spoke to the removal of trees from the subject site, the buffer between the site and Highway 10 and watercourses located on the site.

D. Bailey, Surrey: The delegation spoke to off-street parking, lack of walkability and proximity to a potential commercial hub.

A. Kaps, Surrey: The delegation spoke to the proposed setbacks, alderwood trees and daylighting creeks.

Written submissions were received as follows:

- Email dated June 22, 2021, R. Landale expressing opposition for the proposal citing trees.
- Email dated June 25, 2021, D. Bailey expressing opposition for the proposal.

7. **"Surrey Zoning Bylaw, 1993, No. 12000, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20377"**
Application: 7920-0127-00

CIVIC ADDRESS: 14992 - 76 Avenue

APPLICANT: Owner: Satnam Education Society of British Columbia, Inc.
Agent: Satnam Education Society of B.C. (Harinder Singh Sohi)

PURPOSE: The applicant is requesting to rezone the site from Half-Acre Residential Zone to Comprehensive Development Zone to permit the development of a new childcare facility.

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

D. Frances, Chimney Hill: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing the rezoning in Chimney Hill, inappropriate location for a childcare facility, planned and existing childcare facilities in the neighbourhood, parking, traffic and potential for more CD zoning in the area.

G. Malik, Newton: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing an appropriate and convenient location for a childcare facility.

J. Singh, Fleetwood: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing an appropriate and convenient location and need for a childcare facility.

M. Ghuman, Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing an appropriate and convenient location and need for a childcare facility.

S. McNeil, Newton: The delegation expressed concerns regarding traffic and parking and noted that it is an inappropriate location for a childcare facility.

R. Kaur, Chimney Hills: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing an appropriate and convenient location and need for a childcare facility.

G. Kaur, Chimney Hills: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing an appropriate and convenient location for childcare facility.

J. Kaur Bagri, Newton: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing an appropriate and convenient location, need for a childcare facility and job creation.

B. Bagri, Newton: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing an appropriate and convenient location, need for a childcare facility and adequate on-site parking.

J. Bhatia, Chimney Hills: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing an appropriate and convenient location and need for a childcare facility.

P. Austin, Chimney Hills: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing traffic, non-compliance with policies regarding location of childcare facilities and impacts to neighbouring properties.

T. Randhawa, Fleetwood: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing an appropriate and convenient location.

J. Singh, Chimney Hills: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing the need for a childcare facility and adequate on-site parking.

P. Gill, Chimney Hills: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing an appropriate and convenient location for a childcare facility.

J. Bhatia, Chimney Hills: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing the need for a childcare facility.

I. Singh, Chimney Hills: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing an appropriate and convenient location for a childcare facility.

J. Singh Bhullar, Chimney Hills: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing an appropriate and convenient location and need for a childcare facility.

H. Kaur Bhullar, Chimney Hills: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing an appropriate and convenient location for a childcare facility.

Resident, Fleetwood: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing an appropriate and convenient location for a childcare facility.

G. Kaur, Chimney Hills: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing an appropriate and convenient location for a childcare facility.

J. Norton, Chimney Hills: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing the rezoning, size and impact to the existing neighbourhood character.

A. Kaps, Surrey: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing rezoning, non-conformance, inappropriate location for a childcare facility, traffic and use for a specific cultural group.

D. Graham, Newton: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing rezoning, impact to the existing neighbourhood character, inappropriate location for a childcare facility and non-compliance with the City's childcare location guidelines.

D. Kaur, Chimney Hills: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing an appropriate and convenient location for a childcare facility.

P. Yue (Agent on behalf of the Applicant): The agent spoke to traffic and parking.

Written submissions were received as follows:

- Letter dated May 25, 2021, Jinny Sims expressing support for the proposal.
- Petition dated June 8, 2021, Satnam Education Society of British Columbia, 733 petition signatures expressing support for the proposal.
- Letter dated June 8, 2021, Harry Bains expressing support for the proposal.
- Letter dated June 10, 2021, Sukh Dhaliwal expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 16, 2021, K. Pictin expressing opposition for the proposal citing traffic and character of neighborhood.
- Email dated June 17, 2021, A. Kraljevic expressing opposition for the proposal citing traffic and character of neighborhood.
- Email dated June 16, 2021, G. Ph expressing opposition for the proposal citing traffic and character of neighborhood.
- Email dated June 17, 2021, J. Brar expressing opposition for the proposal citing traffic and character of neighborhood.
- Email dated June 16, 2021, S. Dhaliwal expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated May 27, 2021, T. Rowlands expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated June 19, 2021, A. Kanwal expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighborhood.
- Email dated June 18, 2021, D. and S. Graham expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighborhood.
- Email dated June 19, 2021, H. Teixeira expressing opposition for the proposal citing traffic and character of neighborhood.
- Email dated June 20, 2021, I. Kaur expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 21, 2021, J. Basran expressing opposition for the proposal citing traffic, character of neighborhood, parking and noise.
- Email dated June 21, 2021, C. Basran expressing opposition for the proposal citing traffic, congestion, parking and character of neighbourhood.
- Email dated June 20, 2021, H. Kaur expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 20, 2021, J. Kaur expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated August 25, 2020 and November 12, 2020, M. Basran expressing opposition for the proposal citing traffic and character of neighborhood.
- Email dated June 22, 2021, R. Landale expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 19, 2021, Satnam Education Society of British Columbia expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 16, 2021, Y. Breck expressing opposition for the proposal citing traffic and character of neighborhood.
- Letters dated June 24, 2021, 157 Form Letters expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 23, 2021, N. Halsted and A. Gill expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated June 24, 2021, S. Yelland expressing opposition for the proposal citing size of development and traffic.
- Email dated June 28, 2021, A. and K. Saroay expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighbourhood.
- Email dated June 26, 2021, A. Kang expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 26, 2021, A. Anand expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 25, 2021, A. Kubara expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated June 26, 2021, B. Kaur expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 25, 2021, B. Rakhra expressing support for the proposal.

- Email dated June 26, 2021, D. Basra expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 25, 2021, G. and R. Bajwa expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated June 25, 2021, G. Malik expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 28, 2021, G. Sidhu expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighbourhood.
- Email dated June 26, 2021, G. Singh expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 26, 2021, G. Singh expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 26, 2021, G. Suri expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 26, 2021, G. Takhar expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 26, 2021, G. Virk expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 26, 2021, H. Anand expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 26, 2021, H. Kaur expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 26, 2021, H. Dhillon expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 26, 2021, H. Randhawa expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 26, 2021, I. Kaur expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 26, 2021, J. Bagri expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 25, 2021, J. Clark expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighbourhood and traffic.
- Email dated June 26, 2021, J. Dhaliwal expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 25, 2021, J. Norton expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighbourhood.
- Email dated June 26, 2021, J. Purba expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 26, 2021, J. Singh expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 27, 2021, J. Singh expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 26, 2021, J. Tatla expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 26, 2021, K. Anand expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 26, 2021, K. Kaur expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 26, 2021, K. Neidert expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighbourhood and traffic.
- Email dated June 26, 2021, K. Nijjar expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 25, 2021, L. Kaur expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 26, 2021, M. Ghuman expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 25, 2021, R. Bhullar expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 25, 2021, R. Bhullar expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 24, 2021, R. Bysouth expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighbourhood
- Email dated June 25, 2021, R. Kubara expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighbourhood and traffic.
- Email dated June 26, 2021, R. Warich expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 26, 2021, S. Basra expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 26, 2021, S. Kaur expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 26, 2021, S. Kaur expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 25, 2021, S. Kaur expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 26, 2021, S. Sharma expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 26, 2021, S. Singh expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 25, 2021, T. Sandhu expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 25, 2021, T. Sandhu expressing opposition for the proposal citing traffic.

**8. "Surrey Zoning Bylaw, 1993, No. 12000, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20379"
Application: 7919-0298-00**

CIVIC ADDRESS: 17141 and 17153 - o Avenue; Portion of 171A Street
Unconstructed Road Allowance

APPLICANT: Owners: D. Brar, M. Hayer, A. Brar, J. Hayer, 1041232 B.C. Ltd.
(Director Information: Lashman Dhaliwal)
Agent: Hub Engineering Inc. (Mike Kompter)

PURPOSE: The applicant is requesting to rezone the site from One-Acre Residential Zone to Single Family Residential Zone and rezone a portion of the 171A Street unconstructed road allowance from Single Family Residential (13) Zone and One-Acre Residential Zone to Single Family Residential Zone to allow subdivision into seven single family lots.

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

D. Jack, Surrey Environmental Partners: The delegation spoke to the removal of trees from the subject site.

L. Dhaliwal, Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal.

Written submissions were received as follows:

- Email dated June 22, 2021, R. Landale expressing opposition for the proposal citing trees.
- Email dated June 24, 2021, B. and J. Dumbeck expressing opposition for the proposal citing access and traffic.
- Email dated June 28, 2021, T. Fraser expressing opposition for the proposal citing inadequate notification.

**9. "Surrey Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2013, No. 18020, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20374"
"Surrey Zoning Bylaw, 1993, No. 12000, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20375"
Application: 7918-0221-00**

CIVIC ADDRESS: 15961 and 15975 - 16 Avenue; 1609 and 1627 - 160 Street

APPLICANT: Owners: B. Johal, Mortise Titleco (Alder Place) Ltd.,
670805 B.C. Ltd.
(Director Information: Baljit Johal)
Agent: Mortise Construction Ltd. (Baljit Johal)

PURPOSE: The applicant is requesting an amendment to the Official Community Plan to redesignate the site from Urban to Multiple Residential. In addition, the proposal includes rezoning the site from Single Family Residential Zone to Comprehensive Development Zone. The proposal also includes the development of a 4-storey mixed-use building consisting of 56 rental apartment units and 1,142.5 square metres of ground-floor commercial space.

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

D. Jack, Surrey Environmental Partners: The delegation spoke to the removal of trees from the subject site, outdoor amenity space and lack of trees or planting on the flat roof.

A. Clark, Alderwood: The delegation expressed concerns regarding access, density, lack of sidewalks, safety and student enrolment projections.

L. Ho, Alderwood: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing the timing of the traffic and noise surveys at the start of the pandemic, access, density, inappropriate location for commercial units, inadequate parking and traffic.

Written submissions were received as follows:

- Email dated June 18, 2021, M. Kennedy expressing opposition for the proposal citing traffic, densification and character of neighbourhood.
- Email dated June 18, 2021, K. Shelley expressing opposition for the proposal citing traffic, noise and construction.
- Email dated June 22, 2021, R. Landale expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighbourhood, traffic, parking and trees.
- Petition and letter dated June 8, 2021, Mortise Group, 39 petition signatures expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 24, 2021, S. Husain expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighbourhood, infrastructure and traffic.

10. **"Surrey Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2013, No. 18020, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20382"**
"Surrey Zoning Bylaw, 1993, No. 12000, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20383"
Application: 7918-0033-00

CIVIC ADDRESS: 16352 - 88A Avenue

APPLICANT: Owner: Cedar Row Estates Ltd.
Agent: Aplin & Martin Consultants Ltd. (Maggie Koka)

PURPOSE: The applicant is requesting an amendment to the Official Community Plan to redesignate the site from Suburban to Multiple Residential. In addition, the proposal includes rezoning the site from One-Acre Residential Zone and General Agriculture Zone to Comprehensive Development Zone. The proposal also includes the development of 106 townhouse units and the conveyance of the riparian protection area to the City.

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

D. Jack, Surrey Environmental Partners: The delegation spoke to the removal of trees from the subject site, riparian area and lack of information from Provincial environmental officers.

E. Piaseczna, Fleetwood: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing the rezoning, non-compliance with the Official Community Plan, environmental impacts, traffic and access.

B. Fromm, Fleetwood: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing non-compliance with the Official Community Plan and environmental impacts.

A. Nowak, Fleetwood: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing the rezoning, non-compliance with the Official Community Plan, traffic, safety and distance to the future potential SkyTrain.

M. Piaseczny, Fleetwood: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing wildlife, habitat and environmental impacts.

J. Dhillon, Guildford: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing the need for housing.

P. Yzerman, Fleetwood: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing environmental impacts and buffer between agricultural land.

M. Sraw, Delta: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing the need for affordable housing.

A. Leese, Fleetwood: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing the need for affordable housing and proximity to a potential future SkyTrain station.

A. Kaps, Surrey: The delegation spoke to the environmental impacts and impacts to agricultural land.

N. Yzerman, Fleetwood: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing density and impact to the existing neighbourhood character.

A. Shei, Fleetwood: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing the need for affordable housing and proximity to a potential future SkyTrain station.

P. Pitar, Fleetwood: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing the need for affordable housing and proximity to schools.

G. Hugai, Fleetwood: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing environmental impacts, access, traffic, the timing of the traffic impact assessment during the pandemic and loss of wildlife habitat.

P. Yzerman, Fleetwood: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing density and impact to the existing neighbourhood character.

R. Marwaha, Fleetwood: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing the need for affordable housing.

R. Kumar, Fleetwood: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing the need for affordable housing.

L. Kumal, Fleetwood: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing the need for affordable housing and conformity with the existing neighbourhood.

M. Minhas, Fleetwood: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing the need for affordable housing.

R. Grewal, Fleetwood: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing the need for affordable housing.

K. Sandhu, Fleetwood: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing the need for affordable housing.

H. Dhaliwal, Fleetwood: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing the need for affordable housing.

R. Kapila, Fleetwood: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal.

A. Singh, Fleetwood: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing the need for housing.

M. Willis, Whalley: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing lack of capacity in local schools, lack of property tax revenue to pay for needed infrastructure, road capacity, distance to transit, removal of trees from the subject site, impact to wildlife habitat, biodiversity impacts and lack of affordability.

M. Yzerman, Fleetwood: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing neighbourhood character, density and traffic.

K. Minhas, Fleetwood: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing the need for a sustainable land use plan to support transit, businesses, lower taxes and police services.

M. Novak, Fleetwood: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing non-conformity with the existing neighbourhood and land use plans and lack of support for the biodiversity.

J. Faufton, Whalley: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing the need for affordable housing.

One individual expressed support for the proposal but did not wish to speak at the Public Hearing.

Written submissions were received as follows:

- Email dated June 20, 2021, J. Dhesi expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 21, 2021, A. Ak expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 21, 2021, E. Piaseczny expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighborhood, environment, traffic and schools.
- Email dated June 21, 2021, G. Norris expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 21, 2021, J. Yuen expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 21, 2021, K. Pelzer expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 21, 2021, K. Recsky expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated June 21, 2021, M. Jay expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated June 21, 2021, M. Piaseczny expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated June 21, 2021, M. Recsky expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated June 21, 2021, P. Edge expressing opposition for the proposal citing densification, infrastructure, character of neighbourhood and traffic.
- Email dated June 21, 2021, S. Reimer expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Petition dated June 22, 2021, 318 petition signatures expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighbourhood and traffic.
- Email dated June 22, 2021, D. Gonzalez expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated June 22, 2021, F. Tang expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighbourhood.
- Email dated June 22, 2021, G. Gonzalez expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated June 22, 2021, G. Saini expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 22, 2021, G. Spears expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighbourhood and traffic.
- Email dated June 22, 2021, J. Li expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated June 22, 2021, J. MacCharles expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighbourhood.
- Email dated June 22, 2021, J. Sohi expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated June 22, 2021, J. Tran expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated June 22, 2021, K. Li expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighbourhood and traffic.
- Email dated June 22, 2021, K. Luangoudom expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated June 22, 2021, K. MacCharles expressing opposition for the proposal citing green space and environment.
- Email dated June 22, 2021, L. Gonzalez expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated June 21, 2021 and June 22, 2021, M. Spears expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighbourhood.

- Email dated June 22, 2021, N. Sharma expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated June 22, 2021, N. Sharma expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated June 22, 2021, P. Saldanha expressing opposition for the proposal citing traffic and safety.
- Email dated June 22, 2021, P. Zhong expressing opposition for the proposal citing traffic.
- Email dated June 22, 2021, R. Harding expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighbourhood.
- Email dated June 22, 2021, R. Sharma expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated June 22, 2021, R. Worsley expressing opposition for the proposal citing traffic and character of neighbourhood.
- Email dated June 22, 2021, S. Sharma expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighbourhood.
- Email dated June 22, 2021, S. Wetherup expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighbourhood and traffic.
- Email dated June 22, 2021, W. Nusche expressing opposition for the proposal citing loss of agricultural land, environment and densification.
- Email dated June 23, 2021, A. Betts expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighbourhood.
- Email dated June 23, 2021, C. Lo expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated June 23, 2021, H. Liu expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighbourhood
- Email dated June 22, 2021, K. Wahlla expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighbourhood.
- Email dated June 22, 2021, M. Piaseczny expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated June 23, 2021, P. Noort expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 22, 2021, R. Mike expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated June 22, 2021, R. Landale expressing opposition for the proposal citing densification, traffic, character of neighbourhood and trees.
- Email dated June 23, 2021, S. Gill expressing concerns for the proposal citing traffic.
- Email dated June 24, 2021, J. Deol expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 24, 2021, L. and S. Hilderman expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated June 24, 2021, T. Jay expressing opposition for the proposal citing density and traffic.
- Email dated June 24, 2021, A. Sidhu expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 24, 2021, B. Bratch expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated June 24, 2021, J. Campbell expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 24, 2021, S. Kim expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighbourhood.
- Email dated June 26, 2021, D. Chahal expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated June 26, 2021, G. Wright expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and character of neighbourhood.
- Email dated June 27, 2021, A. Arora expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated June 27, 2021, A. Guled expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated June 27, 2021, P. and N. Yzerman expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighbourhood.
- Email dated June 27, 2021, S. Malish expressing opposition for the proposal.

- Email dated June 27, 2021, Y. Savchuk expressing opposition for the proposal citing infrastructure, traffic and parking.
- Email dated June 28, 2021, A. Nowak expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighbourhood, environment, schools and traffic.
- Email dated June 28, 2021, A. Nowak expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighbourhood and environment.
- Email dated June 24, 2021, E. Leung expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighbourhood and parking.
- Email dated June 25, 2021, G. Milne expressing opposition for the proposal citing densification, environment and traffic.
- Email dated June 28, 2021, G. Huguet expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighbourhood and traffic.
- Email dated June 26, 2021, G. Wright expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and character of neighbourhood.
- Email dated June 28, 2021, H. Nowak expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated June 28, 2021, I. Fromm expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated June 28, 2021, J. Camps expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighbourhood, parking and traffic.
- Email dated June 28, 2021, J. Nielsen expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighbourhood and environment.
- Email dated June 28, 2021, J. Nielsen expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighbourhood and environment.
- Email dated June 28, 2021, K. Gill expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighbourhood, access and traffic.
- Email dated June 28, 2021, M. Nowak expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighbourhood and traffic.
- Email dated June 27, 2021, M. Yzerman expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighbourhood, environment, traffic and schools.
- Email dated June 27, 2021, P. Yzerman expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighbourhood.
- Email dated June 24, 2021, S. Kim expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighbourhood, traffic and noise.
- Email dated June 28, 2021, T. Nielsen expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.

Council recessed from 10:36 – 10:40 p.m.

Sunnyside Acres Urban Forest - Recognizing Dr. Roy Strang's Contributions to the City of Surrey

It was Moved by Councillor Guerra
Seconded by Councillor Patton
That Council:

1. Receive the report from the Urban Forestry Manager, dated May 12, 2021, entitled "Sunnyside Acres Urban Forest – Recognizing Dr. Roy Strang's Contributions to the City of Surrey" (attached **Appendix 2**), as information; and
2. Endorse the recommendations of the report that:
 - a. The City maintain in perpetuity Dr. Strang's existing dedication bench located in Sunnyside Acres Urban Forest;
 - b. Staff develop and install a storyboard adjacent to Dr. Strang's bench outlining the history of Sunnyside Acres Urban Forest and Dr. Strang's involvement; and
 - c. The City rename an existing nature trail after Dr. Strang.

RES.R21-1237

Carried by members remaining

Councillor Pettigrew re-entered the meeting at 10:42 p.m.

D. BOARD/COMMISSION REPORTS

This section had no items to consider.

E. MAYOR'S REPORT

1. **2021 Honey Hooser Scholarship**
File: 0290-20 HH; 0290-20

Council recognized Cindy Cui as the recipient of the 2021 Honey Hooser Scholarship.

F. GOVERNMENTAL REPORTS

This section had no items to consider.

2. Authorize the General Manager, Engineering to sign the Change Order for the increase to Contract No. 1718-042-11.

RES.R21-1239

Carried

**Item No. R125 Award of Contract No. 1220-030-2021-013
Supply and Installation of Artificial Turf – Two Park Sites
File: 6140-20/C**

The General Manager, Parks, Recreation & Culture submitted a report regarding the Award of Contract for the supply and installation of shock pad, synthetic turf carpet and infill, on Field #6 at Newton Athletic Park and Field #8 at South Surrey Athletic Park.

It was

Moved by Councillor Guerra
Seconded by Councillor Patton
That Council:

1. Award Contract No. 1220-030-2021-013 to Team Rochon Inc./GTR Turf in the amount of \$994,854.00, including GST, for the supply and installation of artificial turf product at two athletic parks;
2. Set the expenditure authorization limit for Contract No. 1220-030-2021-013 at \$1,094,339.40 (including GST and contingency); and
3. Authorize the General Manager, Parks, Recreation & Culture to execute Contract No. 1220-030-2021-013.

RES.R21-1240

Carried

**Item No. R126 Award of Contract No. 4817-053-21
West Clayton Pond Phase 3 Work
File: 4817-053-21**

The General Manager, Engineering submitted a report regarding Phase 3 of the construction of the stormwater detention facility in the West Clayton Neighbourhood Concept Plan area, to support existing and future development.

It was

Moved by Councillor Guerra
Seconded by Councillor Patton
That Council:

1. Award Contract No. 4817-053-21 to Wilco Civil Inc. in the amount of \$3,429,345.78 (including GST) for the West Clayton Pond Phase 3 Work;
2. Set the expenditure authorization limit for Contract No. 4817-053-21 at \$3,772,300.00 (including GST and contingency); and
3. Authorize the General Manager, Engineering to execute Contract No. 4817-053-21.

RES.R21-1241

Carried

2. Approve re-engagement of Contract No. 1220-030-2016-007 with Taylor Kurtz Architecture + Design Inc. in association with Rounthwaite, Dick and Hadley Architects Inc. ("TKA+RDH") in the amount of \$1,050,000.00 (including GST) for completion of the architectural design process and construction administration services for Cloverdale Sport and Ice Complex ("the Project");
3. Set the expenditure authorization limit for Contract No. 1220-030-2016-007 at \$1,155,000.00 (including GST and contingency); and
4. Authorize the General Manager, Planning & Development, or his delegate, to execute the contract agreement.

RES.R21-1244

Carried

**Item No. R130 City Centre Sports Complex Phase 1 – Award of Architectural Design and Construction Administration Services
File: 0760-20 (City Centre Sports Complex – Phase 1)**

The General Manager, Planning & Development and the General Manager, Parks, Recreation & Culture submitted a report to obtain Council approval to award a contract to Shape to design and manage the construction of the City Centre Sports Complex Phase 1 ("the Project"). This Project is to be integrated into the existing Chuck Bailey Recreation Centre.

It was

Moved by Councillor Guerra
Seconded by Councillor Patton
That Council:

1. Award Contract No. 1220-030-2021-030 to Shape Architecture Inc. ("Shape") in the amount of \$2,534,830.20 (including GST) for the City Centre Sports Complex Phase 1;
2. Set the expenditure authorization limit for Contract No. 1220-030-2021-030 at \$2,800,000.00 (including GST and contingency); and
3. Authorize the General Manager, Planning & Development, or his delegate, to execute Contract No. 1220-030-2021-030.

RES.R21-1245

Carried

**Item No. R131 Annual (2020) Development Cost Charge Report
File: 3150-01**

The General Manager, Engineering, General Manager, Finance and General Manager, Parks, Recreation & Culture, submitted a report to advise Council of the amount of Development Cost Charges ("DCCs") received in 2020, the expenditures in 2020 from each DCC reserve fund, the balance in each DCC reserve fund at the start and at the end of 2020, and to advise of any waivers and reductions provided and funded by the City in 2020.

- 3. Authorize staff to proceed with all necessary actions to proceed to the Stage 2 Plan development as described in the report; and
- 4. Authorize staff to receive and process development applications for properties within the Newton – King George Boulevard Plan Area based on the Stage 1 Plan, provided that any such application should not proceed to final approval until a completed Stage 2 plan is approved by Council.

RES.R21-1248

Carried

Item No. R134 COVID-19: Emergency Operations Centre Update
File: 7130-16

The City Manager submitted a report to provide Council a status update of various actions taken in response to COVID-19 since the last Corporate Report which was provided to Council at the June 14, 2021 Regular Council Public Hearing meeting.

It was

Moved by Councillor Guerra
 Seconded by Councillor Patton
 That Council:

- 1. Receive Corporate Report R134 for information; and
- 2. Continue to hold Council meetings in July virtually as described in the report while staff prepare a viable approach to introducing in person participation at Council meetings starting this September, and while ensuring to meet the principles of openness, transparency and accessibility in the following ways:
 - The City’s website includes updated Council meeting information and procedures for participation at a meeting;
 - Council meetings are livestreamed on the City’s website and videos are archived and accessible for future reference;
 - The City’s Notice Board, Council agenda packages and Public Hearing documents are available on the City’s website;
 - Council meeting minutes are available on the City’s website;
 - Members of the community have the ability to email or send a letter with comments regarding an agenda item for distribution to Council; and
 - Members of the public may email or write a letter with comments regarding Public Hearing items, they may register in advance to speak to a Public Hearing item during the meeting or call the phone number displayed on the screen during the Public Hearing in order to provide verbal comments to Council regarding a Public Hearing item.

RES.R21-1249

Carried

RES.R21-1252

It was Moved by Councillor Guerra
Seconded by Councillor Patton
That "Surrey Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2013, No. 18020, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20368" pass its third reading.
Carried
With Councillor Pettigrew opposed.

"Surrey Zoning Bylaw, 1993, No. 12000, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20369" RF to CD (based on RM-70) - 10814 - 139A Street (13957 - 108 Avenue); 10824 and 10834 - 139A Street; 10827 and 10837 - 140 Street; 13965, 13975 and 13987 - 108 Avenue - to permit the development of two 6-storey apartment buildings in City Centre.

Council direction received June 14, 2021

RES.R21-1253

It was Moved by Councillor Guerra
Seconded by Councillor Patton
That "Surrey Zoning Bylaw, 1993, No. 12000, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20369" pass its third reading.
Carried
With Councillor Pettigrew opposed.

3. "Surrey Zoning Bylaw, 1993, No. 12000, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20378" 7921-0124-00
Owner: The Parish of Christ the Redeemer (Surrey), 51
Agent: Aplin & Martin Consultants Ltd. (Samira Khayambashi)
PA-1 to RF - a portion of 16613 Bell Road - to permit subdivision into six single family residential lots and one remainder institutional lot to retain an existing church.

Council direction received June 14, 2021

RES.R21-1254

It was Moved by Councillor Guerra
Seconded by Councillor Patton
That "Surrey Zoning Bylaw, 1993, No. 12000, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20378" pass its third reading.
Carried

Development Variance Permit No. 7921-0124-00
16613 Bell Road

To reduce the minimum lot width from 15.0 metres to 13.5 metres for proposed Lot 5; to reduce the minimum southwest side yard setback from 10.8 metres to 6.1 metres to the principal building face of the existing church on proposed Lot 7; to reduce the minimum required on-site parking spaces for the existing church from 93 spaces to 53 spaces on proposed Lot 7; and to reduce the minimum landscaped strip width requirement from 3 metres to 1 metre along the southwest property line of proposed Lot 7.

It was Moved by Councillor Guerra
 Seconded by Councillor Patton
 That Council support Development Variance
 Permit No. 7921-0124-00 and consider issuance of the Permit upon final adoption
 of the associated rezoning bylaw.

RES.R21-1255 Carried

4. "Surrey Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2013, No. 18020, Amendment Bylaw, 2021,
 No. 20371"
 7915-0442-00
 Owner: T. Nguyen, 1001696 B.C. Ltd. (Director Information: Hiep Khoa Luu)
 Agent: Pacific Land Group Ltd. (Laura Jones)
 To amend Figure 3: General Land Use Designations from Suburban to Urban for
 the site located at 10245 and 10267 - 176 Street.

Council direction received June 14, 2021

It was Moved by Councillor Guerra
 Seconded by Councillor Patton
 That "Surrey Official Community Plan Bylaw,
 2013, No. 18020, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20371" pass its third reading.

RES.R21-1256 Carried
 With Councillor Pettigrew opposed.

"Surrey Zoning Bylaw, 1993, No. 12000, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20372"
 RA to RF and RF-G - 10245 and 10267 - 176 Street - to permit subdivision into eight
 single family lots, four single family gross density lots, and three lots to be
 conveyed to the City for riparian protection purposes in Abbey Ridge.

Council direction received June 14, 2021

It was Moved by Councillor Guerra
 Seconded by Councillor Patton
 That "Surrey Zoning Bylaw, 1993, No. 12000,
 Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20372" pass its third reading.

RES.R21-1257 Carried
 With Councillor Pettigrew opposed.

Development Variance Permit No. 7915-0442-00
 10245 and 10267 - 176 Street
 To reduce the minimum front (south) yard setback from 7.5 metres to 6.5 metres
 for an attached garage and 4.0 metres for the remaining portion of the principal
 building face, and to reduce the minimum side (east and west) yard setbacks from
 1.8 metres to 1.2 metres.

RES.R21-1258

It was Moved by Councillor Guerra
Seconded by Councillor Patton
That Council support Development Variance
Permit No. 7915-0442-00 and consider issuance of the Permit upon final adoption
of the associated rezoning bylaw.

Carried
With Councillor Pettigrew opposed.

5. "Surrey Zoning Bylaw, 1993, No. 12000, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20373"
7917-0551-00
Owner: Remond Holdings Corp.
Agent: Atelier Pacific Architecture Inc. (Gordon You)
RF and C-15 to CD (based on RM-70 and C-15) - 10207 - 153 Street; 10221 - 153 Street
(10233 - 153 Street) - to permit the development of a 6-storey mixed use building
on the west portion of the consolidated site.

Council direction received June 14, 2021

RES.R21-1259

It was Moved by Councillor Guerra
Seconded by Councillor Patton
That "Surrey Zoning Bylaw, 1993, No. 12000,
Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20373" pass its third reading.

Carried

6. "Surrey Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2013, No. 18020, Amendment Bylaw, 2021,
No. 20380"
7919-0036-00
Owner: Core Group Properties Ltd.
Agent: Hub Engineering Inc. (Mike Kompter)
To amend Figure 3: General Land Use Designations from Suburban to Urban for
the site located at 9746 - 179 Street.

Council direction received June 14, 2021

RES.R21-1260

It was Moved by Councillor Guerra
Seconded by Councillor Patton
That "Surrey Official Community Plan Bylaw,
2013, No. 18020, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20380" pass its third reading.

Carried
With Councillor Pettigrew opposed.

"Surrey Zoning Bylaw, 1993, No. 12000, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20381"
RA to RF-13 and RF - 9746 - 179 Street - to permit subdivision into three single
family small lots and four single family lots in Abbey Ridge.

Council direction received June 14, 2021

RES.R21-1261 It was Moved by Councillor Guerra
Seconded by Councillor Patton
That "Surrey Zoning Bylaw, 1993, No. 12000,
Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20381" pass its third reading.
Carried
With Councillor Pettigrew opposed.

Development Variance Permit No. 7919-0036-00
9746 - 179 Street

To increase the front (south) yard setbacks from 6.0 metres to 6.5 metres for 50% of the building face, 7.5 metres for the remaining portion of the building face and 4.5 metres for up to 50% of the building face for an attached deck for Lots 1-3; to vary the basement access and basement well requirements to permit a basement access and basement well between the principal building and the front (south) lot line for Lots 1-5; to vary the minimum front (south) yard setback for an accessory building or structure from 18.0 metres to 1.0-metre for Lots 4-5; and to vary the RF-13 Zone to permit an accessory building or structure in the front (south) yard and set the minimum setback to 1.0-metre for Lots 1-3.

RES.R21-1262 It was Moved by Councillor Guerra
Seconded by Councillor Patton
That Council support Development Variance
Permit No. 7919-0036-00 and consider issuance of the Permit upon final adoption
of the associated rezoning bylaw.
Carried
With Councillor Pettigrew opposed.

7. "Surrey Zoning Bylaw, 1993, No. 12000, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20377"
7920-0127-00
Owner: Satnam Education Society of British Columbia, Inc.
Agent: Satnam Education Society of B.C. (Harinder Singh Sohi)
RH to CD - 14992 - 76 Avenue - to permit the development of a new childcare
facility for up to 57 children.

Council direction received June 14, 2021

RES.R21-1263 It was Moved by Councillor Guerra
Seconded by Councillor Patton
That "Surrey Zoning Bylaw, 1993, No. 12000,
Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20377" pass its third reading.
Carried
With Councillor Pettigrew opposed.

PERMITS - APPROVAL

- 11. Development Variance Permit No. 7921-0128-00
 13191 - 15 Avenue
 Owner: S. Sohal, H. Sohal
 Agent: S. Sohal, H. Sohal
 To reduce the minimum rear yard setback from 7.5 metres to 6.0 metres to the principal building face for the north property line in order to construct a single-family dwelling with a functional layout.

Two pieces of correspondence expressing opposition, one piece of correspondence expressing support and one piece of correspondence expressing concerns have been received prior to the printing of this agenda.

It was Moved by Councillor Guerra
 Seconded by Councillor Patton
 That Council authorize the issuance of
 Development Variance Permit No. 7921-0128-00.

RES.R21-1269

Carried

FINAL ADOPTIONS

- 12. "Surrey Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2013, No. 18020, Text Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20292"
 3900-20-20292 – Regulatory Text Amendment
 This bylaw includes amendments to the Urban and Commercial Designations, as well as to the Form and Character Development Permit Guidelines. These amendments pertain to building separation distances for low-rise and medium-rise buildings, and to high-rise building floor plate maximums as described in Corporate Report 2021-R048.

Council direction received March 8, 2021
 Corporate Report Item No. 2021-R048

- * Bylaw No. 20292 was referred back to staff after the Public Hearing held on April 12, 2021. At the June 14, 2021, Regular Council - Public Hearing meeting, Council approved the recommendations of the Development Advisory Committee, which supported the changes to the OCP and subsequent adoption of the Bylaw. Planning and Development advise (see memorandum in back-up) that it is now in order for Council to consider third reading and final adoption of the Bylaw.

It was Moved by Councillor Guerra
 Seconded by Councillor Patton
 That "Surrey Official Community Plan Bylaw,
 2013, No. 18020, Text Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20292" pass its third reading.

RES.R21-1270

Carried

It was
 2013, No. 18020, Text Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20292" be finally adopted.
 RES.R21-1271
 Moved by Councillor Guerra
 Seconded by Councillor Patton
 That "Surrey Official Community Plan Bylaw,
Carried

I. CLERK'S REPORT

This section had no items to consider.

J. NOTICE OF MOTION

1. **Truth and Reconciliation Commission and United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous People (UNDRIP) Recommendations for Local Governments**
 File: 0440-01

At the June 28, 2021 Regular Council – Public Hearing meeting, Councillor Hundial provided the following notice of motion:

"That Council direct staff to fully consider the recommendations of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission reports "Call to Action" and those outlined in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples that apply solely or jointly to local government and other levels of government, and report back with a recommended course of action."

2. **Surrey Police Service Referendum**
 File: 7400-01

At the June 28, 2021 Regular Council – Public Hearing meeting, Councillor Locke provided the following notice of motion:

"That the City of Surrey have no legal impediment otherwise call on the provincial government to hold a regional referendum on whether or not the RCMP be retained or the proposed Surrey Police Service go forward."

Mayor McCallum ruled the notice of motion out of order, citing previous rulings related to the police transition.

Councillor Locke challenged the ruling of the Chair.

The Chair then put the question:

RES.R21-1272
 Shall the Chair be sustained.
Carried
 With Councillors Annis, Hundial, Locke and Pettigrew opposed.

K. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Cost-Benefit Analysis of Metro Vancouver Services and Facilities

File: 0450-01

At the June 14, 2021 Regular Council – Public Hearing meeting, Councillor Locke provided the following Notice of Motion:

"That Council direct staff to prepare a cost/benefit analysis on a per capita basis of the Metro Vancouver taxes paid by Surrey residents in relation to the services and facilities provided by or paid for by Metro Vancouver for Surrey."

It was Moved by Councillor Guerra
Seconded by Councillor Patton
That Council direct staff to prepare a cost/benefit analysis on a per capita basis of the Metro Vancouver taxes paid by Surrey residents in relation to the services and facilities provided by or paid for by Metro Vancouver for Surrey.

Councillor Patton had technical difficulties and disconnected from the meeting at 12:09 a.m. She reconnected at 12:15 a.m.

RES.R21-1273

Defeated
With Mayor McCallum and Councillors Annis, Elford, Guerra, Patton opposed.

L. ADJOURNMENT

It was Moved by Councillor Guerra
Seconded by Councillor Patton
That the June 28, 2021 Regular Council -

Public Hearing meeting be adjourned.

RES.R21-1274

Carried

The Regular Council - Public Hearing meeting adjourned at 12:30 a.m.

Certified correct:

Jennifer Ficocelli, City Clerk

Mayor Doug McCallum