

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
Acting General Manager, Planning & Development
City Solicitor
Manager, Area Planning & Development, North Division
Manager, Area Planning & Development, South Division
Land Development Engineer

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

It was

Moved by Councillor Guerra

Seconded by Councillor Patton

That the agenda of the July 26, 2021, Regular

Council Public Hearing meeting be adopted.

RES.R21-1485

Carried**2. Adoption of the Minutes****a. Special (Regular) Council - July 12, 2021**

It was

Moved by Councillor Guerra

Seconded by Councillor Patton

That the minutes of the Special (Regular)

Council meeting held on July 12, 2021, be adopted.

RES.R21-1486

Carried**b. Regular Council - Land Use - July 12, 2021**

It was

Moved by Councillor Guerra

Seconded by Councillor Patton

That the minutes of the Regular Council -

Land Use meeting held on July 12, 2021, be adopted.

RES.R21-1487

Carried

- (d) In Table C.1 of Part 5 Off-Street Parking and Loading/Unloading, the minimum number of required off-street parking spaces for the proposed 6-storey apartment building is reduced from 137 spaces to 83 spaces.
- (e) In Section J. Special Regulations, Sub-Section 1(c) of Part 22 Multiple Residential 30 Zone (RM-30), the indoor amenity space requirement is reduced from 279.0 square metres to 116.0 square metres.

Councillor Annis declared a conflict of interest and left the meeting at 2:02 p.m.

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

R. Landale, Fleetwood: The delegation expressed concerns regarding the proposed non-market affordable housing and spoke in opposition to the proposal citing setbacks, indoor amenity requirements, parking, traffic and safety.

D. Jack, Surrey Environmental Partners: The delegation spoke to the meandering trail that will conserve trees.

K. Millard, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing affordable supportive housing and appropriate density for the neighbourhood.

E. Tichelman, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing support for the Semiahmoo Trail realignment by the Heritage Advisory Commission, lack of traffic impact, affordable supportive housing and appropriate density for the neighbourhood.

M. Stirling, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing affordable supportive housing, proximity to transit, Semiahmoo Trail realignment and lack of traffic and parking impacts.

B. Ghangass, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing affordable supportive housing.

S. Wieczorek, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing affordable supportive housing, compatibility with the existing neighbourhood, proximity to transit and no concerns regarding height, removal of trees from the subject site, parking and traffic.

R. Pope, Whalley: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing affordable supportive housing.

C. Semaniuk, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing affordable supportive housing.

J. Millard, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing affordable supportive housing and protection and enhancement of the Semiahmoo Trail.

I. Jarvis, Ocean Park: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing affordable supportive housing, compatibility with the existing neighbourhood, appropriate density and height, and retention of trees on the subject site.

B. Sadko, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing height, density and incompatibility with the existing neighbourhood,

P. Wheeler, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing the Semiahmoo Trail realignment, renewal of aging homes and affordable supportive housing.

L. Boughen, UNITI: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing affordable supportive housing, appropriate land use, inclusive communities and building height.

R. Kison, Newton: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing affordable supportive housing, inclusive communities, and proximity to transit and recreation.

T. Leport, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing affordable supportive housing.

M. Ganghass, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing affordable supportive housing.

P. Kreuk, Durante Kreuk Ltd. (Project Landscape Architect): The Project Landscape Architect spoke to the Semiahmoo Trail realignment.

E. Powell, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing the Semiahmoo Trail realignment, inclusive communities and affordable supportive housing.

N. Morrison, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing affordable supportive housing.

J. Sephton, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing affordable supportive housing and appropriate location for the project.

L. Simpson, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing affordable supportive housing and proximity to transit.

A. Bailey, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing building height, density and requested parking reductions.

C. Mohr, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing affordable supportive housing and inclusive communities.

G. Chambers, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing building height, density, parking, traffic and incompatibility with the existing neighbourhood.

H. Lui, Development Manager, Catalyst Community (Consultant for the Project): The delegation spoke to the Semiahmoo Trail realignment, density, surrounding developments and community engagement.

M. Sabine on behalf of T. Sheppard: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing affordable supportive housing, support for the local economy, inclusive communities and the Semiahmoo Trail realignment.

K. Verschoor, Inclusion BC: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing affordable supportive housing.

D. Matheson, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing future development of the remaining subject site, traffic and potential discrimination and isolation of tenants.

D. Lawby, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing appropriate building height and affordable supportive housing.

I. Cullis, BC Non-Profit Housing Association: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing affordable supportive housing.

R. Bayer, Newton: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing affordable supportive housing and support for the local economy.

C. Ferguson, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing community engagement and UNITI's successful business model.

M. Miller, White Rock: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing affordable supportive housing.

T. Wall, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing affordable supportive housing.

J. Macabulos, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing the Semiahmoo Trail realignment and affordable housing.

S. Baranszky-Job: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing the Semiahmoo Trail realignment and affordable housing.

C. Scott, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing affordable supportive housing and inclusive communities.

T. Miller, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing affordable supportive housing.

L. Harrison, President, Community Catalyst (Development Consultant for the Project): The delegation spoke to the building height and density, affordable supportive housing and compliance with zoning and land use plans.

S. Green, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing the Semiahmoo Trail realignment, inclusive communities and the need for affordable housing.

J. Glennie, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing the Semiahmoo Trail realignment and height of the development.

M. Tibbits, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing the need for affordable housing, the Semiahmoo Trail realignment, lack of impact to traffic, proximity to transit and compatibility with the existing neighbourhood.

D. Glennie, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal.

B. Simpson, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing affordable supportive housing and inclusive communities.

J. Perry, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing affordable supportive housing and inclusive communities.

M. Gilley, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing affordable supportive housing and the Semiahmoo Trail realignment.

K. Gilley, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing the realignment of the Semiahmoo Trail.

R. Tichelman, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing appropriate density and building height, affordable supportive housing and compatibility with the existing neighbourhood.

Dwayne Siegrist, Integra Architecture (Architect on behalf of the Project): The Architect spoke to the neighbourhood context, compliance with the Semiahmoo Town Centre Plan and Official Community Plan, affordable housing construction, the building footprint, building shadowing, conservation of trees on the subject site, parking, traffic and building appearance and massing.

L. Holmes, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing density, future development of the subject site and building height.

N. Floyd, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of supportive housing but expressed opposition to the proposal citing building height, density, incompatibility with the existing neighbourhood, displacement of existing tenants and the Semiahmoo Trail realignment.

K. Mulholland, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing building height.

E. Karczewsk, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing affordable supportive housing and proximity to transit and amenities.

N. Ware, White Rock: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing the Semiahmoo Trail realignment and affordable housing.

C. Arychuk, White Rock: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing the zoning, building height, density, landscaping and realignment of the Semiahmoo Trail.

H. Grant, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal.

J. Petruena, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing affordable supportive housing.

P. Brownsword, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing building height, density, traffic, parking, loss of trees from the subject site and incompatibility with the existing neighbourhood.

C. McGothdeen, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing the realignment of the Semiahmoo Trail and affordable supportive housing.

L. Baltaji, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing the need for redevelopment and affordable supportive housing.

B. Hadikin, Semiahmoo Housing Society: The delegation spoke to affordable supportive housing, building height, Semiahmoo Trail realignment, traffic, and parking.

Written submissions were received as follows:

- Email dated April 26, 2021, Bob Wirtz expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height, character of neighbourhood, densification and parking.
- Email dated April 26, 2021, J. Noble expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height, character of neighbourhood, traffic and parking.
- Email dated April 27, 2021, M. Solie expressing support for the proposal.
- Letter dated April 26, 2021, R. Borutski expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated May 7 and July 20, 2021, M. Waigh expressing concerns for the proposal citing, building height, trees, parking, traffic and densification.
- Letter dated May 7, 2021, T. Sheppard expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated May 7, 2021, W. and G. Simpson expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated May 10 and July 19, 2021, B. and F. Kohler expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated May 7, 2021, C. and G. Dean expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated May 10, 2021, D. Bosma expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated May 9 and July 18, 2021, L. Holmes expressing concerns for the proposal citing, building height, traffic and densification.
- Email dated May 11, 2021, B. Sleath expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated May 10, 2021, J. Power expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated May 21, 2021, The Peninsula Estate's Neighbours Committee expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height, landscaping, densification and traffic.
- Email dated May 12, 2021, C. Ferguson expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated May 12, 2021, C. Anderson expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated May 13, 2021, D. Goldberg expressing support for the proposal.
- Letter dated May 12 and July 14, 2021, Peninsula Homeless to Housing Task Force expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated May 13, 2021, J. Heuft expressing support for the proposal.
- Letter dated May 11, 2021, D., D. and M. Lawby expressing support for the proposal.

- Letter dated May 16 and July 8, 2021, R. and M. Gilley expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated May 15, 2021, S. McIntyre expressing support for the proposal.
- Letter dated May 17, 2021, Self Advocates of Semiahmoo expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated May 18, 2021, N. Ware expressing support for the proposal.
- Letter received June 7, 2021, R., K. and A. Kison expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 15 and July 10, 2021, B. Ghangas expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated June 28, 2021, N. Floyd expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighbourhood.
- Letter dated June 25, 2021, Stephanie Cadieux expressing support for the proposal.
- Letter dated July 8, 2021, Amadea Hallwas expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 8, 2021, N. Morrison expressing support for the proposal.
- Letter received July 8 and July 15, 2021, Alexandra Neighbourhood House expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 12, 2021, A. Bhatti expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 12, 2021, B. Hall expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 12, 2021, B. Hopaluk expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 12, 2021, C. Ferguson expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 12, 2021, C. Jones expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 12, 2021, C. Scott expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 12, 2021, D. Westdorp expressing support for the proposal.
- Letter dated July 12, 2021, B. and J. Cutting expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 10, 2021, E. Gabelmann expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 12, 2021, E. Tichelman expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 13, 2021, F. Schultz-Lorentzen expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 13, 2021, G. McNamara expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 12, 2021, J. Kristianson expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 12, 2021, J. Macabulos expressing support for the proposal.
- Letter received July 13, 2021, J. Millard expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 11, 2021, J. Sephton expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 12, 2021, K. Iversen expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 10, 2021, K. Kristianson expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 13, 2021, K. Utendale expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 12, 2021, L. Cummings expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 11, 2021, L. Kovatch expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 12, 2021, L. Mercado expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 13, 2021, M. Cassels expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 12, 2021, M. Yuen expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 12, 2021, P. Heslop expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 12, 2021, S. Graham for D. Armstrong expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 9, 2021, S. Subject expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 12, 2021, S. Tripathi expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 13, 2021, T. and K. Shannon expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 12, 2021, T. Polege expressing support for the proposal.
- Letter dated July 2, 2021, W. and G. Simpson expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 14, 2021, A. Hana expressing support for the proposal.

- Email dated July 14, 2021, B. Webster expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 11 and 14, 2021, C. Anderson expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 11, 2021, C. Lightowlers expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 14, 2021, C. Mohr expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 13, 2021, D. Antifaeu expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 14, 2021, D. Glenie expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 14, 2021, D. Tennant expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 14, 2021, D. Ure expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 14, 2021, G. Gritten expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 14, 2021, J. Glennie expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 14, 2021, J. Glennie expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 14, 2021, J. Lusted expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 13, 2021, K. Mulholland expressing concerns for the proposal citing character of neighborhood and building height.
- Email dated July 14, 2021, K. Pelt expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 13, 2021, L. Johnston expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 14, 2021, L. Verrall expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 13, 2021, L. Witt expressing support for the proposal.
- Letter dated July 14, 2021, M. Wiczorek expressing support for the proposal.
- Letter dated July 14, 2021, Mount Olive Lutheran Church expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 14, 2021, Nela Hallwas expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 13, 2021, N. Walton expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 14, 2021, T. Aristizabal expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 14, 2021, T. Aristizabal expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 13, 2021, T. Palmer expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 14, 2021, T. Sheppard expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, A. Haffenden expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, A. Hana expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, A. Larson expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, A. Schouten expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, A. Wright expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, B. Besufekad expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, B. Hadikin expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, B. Kohler expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, B. Webster expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, C. Barone expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, C. Benson expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, C. Smith expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, C. Vaksdal expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, D. Stevenson expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, E. Martinez expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, E. Matthews expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, E. Rice expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, F. Kohler expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, F.J. expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, G. Dean expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, G. Negri expressing support for the proposal.

- Email dated July 15, 2021, H. Jones expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, I. Jarvis expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, I. Narod expressing support for the proposal.
- Letter dated July 15, 2021, Inclusion BC and Inclusion Canada expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, J. Aristizabal expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, J. Henriques expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, J. Hoogenraad expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, J. Purdon expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, J. Rice expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, K. Lofing expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, K. McIntyre expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, L. Cummings expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, L. Mercado expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, L. O'Hagan expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, L. Tremblay expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, L. Wood expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, M. Ahmed expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, M. Aristizabal expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, M. Castagnoli expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, M. Cruickshank expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, M. Hoogenraad expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, M. Simmonds expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, M. Yorston expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, N. Patterson expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, N. Ware expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, P. Bradley expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, P. Cole expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, P. Doyle expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, P. Henriques expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, R. Frederiksen expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, R. Gorman expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, R. Maurer expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, R.K. expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, R. Green expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, S. Kohler expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, S. Reiersen expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, S. Schaffer expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, S. Tripathi expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, S. Wood expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, T. Garratt expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, T. Henriques expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, T. Wall expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, V. Goddard expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, A. Brownsword expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height and character of neighborhood.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, A. Skalbania expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, A. Soheili expressing support for the proposal.

- Email dated July 16, 2021, A. Vant Slot expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, B. and J. Ihaksi expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height, character of neighborhood, traffic and protection of trail.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, B. Ball expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, B. Ghangass expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, B. Sheedy expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, C. Anderson expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, C. Arychuk expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, C. Ferguson expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, C. Lehwald expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, D. Cooper expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, D. Glover expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, D. Grant expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, D. Newbold expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, D. Simcoe expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, E. Dunai expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, E. Powell expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, G. Akey expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, G. Gritten expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, G. Simpson expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, H. Grant expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, J. Aanes expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, J. Bailey expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, J. Brauckmann expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, J. Cutting expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, J. Grant expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, J. Kristianson expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, J. Maynes expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, J. Millard expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, J. Powell expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, J. Scott expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, J. Sephton expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, J. Young expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, K. Bailey expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, K. Hannaway expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, K. Kristianson expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, K. Leith expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, L. Dinsmore expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, L. Simpson expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, L. Thomas expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, M. Ankenman expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, M. Cassels expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, M. Grant expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, M. Moore expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, M. Sabine expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, N. Morrison expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, N. Ogloff expressing support for the proposal.

- Email dated July 16, 2021, P. Ballinger expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, P. Grant expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, P. Grier expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, P. Buchy expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, R. Field expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, R. Scott expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, R. Scott expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, R. St. John expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, S. Alfonso expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, S. Ballinger expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, S. Clemas expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, S. Graham expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, S. Hassard expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, S. Hentzen expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, S. O'Hara expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, T. Shannon expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, W. Simpson expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 17, 2021, A. Cunningham expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 17, 2021, C. Mclay expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 17, 2021, D. Bosma expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 17, 2021, D. Ellis-Tadros expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 17, 2021, E. Batut expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 17, 2021, E. Gabelmann expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 17, 2021, G. Hogg expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 17, 2021, J. Burnett expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 17, 2021, J. Lewis expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 17, 2021, J. MacInnes expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 17, 2021, K. Kerslake expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 17, 2021, K. Simpson expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 17, 2021, L. Cooper expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 17, 2021, M. Ellis expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 17, 2021, P. Sephton expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 17, 2021, R. Karcher expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 17, 2021, R. Rumbines expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 18, 2021, A. Low expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height.
- Email dated July 18, 2021, C. Davison expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 18, 2021, C. Hughes expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 18, 2021, C. Robinson expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 18, 2021, D. Utendale expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 18, 2021, G. McNamara expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 18, 2021, H. Hardman expressing concern for the proposal citing building height and character of neighborhood.
- Email dated July 18, 2021, J. Goodbrand expressing opposed for the proposal citing building height.
- Email dated July 18, 2021, K. Utendale expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 18, 2021, L. Caron expressing concern for the proposal citing building height, character of neighborhood and traffic.

- Email dated July 18, 2021, L. Gregory expressing opposed for the proposal citing building height.
- Email dated July 18, 2021, L. Mack expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 18, 2021, M. Herrmann expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 18, 2021, N. Hanson expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 18, 2021, N. Raven expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 18, 2021, P. Hadikin Herrmann expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 18, 2021, P. Hadikin Herrmann expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 18, 2021, P. Utendale expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 18, 2021, S. Pietracci expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 18, 2021, T. Palmer expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 18, 2021, T. Pimentel expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, A. Bailey expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height, character of neighborhood, densification and parking.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, A. Chung expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, A. Clarke expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, A. Morrison expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, A. Mungal expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, A. Szymczak expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, A. Wisdom expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, B. Mack expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, B. Reeve expressing concerns for the proposal citing building height and density.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, C. Fletcher expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, C. Goode expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, C. Hagemoen expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, C. Larden expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, C. McGoff Dean expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, C. Oram expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, C. Robinson expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, D. Cherry expressing concerns for the proposal citing building height, character of neighborhood and privacy.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, D. Hodgins expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, D. Savage expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, D. Savage expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, E. Deschenes expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, E. Tarshis expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, E. Tichelman expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, F. Coelho expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, G. Bhurji expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, G. Chambers expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height, character of neighborhood and parking.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, G. Ross expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, H. Lui expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, I. Charyna expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, I. Connors expressing support for the proposal.

- Email dated July 19, 2021, I. Rumlena expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, J. Lefebvre expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height and density.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, J. Utendale expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, K. Downing expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, K. Gregory expressing concerns for the proposal citing building height.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, K. Macdonald expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, K. Mulholland expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height and character of neighborhood.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, L. Bowie expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height and parking.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, L. Cochran expressing concerns for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, L. Geddes expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, L. McCrossin expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, L. Oag expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, L. Roegele expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, L. Utendale expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, M. Geotina expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, M. Hulme expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, M. LaMontagne expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, M. Lefebvre expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height and density.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, M. Molson expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, M. Nelson expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, M. Solie expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, M. Van De Keere expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, N. Flaherty expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, N. Milau expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, P. Caune expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, P. MacDonald expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, P. Petrala expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, P. Robinson expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, P. Wheeler expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, R. Bevis expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, R. Fox expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, R. Kaptyn expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, R. Marin expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, R. Moore expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, R. Pasko expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, R. Segaar expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, S. Chessell expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, S. Downing expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, S. Kraft expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, S. Reeve expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height and density.

- Email dated July 19, 2021, S. Reid expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, S. Tennant expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, S. Van Geel expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, T. and L. Roberts-Mason expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height and character of neighborhood.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, T. Khanna expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, T. Utendale expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, V. Stratton expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, Y. Jung expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, A. Brown expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, A. Brownsword expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, A. Choi expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height and density.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, A. Colpitts expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, A. Podmore expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, A. Rayas expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, A. Sianquita expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, B. Berger expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, T. Whalley and B. Birtch expressing concerns for the proposal citing building height, traffic and density.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, B. Ferguson expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, B. Sadko expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height and density.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, B. Tan expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height, density and traffic.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, B. Waigh expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height and character of neighborhood.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, C. and G. Dean expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, C. Baasch expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, C. Clarke expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, C. Coueffin expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, C. Drake expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, C. Graham expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, C. Johnston expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, C. McLeod expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, C. Richards expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, C. Shum expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, D. Allen expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, D. Britt expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height and character of neighborhood.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, D. Debruyn expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, D. Geddes expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, D. Huang expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, D. Ivens expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, D. Li expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, D. Robinson expressing support for the proposal.

- Email dated July 20, 2021, D. Ure expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, E. Cutting expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, F. Aboloc expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, G. Dean expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, G. Racanello expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, H. Arneja expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, I. Menendez expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, I. Ooms expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, J. and M. Hutchinson expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, J. Arnold expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, J. Berger expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, J. Bromley expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, J. Duson expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, J. Houston expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, K. Holmes expressing concerns for the proposal citing building height, character of neighborhood and density.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, K. Leith expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, K. Mulholland expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height and character of neighborhood.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, K. O'Connor expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, K. Raja expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, K. Shih expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height, character of neighborhood and privacy.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, K. Yoo expressing concerns for the proposal citing building height, traffic and density.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, L. Allen expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, L. Halldorson expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, L. Verrall expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, M. Falez expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, M. Herrmann expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, M. Miller expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, M. Osmond expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height, character of neighborhood, density and traffic.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, M. Ramage expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, M. Ramage expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, M. Solie expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, M. Sood expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, N. Aboloc expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, N. and F. Boehm expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height, character of neighborhood, density, parking and traffic.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, N. Duran expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, N. Glubb expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, N. Look expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, N. Rashid expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, O. Moore expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, P. Kaila expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, P. Wheeler expressing support for the proposal.

- Email dated July 20, 2021, R. Babcook expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height and traffic.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, R. Fox expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, R. Gable expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, R. Hardman expressing concerns for the proposal citing building height, character of neighborhood and density.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, R. Rose expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, S. Baranszky-Job expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, S. Burrows expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, S. Dales expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, S. Falez expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, S. Henry expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, S. Hodgins expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, S. Nichols expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, S. Nixon expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, S. Phillips expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, S. Preddy expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, Suzanne Swanson expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height, property values and crime.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, T. Rogerson expressing opposition for the proposal citing noise, traffic, parking and crime.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, T. Polege expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, T. Redies expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, T. Silvester-Lee expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, W. Ennis expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, A. Gee expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, A. Goddyn expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, A. Green expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, A. Johnson expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, B. Best expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height and character of neighborhood.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, Bea Hadikin expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, C. Arychuk expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, C. Baker expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, C. Billow expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, C. Fosolan and H. Saber expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighborhood, parking and traffic.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, C. Isaak expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, C. Kannegiesser expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, C. Semaniuk expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, D. VanSant expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, I. Smith expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, J. and S. Bernat expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, J. Battie expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, J. Brown expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, J. Faye expressing support for the proposal.

- Email dated July 21, 2021, J. Hale expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighborhood, privacy, density and building height.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, J. Lambie expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighborhood and building height.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, J. McEwen-Doris expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, K. Heber expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height, character of neighborhood, density, parking and traffic.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, L. Brookes expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, L. Partin expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, L. Sinclair expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, M. and L. Cleutinx expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, M. Badenhorst expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, M. Kaulius expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, N. Molley expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, N. Morris expressing support for the proposal.
- Submission dated July 21, 2021, 5,859 Petition Signatures in support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, R. Bishop expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, R. Burns expressing opposition for the proposal citing densification and traffic.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, R. Hale expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height, character of neighborhood, density and traffic.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, R. Harkala expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighborhood.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, R. Racanello expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, R. Thew expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Letter dated July 21, 2021, S. and T. Wieczorek expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, S. Arkley expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, S. Hudson expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, T. Etmanski expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, T. Harvey expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, T. Thorsteinson expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, Uniti providing additional information for the proposal regarding public consultation and building design.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, W. Lowry expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height, character of neighborhood, density and traffic.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, Z. Gamage expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, D. Fraser expressing concerns for the proposal citing building height, parking and setbacks.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, B. Esplen expressing opposition for the proposal citing traffic and parking.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, C. and G. Batch expressing concerns for the proposal citing building height, character of neighborhood and traffic.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, C. Rice expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, C. Totten expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, D. Simpson expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighborhood, noise, traffic, parking and congestion.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, J. Latimer expressing support for the proposal.

- Email dated July 22, 2021, L. Clement expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, L. Fraser expressing concerns for the proposal citing building height, parking and setbacks.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, P. Herrmann expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, D. Matheson expressing concern for the proposal.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, R. Landale expressing opposition for the proposal citing setbacks, parking and traffic.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, A. Roman expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, B. Cowen expressing opposition for the proposal citing densification.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, C. Barrett expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, C. East expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, B. Cowen expressing opposition for the proposal citing densification, building height and character of neighborhood.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, H. Qu expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height and character of neighborhood.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, E. Sagert expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, J. Atkey expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, J. Gauthier expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, J. Murray expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, A. Roman expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, K. Booth expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, K. Cowen expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height and densification.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, L. Dixon expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, M. Haring expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height and densification.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, N. Sahota expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, P. Brownsword expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighbourhood and trees.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, R. Bevis expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, S. Esplen expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height and traffic.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, T. Cheong expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighbourhood, building height and densification.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, T. Rabinski expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, V. Delosky expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighbourhood, building height, parking and densification.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, A. Dhanani expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, B. Ediger expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height and densification.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, B. Writz expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height, parking and densification.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, B. Woosnam expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, C. Shih expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height, character of neighbourhood and densification.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, C. Tang expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height, traffic and densification.

- Email dated July 23, 2021, D. Goudriaan expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, D. Matheson expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height, character of neighbourhood and densification.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, E. Heriouille expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height and nature.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, E. Karczewska expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, E. Lougheed Green expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, G. Burwash expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, G. Edigar expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height and densification
- Email dated July 23, 2021, J. Chou expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height, character of neighbourhood, parking and traffic.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, J. Paras expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, L. Bekhuys expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, M. Wen expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height and densification.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, N. Floyd expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, R. Chilton expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, S. Paras expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, T. Jacobs expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, A. Kaps expressing concern for the proposal.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, A. Wilson expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, B. Donolo expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, C. Dougan expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, C. Hodson expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, C. Claudia Jane expressing concern for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, C. Steinhauer expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height and densification.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, D. Cox expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, F. Raja expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, J. Nobel expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, K. Madsen expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, K. Raja expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, M. Fair expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, M. Holl expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height, character of neighbourhood, traffic and densification.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, M. Pebernat expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, P. Chabot expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, P. Mulvaney expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, R. Gill expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, R. Goldberg expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, S. Docharty expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, S. Gill expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, S. Mitchell expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, S. Piper expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height, character of neighbourhood, traffic and parking.

- Email dated July 24, 2021, W. and C. Higgins expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height and traffic.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, A. McCorkell expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, A. Ciobanu expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, A. Ciobanu expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height, costs and traffic.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, B. Sadko expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, B. Triloff expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighbourhood and building height.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, C. Hawke expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, C. Monaghan expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, C. Shields expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, D. Davison expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, D. Hewitt expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, D. Mcewan expressing opposition for the proposal citing densification, schools and traffic.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, F. Hooper expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, J. Macdonald expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, J. Martin expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height and parking.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, J. Schmok expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, K. Simpson and J. Lewis expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, L. Beran expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, L. Hillier expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, L. Naylor expressing opposition for the proposal citing character of neighbourhood.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, L. Shaw expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, O. Ciobanu expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height and traffic.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, P. Docharty expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, R. Ferguson expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height and densification.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, R. Fleming expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height and densification.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, R. Moore expressing opposition for the proposal citing densification and character of neighbourhood.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, R. Mostar expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, R. Pope expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, S. Harvey expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height and parking.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, Y. Hsia expressing opposition for the proposal citing building height, parking and traffic.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, A. Spyker expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, C. Mackinnon expressing concern for the proposal citing densification and building height.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, D. Hall expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, I. Joharchy expressing support for the proposal.

- Email dated July 26, 2021, K. Dhaliwal expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, K. Egger expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, K. McAuliffe expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, K. McGregor expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, L. Vaksdal expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, M. Bagai expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, M. Gendall expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, M. Linklater expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, P. Hall expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, R. Borutski expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, R. Pope expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, R. Spyker expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, R. Tichelman expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, S. Palmer expressing support for the proposal.

The following expressed an opinion in writing and did not wish to speak:

- 13 in support; and
- One in opposition.

Council recessed from 5:28 p.m. – 5:34 p.m.

Councillor Annis rejoined the meeting at 5:34 p.m.

2. **"Surrey Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2013, No. 18020, Text Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20393"**
File No: 3900-20-20393 – Regulatory Text Amendment

PURPOSE: This bylaw includes amendments to Figure 3, General Land Use Designations; Figure 4, Secondary Plan Areas; Figure 17, Surrey Urban Containment Boundary; Figure 42, Major Employment Areas; Figure 43, Agricultural Lands; Figure 51, RCS: Regional Growth Strategy Land Use Designations; and Figure 63, Secondary Plan Areas of the Official Community Plan, to align with the revised Stage 1 Land Use Plan for South Campbell Heights as described in Corporate Report 2021-R147.

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

R. Landale, Fleetwood: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing future removal of trees, impact to water wells, aquifer, waterways and removal of natural lands.

D. Jack, Surrey Environmental Partners: The delegation spoke to lack of notification and consultation, preferred use as parkland, biodiversity loss, lack of regional parkland, proximity to local parks, meadows and forests for pollinators, multi-storey industrial development and potential future habitat and waterway loss.

R. Hundal, South Campbell Heights: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing future economic opportunities and environmentally respectful smart development.

C. Juteau, South Campbell Heights: The delegation expressed concerns regarding salmon and wildlife habitat, the aquifer, waterways, biodiversity conservation area protection, water quality in Boundary Bay, stormwater management and cumulative impacts of industrial development.

A. Bining, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing development needed to sustain growth and economic and employment opportunities.

E. Hart, Port Kells: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing destruction of environmental and archaeological sites, water quality, loss of filming opportunities and safety.

I. Hundal, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing smart development, potential road improvements and employment opportunities.

P. Kariya, Langley: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing salmon habitat and watershed protection.

S. Petrovic, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing underutilized land, lack of economic opportunities and poor soil for agricultural viability.

K. Bahi, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing riparian area setback guidelines.

M. Weber, Campbell Heights: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing employment and economic opportunities.

A. Pawar, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing environmental guidelines and setbacks, employment and economic opportunities, lack of agricultural viability and community support.

N. Kaur, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing minimal impacts to the environment and watershed, lack of agricultural viability and economic and employment opportunities.

O. Rai, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing economic and employment opportunities and improvements to water supply, sewer systems and roadways.

D. Smetheram, White Rock: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing economic and employment opportunities and environmental and riparian area protection.

D. Anderson, A Rocha Canada: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing rural, heritage, conservation and agricultural value, impacts to the Little Campbell River, negative employment opportunities due to environmental impacts and agricultural viability.

R. Brar, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing soil and water quality, lack of agricultural viability and economic and employment opportunities.

P. Stepney, Langley: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing environmental impacts, lack of valuable employment opportunities and lack of need for additional industrial lands.

V. Sukunda, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing lack of agricultural viability, proximity to 16 Avenue and the American border and economic opportunities.

T. McNeice, South Surrey: The development spoke in opposition to the proposal citing environmental and community concerns, Little Campbell River, and aquifer impacts.

D. Unrau, South Surrey: The development spoke in opposition to the proposal citing need for consultation with the First Nations, environmental and biodiversity concerns, climate change and water supply impacts.

K. Saliken, Redwood Park: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing conservation, protection of Little Campbell River, lack of agricultural viability and economic and employment opportunities.

L. Furlani, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing environmental impacts.

Y. Patterson, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing salmon habitats, aquifer impacts and environmental concerns.

A. Patterson, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing Little Campbell River and environmental impacts, wildlife and salmon impacts.

A. Chatha, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing economic opportunities.

K. Herber, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing environmental, wildlife, salmon, Little Campbell River and aquifer impacts.

A. Patterson, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing environmental, salmon habitat and Little Campbell River impacts.

C. Meersman, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing environmental concerns, salmon habitat, impacts to Little Campbell River and better employment opportunities elsewhere.

D. Riley, Little Campbell River Society: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing environmental, salmon habitat and Little Campbell River impacts.

B. Holmes, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing lack of agricultural viability, environmental impacts and employment and economic opportunities.

J. Larocque, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing the need for more green space.

B. Gardener, Friends of McNally Creek: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing aquifer, environmental, Little Campbell River and salmon and wildlife habitat impacts and better employment and economic opportunities elsewhere.

M. Manning, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing employment opportunities and provisions as outlined in the Local Area Plan.

C. Nordquist, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing lack of agricultural viability and safety impacts.

S. Grewal, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing employment and economic opportunities.

S. Rush, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing lack of Metro Vancouver support, lack of public consultation, studies needed to support the proposal and environmental concerns.

R. Winston, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing the reduction of natural habitat and agricultural land and water and air quality impacts.

M. York, South Campbell Heights: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing lack of agricultural viability and employment and economic opportunities.

P. Kalkat, South Campbell Heights: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing lack of agricultural viability, employment and economic opportunities and inclusion of conservation area and setbacks.

R. York, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing employment and economic opportunities and lack of agricultural viability.

A. Baedak, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing better employment opportunities, Little Campbell River and fish habitat impacts.

K. Stepney, Langley: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing lack of public consultation, aquifer and well water supply impacts and inappropriate land use.

C. Adams, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing impacts to the environment, Little Campbell River and salmon habitat.

N. Bains, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing employment and economic opportunities.

L. Kostamo, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing aquifer, salmon habitat and environmental impacts, agricultural, environmental and biodiversity value and lack of transportation infrastructure to support development.

Mayor McCallum left the meeting at 8:00 p.m. and re-entered the meeting at 8:02 p.m.

Council recessed from 8:04 p.m. - 8:17 p.m.

K. Trommel, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing environmental impacts.

C. So, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing environmental and salmon habitat impacts.

R. Balzer, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing environmental impacts.

R. Cheema, Grandview Heights: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing employment and economic opportunities and lack of agricultural viability.

R. Faw, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing environmental, Little Campbell River, salmon and wildlife habitat and aquifer impacts, lack of public consultation, loss of agricultural lands and lack of infrastructure to support development.

A. Baedak, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing biodiversity, Little Campbell River, wildlife and salmon habitat impacts and riparian area setback requirements.

P. Sandberg, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing environmental, water supply and wildlife and salmon habitat impacts, better locations for employment areas and lack of public consultation.

S. Sajda, Whalley: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing negative public response and lack of consultation with neighbouring municipalities.

R. Mackay, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing environmental impacts, Little Campbell River, biodiversity and wildlife impacts, and lack of public consultation.

M. Kostamo, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing environmental impacts, loss of agricultural land, wildlife habitat loss and biodiversity value.

S. Tompe, Hazelmere: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing agricultural potential, noise, soil and water pollution, traffic and road safety.

P. O'Connell, Bolivar Heights: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing the conservation value, water supply impacts, wildlife and fish habitat and environmental impacts and negative public responses.

M. Kostamo, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing better land uses available including mixed-use and agri-tourism.

T. Plater, Langley: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing wildlife and salmon habitat and aquifer impacts and ecological and biodiversity value.

I. Stevenson, Hazelmere: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing traffic, lack of infrastructure to support development and impacts to agricultural land value.

J. Weemhoff, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing environmental education in the area and land preservation.

A. Jeen, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing the loss of heritage value in the area and other available industrial lands in Metro Vancouver.

L. Gomes, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing employment and economic opportunities, lack of agricultural viability and potential environmental improvements.

R. Groat, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing ecological value, potential for biodiversity conservation, lack of infrastructure and transit to support development, and inappropriate land use.

C. Smith, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing ecological impacts and the need for more recreation areas.

W. Buckner, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing biodiversity value and aquifer and salmon habitat impacts.

S. Hindmarch, Langley: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing aquifer, salmon and wildlife habitat and environment impacts

S. Buckner, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing Brookwood aquifer and environment impacts, biodiversity and agricultural value, traffic, noise pollution and lack of infrastructure to support development.

A. Richardson, Cloverdale: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing non-compliance with the 15 minute neighbourhood concept and ecological impacts.

A. Kaps, North Surrey: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing agricultural value, biodiversity value, wildlife and salmon habitat impacts, lack of First Nation consultation, lack of support from the Township of Langley and lack of infrastructure to support development.

M. Scott, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing biodiversity, ecological and agricultural value, lack of public consultation, stakeholder and First Nation consultation and lack of infrastructure to support development.

I. Scott, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing negative public responses and lack of consultation with Surrey RCMP, Surrey Fire Services and BC Ambulance.

B. Coote, Langley: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing inappropriate land use, negative public responses and aquifer impacts.

K. Bansal, Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing proximity to the American border.

P. Coffey, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing ecological and agricultural value and low-value employment opportunities.

J. Proctor, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing lack of public consultation and environmental impacts.

L. Charchuk, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing green space protection, the need for environmental protection, wildlife habitat impacts, food supply and lack of infrastructure to support development.

P. Garcha, Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing a balance of future employment with the environment, lack of agricultural viability, inclusion of conservation land, proximity to truck routes and employment and economic opportunities.

S. Hille, Langley: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing environmental impacts.

H. Greco, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing the need to protect Little Campbell River and salmon habitat, inappropriate land use and environmental impacts.

L. Haliburten, Boundary Park: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing impacts to the Little Campbell River and salmon habitat, loss of trees, ecological value and inappropriate land use.

K. Dhesa, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing the need for industrial lands, lack of agricultural viability, environmental protection and employment and economic opportunities.

Council recessed from 10:28 – 10:33 p.m.

L. Randawa, Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing appropriate land use, employment and economic opportunities and proximity to the American border.

M. Laengin-Bueckert, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing inappropriate land use and impacts to waterways and wildlife habitat.

D. Heinz, Sullivan Heights: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing loss of agricultural and biodiversity land, green space and riparian areas, and environmental and watershed impacts.

K. Boisclair-Joly, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing agricultural viability, biodiversity impacts, the need for First Nation consultation and inadequate public consultation.

C. Garcia, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support for the proposal citing inclusion of conservation lands and employment opportunities.

D. Godwin, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing ecological value, aquifer and salmon habitat impacts and low-value employment opportunities.

W. Moxley, Newton: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing employment and economic opportunities.

Councillor Jo Ann Charles, Semiahmoo First Nation: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing lack of First Nation consultation and Little Campbell River impacts.

M. Smith, Whalley: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing the need to retain trees and environmental impacts.

M. Gill, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing employment and economic opportunities.

A. Singh, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing employment and economic opportunities.

M. Lamont, Hazelmere Valley: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing agricultural viability and suggested that the area be developed for agri-tourism.

J. Singh, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing employment and economic opportunities and lack of environmental impacts.

A. Gill, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing lack of environmental impacts, retention of trees and green space, employment and economic opportunities and proximity to the American border and truck routes.

R. Greywall, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing employment and economic opportunities.

R. Singh, Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing employment and economic opportunities and environmental preservation.

B. Greywall, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing employment and economic opportunities.

J. Swanson, South Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal.

Written submissions were received as follows:

- Email dated July 20, 2021, B. and P. Gardner expressing opposition for the proposal citing tress and agricultural land.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, B. Menzo expressing opposition for the proposal citing wildlife, trees and agricultural land.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, C. and D. Roulson expressing opposition for the proposal citing wildlife, trees and agricultural land.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, C. Johnson expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, wildlife and trees.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, C. Kwok expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, D. Berringer expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, wildlife and trees.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, D. Denischuk expressing opposition for the proposal citing wildlife, trees and agricultural land.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, D. Lapierre expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, wildlife and trees.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, G. Starrs expressing opposition for the proposal citing wildlife.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, H. Dickinson expressing opposition for the proposal citing trees and environment.

- Email dated July 20, 2021, H. Ible expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, H. Hanna expressing opposition for the proposal citing wildlife, trees and agricultural land.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, J. Cook expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, J. Priebe expressing opposition for proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, K. Brown expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, L. Fontaine expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, wildlife and trees.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, L. Hunter expressing opposition for the proposal citing agricultural land, environment and wildlife.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, M. McGarry expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, N. Marynick expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, wildlife and trees.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, P. Johnson expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, wildlife and trees.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, R. and E. Kembel expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and wildlife.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, S. Baker expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Letter dated July 13, 2021, Township of Langley expressing concern for the proposal environment.
- Email dated July 14, 2021, A. Gill expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 14, 2021, H. Singh expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 14, 2021, K. Dhessa expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 14, 2021, S. Shoker expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 14, 2021, T. Dhessa expressing support for the proposal.
- Letter dated July 15, 2021, Greg Ganz expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, L. Rubuliak expressing concern for the proposal citing environment and wildlife.
- Email dated July 15, 2021, W. Jefferies expressing opposition for the proposal citing agricultural land.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, A. Kaps expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and wildlife.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, B. Soriano expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and wildlife.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, D. Dopud opposition for the proposal citing environment and wildlife.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, E. Hart expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, F. Demosten expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, F. Demosten expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, H. Rivers expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and wildlife.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, H. Warman expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, P. Apeles expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.

- Email dated July 16, 2021, T. Ankenman expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 16, 2021, T. Williams expressing concern for the proposal citing wildlife, trees and small business.
- Email dated July 17, 2021, A. Regan expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 17, 2021, J. Sanders expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 17, 2021, S. Green expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, wildlife and traffic.
- Email dated July 18, 2021, A. Kaps expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and wildlife.
- Email dated July 18, 2021, G. Jefferies expressing opposition for the proposal citing wildlife.
- Email dated July 18, 2021, L. Stepney expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 18, 2021, L. Ypenburg expressing opposition for the proposal citing wildlife.
- Email dated July 18, 2021, R. Kaptyn expressing opposition for the proposal citing wildlife.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, C. McGoff Dean expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, D. Hanson expressing concern for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, Emily Best expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, wildlife and trees.
- Letter dated July 19, 2021, G. Loudon expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, wildlife and trees.
- Letter dated July 19, 2021, H. Faw expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and wildlife.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, M. Falconer expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, M. Hulme expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, M. Mackenzie expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, M. Schlifer expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, P. Kehler expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, P. Petrala expressing opposition for the proposal citing climate change.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, R. Kaptyn expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, W. Parsons expressing opposition for the proposal wildlife.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, A. Clark expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, A. Schroeder expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, wildlife and trees.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, B. Blair-Harvey expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, wildlife and trees.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, D. Lapierre expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, wildlife and trees.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, E. Fuchs expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and wildlife.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, J. and P. Tredwell expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, wildlife and trees.

- Email dated July 20, 2021, P. Chin expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, A. Den Dikken expressing opposition for the proposal citing wildlife.
- Letter dated July 7, 2021, A. Dhama expressing support for the proposal.
- Letter dated July 7, 2021, A. Dhama expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, A. Kear expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, B. Lattery expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, B. MacEwan and J. Muir expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, wildlife and trees.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, B. Wilkinson expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, C. Ball expressing opposition for the proposal citing wildlife.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, C. Druce expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, wildlife and trees.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, C. Isaak expressing concerns for the proposal.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, C. Zirk expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, wildlife and trees.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, D. Booth expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and wildlife.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, D. Eglen expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, wildlife and trees.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, D. Johnstone expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, D. Lankmayr expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, D. Welters expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, F. Pownall expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, G. Brosas expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and wildlife.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, G. Heintz expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and wildlife.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, G. Ronse expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, wildlife and trees.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, H. Shoker expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, H. Thiessen expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, wildlife and trees.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, J. Bray expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, wildlife and trees.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, J. Duke expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, J. Freeman expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, J. Friesen expressing concerns for the proposal citing wildlife.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, K. Heber and B. Best expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and wildlife.

- Email dated July 21, 2021, K. Yorke expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, wildlife and traffic.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, L. Burchill expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and wildlife.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, L. Campbell expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, wildlife and agricultural land.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, L. Furlani expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, L. Vaugois expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, M. Jonson expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and wildlife.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, M. Lemay expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, R. Khrod expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, R. Sahota expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, S. Ellingson expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, S. Gardner expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, wildlife and trees.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, S. Sahota expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, S.G. expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, wildlife and trees.
- Letter received July 21, 2021, Bob Donnelly expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, T. Lattery expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email received July 22, 2021, D. Brook expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, G. Maggs expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, wildlife and trees.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, G. Williams expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and wildlife.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, I. King expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, J. LaRocque expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, wildlife and trees.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, J. Lucas expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, J. Ogden expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, L. Jones expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and wildlife.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, M. Collison expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email received July 22, 2021, M. Ellison-Thomas expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, P. Egelstad expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, wildlife and trees.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, S. Maggs expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, wildlife and trees.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, T. Spencer expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, Y. Hogenes expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, R. Landale expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Letter dated July 14, 2021, B. Finucan expressing support for the proposal.
- Letter dated July 14, 2021, L. McBoyle expressing support for the proposal.

- Letter dated July 19, 2021, V. Savkur expressing support for the proposal.
- Letter dated July 21, 2021, P. Ellery expressing support for the proposal.
- Letter dated July 21, 2021, S. Grant expressing support for the proposal.
- Letter dated July 21, 2021, M. Lighting expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, A. Basra expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, A. Farr expressing opposition for the proposal citing endangered species and environment.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, A. Patterson expressing opposition for the proposal citing land designation and environment.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, B. Sangha expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, B. Singh expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, C. Lew de Albizurez expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, C. Meersman expressing opposition for the proposal citing land designation and environment.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, D. McLeod expressing opposition for the proposal citing land designation and environment.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, E. Kitura expressing opposition for the proposal citing agricultural land, endangered species and environment.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, E. North expressing opposition for the proposal citing land designation, endangered species, agricultural land and environment.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, F. Bunnell expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, H. Singh expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, I. Ribeiro expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, J. Calbick expressing opposition for the proposal citing land designation and environment.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, L. Fung expressing opposition for the proposal citing agricultural land, land designation and environment.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, M. Atwal expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, M. Salmond expressing concern for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, N. Green expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, P. Kandola expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, R. Gill expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, R. Saroya expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, R. Sidhu expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, S. Saroya expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, U. Basra expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, A. Holmlund expressing opposition for the proposal citing agricultural land and environment.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, A. Hudson expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, A. Patterson expressing opposition for the proposal citing land designation and environment.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, A. Prosser expressing concern for the proposal.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, A. Skrijelj expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, A. Taylor expressing opposition for the proposal citing land designation, endangered species and environment.

- Email dated July 23, 2021, A. Wasik expressing concern for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, B. Bjorklund expressing opposition for the proposal citing traffic, aquifer and agricultural land.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, B. Chu expressing opposition for the proposal citing traffic, aquifer and environment.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, G. Gill expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, B. Mann expressing concern for the proposal citing change of site.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, B. Mann expressing concern for the proposal citing change of site.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, B. Randhawa expressing concern for the proposal citing change of site.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, C. Chu expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and agricultural land.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, C. Connal expressing opposition for the proposal citing agricultural land and environment.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, C. Fortin expressing opposition for the proposal citing land designation, endangered species, aquifer and environment.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, C. MacNamara expressing opposition for the proposal citing aquifer and environment.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, D. Alary expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, D. Godwin expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, D. Mann expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, E. Layton expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, G. Gill expressing concern for the proposal citing change of site.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, I. Chu expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, I. Kostamo expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, endangered species and agricultural land.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, J. Duke expressing opposition for the proposal citing land designation, endangered species and environment.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, J. Maynes expressing opposition for the proposal citing agricultural land, endangered species and environment.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, K. Matheson expressing concern for the proposal.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, K. Renehan expressing concern for the proposal.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, K. Ross expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, K. Langley expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, M. Leis expressing opposition for the proposal citing aquifer and environment.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, M. MacDonald expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, M. Tang expressing opposition for the proposal citing land designation, endangered species and environment.

- Email dated July 23, 2021, N. Dhesa expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, P. Arora expressing concern for the proposal citing change of site.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, P. Sandberg expressing opposition for the proposal citing endangered species and environment.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, R. Atwal expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, R. Hollins expressing opposition for the proposal citing endangered species and aquifer.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, R. Mackay expressing opposition for the proposal citing endangered species, aquifer and environment.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, R. Mann expressing concern for the proposal citing change of site.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, Little Campbell Watershed Society expressing opposition for the proposal citing endangered species, aquifer and environment.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, S. Sutherland expressing opposition for the proposal citing endangered species, land designation and environment.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, T. Janzen expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 23, 2021, A. Mann expressing concern for the proposal citing change of site and environment.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, B. Sheppard expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, B. Watt expressing concern for the proposal citing change of site.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, C. Adams expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, endangered species and land designation.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, C. Collison expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, C. Martin expressing concern for the proposal citing aquifer and endangered species.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, C. Wright expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, D. Johannes expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and aquifer.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, D. Little expressing opposition for the proposal citing aquifer and environment.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, D. McEwan expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, agricultural land and endangered species.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, D. Singleton expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, aquifer and agricultural land.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, D. Uhlman expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, endangered species and agricultural land.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, E. Fortune expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, land designation and endangered species.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, E. Hannan expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, G. Anderson expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.

- Email dated July 24, 2021, G. Miedema expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, H. Danen expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, land designation and endangered species.
- Letter dated July 24, 2021, J. Imoo expressing concern for the proposal citing environment and schools.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, J. Sedlmair expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, J. Pehar expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, land designation and endangered species.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, J. Thom expressing opposition for the proposal citing development.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, K. Arpink expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, aquifer, land designation and endangered species.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, K. Chisholm expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and agricultural land.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, K. Gaitt expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, K. Godwin expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, K. Martin expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and aquifer.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, L. Cholowski and R. Leonard expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, land designation and endangered species.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, L. Fung expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, agricultural lands and endangered species.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, L. Lawthrop expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, M. Bates expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, agricultural land and endangered species.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, M. Linklater expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, P. Battistoni expressing opposition for the proposal citing development and aquifer.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, P. Rust expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and development.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, R. Andrews expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, R. Fournier expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, R. Humphrey expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, R. Poulsen expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, aquifer and endangered species.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, R. Winston expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, S. deKoning expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, S. Good expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.

- Email dated July 24, 2021, S. Hitchman expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, agricultural land and endangered species.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, S. Moskalyk expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, agricultural land and endangered species.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, S. Vaillant expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, T. Friesen expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, land designation and endangered species.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, W. Bloomquist expressing opposition for the proposal citing development.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, A. Baedak expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, aquifer and endangered species.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, A. Belless expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, A. Bowers expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and agricultural land.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, A. Dhatt expressing opposition for the proposal citing parks.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, A. Farrell expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, A. Keen expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and agricultural land.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, A. McBride expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, A. McCorkell expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, A. Purewal expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, A. Urbanovich expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, A. Wardle expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, B. Neufeld expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and development.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, B. Unrau expressing opposition for the proposal citing notification and environment.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, B. Williams expressing opposition for the proposal citing traffic.
- Letter dated July 22, 2021, M. McDonald expressing concern for the proposal citing environment, land designation and aquifer.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, C. Bunnell expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, C. Newton Chaput expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, land designation and endangered species.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, C. Goode expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, C. Laing expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, C. Monaghan expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and agricultural land.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, C. Robertson expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, C. Shi expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.

- Email dated July 25, 2021, C. So expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, land designation and endangered species.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, C. Sousa expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, C. Walker expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, aquifer and endangered species.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, C. Watson expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, D. Austin expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, D. Burton expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and development.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, D. Dawson expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and aquifer.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, D. Maloway expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, D. Rush expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, aquifer, traffic, endangered species.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, D. Unrau expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, notification and aquifer.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, E. Konrad expressing opposition for the proposal citing agricultural land.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, E. Lafontaine expressing opposition for the proposal citing agricultural land and endangered species.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, E. Linder expressing opposition for the proposal citing agricultural land, notification and endangered species.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, E. Makepeace expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, development and agricultural land.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, G. Borch expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, G. Garner expressing opposition for the proposal citing land designation, environment, endangered species and agricultural land.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, G. Sherk expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, H. Borch expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, aquifer and environment.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, H. Borch expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and development.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, H. Guth expressing opposition for the proposal citing land designation, agricultural land and environment.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, H. Rush expressing opposition for the proposal citing land designation, agricultural land, park, aquifer, endangered species, traffic and environment.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, H. Way expressing opposition for the proposal citing endangered species, agricultural land and environment.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, I. Funk expressing opposition for the proposal citing aquifer.
- Letter dated July 26, 2021, C. Stevenson expressing opposition for the proposal citing aquifer, environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, J. Heavyside expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and park.

- Email dated July 25, 2021, J. Macdonald expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, J. Macdonald expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, J. Salter expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, J. Takai expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, J. Weemhoff expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, notification, endangered species, traffic and agricultural land.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, J. Weemhoff expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and agricultural land.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, J. Wilcock expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, J. and K. Rattray expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, aquifer, land designation and endangered species.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, K. Baker expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, K. Bridgefoot expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, K. Chong expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, K. Chong expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, land designation and endangered species.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, K. Kilbride expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, development and endangered species.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, K. Taylor expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, traffic and park.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, K. Thomas expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and land designation.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, K. Yendrys expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and development.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, L. Borch expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and development.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, L. Furlani expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and development.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, L. Haliburton expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, L. Newberry expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, L. Salaun expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, L. Tsai expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, L. Whitcombe expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, L. Williams expressing opposition for the proposal citing development.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, L. Yang expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, L. Ypenburg expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.

- Email dated July 25, 2021, L. Ypenburg expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, M. Baker expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, M. Baker expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, agricultural land, and endangered species.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, L. Frager expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, M. Griffin expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and park.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, M. Grindlay expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Letter dated July 25, 2021, M. Jackson expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, aquifer and endangered species.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, M. Jackson expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, M. Macdonald expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, M. Manning expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and aquifer.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, M. Shikaze expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and aquifer.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, M. Smith expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, M. Taitt expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, M. Tsai expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, M. Ware expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and agricultural land.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, P. Douglas expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and development.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, P. Engel expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, notification, agricultural land, traffic, land designation and endangered species.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, P. O'Connell expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, land designation.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, P. Swanigan expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, P. Takhar expressing opposition for the proposal citing development.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, P. Williams expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, aquifer and change of site.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, R. Des Cotes expressing concerns for the proposal citing environment, aquifer, endangered species and notification.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, R. Emsley expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, R. Evans expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and aquifer.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, R. Hull expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, R. Mcblain expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.

- Email dated July 25, 2021, R. Sommer expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, R. Wong expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and land designation.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, S. Austin expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, S. Bass expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, S. Godwin expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, S. Hindmarch expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, S. Kroeker expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, notification and agricultural land.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, S. MacPherson expressing opposition for the proposal citing agricultural land.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, S. May expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, S. Turner expressing opposition for the proposal environment and development.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, S. Watkins expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, S. Zhang expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, T. Boorse expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, endangered species, agricultural land and land designation.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, T. Carr expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, agriculture and endangered species.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, T. Fryer expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and agricultural land.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, T. Mawhinney expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and agricultural land.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, T. McNeice expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and aquifer.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, T. Perkins expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Letter dated July 25, 2021, U. Lindenlauf expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, endangered species, notification, agricultural land and traffic.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, V. Fuller expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and development.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, V. Whitlam expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, W. Buckner expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, X. Van Tunen expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, A. Naluz expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, B. So expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, C. Gunson expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, C. Huggett expressing opposition for the proposal.

- Letter dated July 26, 2021, B. So expressing concerns for the proposal citing environment, aquifer, agricultural land and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, C. Maskall expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and aquifer.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, B. Newton Chaput expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, land designation and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, C. Orth expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, C. Smith expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, agricultural land and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, C. Vecchiato expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and development.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, D. Kostamo expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, agricultural land and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, Makepeace expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, notification and agricultural land.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, D. Piezas expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, notification, traffic, endangered species and agricultural land.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, D. Wieler expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, agricultural land and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, F. Cotton expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and aquifer.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, F. Simons expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, S. Rush expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, notification, aquifer, agricultural land and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, G. Barlow expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, traffic, agricultural land and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, G. Snowden expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Letter dated July 21, 2021, C. Orth expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species. Pg. 384
- Email dated July 26, 2021, H. Faw expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and development.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, F. Fuchs expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, agricultural land, aquifer and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, I. Bazso expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, J. and M. Inch expressing concern for the proposal citing environment, aquifer and endangered species. Pg. 388-389
- Email dated July 26, 2021, J. Brodie expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, J. Elliott expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and development.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, J. Jardine expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, aquifer and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, K. Fraser expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and development.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, K. and A. and N. Irwin expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.

- Email dated July 26, 2021, K. Irwin expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, L. Bazso expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, L. DeWitt expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, agricultural land and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, L. Naftel expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, notification, agricultural land, traffic and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, L. Ngo expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, aquifer and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, L. Woods expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, L. Woods expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, notification and agricultural land.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, M. Craig expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, M. Gebauer expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, M. Kostamo expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and aquifer.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, M. Northey expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, M. Pegios expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, N. Breckner expressing opposition for the proposal citing endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, N. Cook expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, N. Giovanella expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, P. Stepney expressing opposition for the proposal citing development.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, R. Newling expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, agricultural land, aquifer and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, S. Buckner expressing concern for the proposal citing environment, land designation, aquifer, agricultural land and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, S. Easu expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, aquifer and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, S. Grewal expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, S. Griffith expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, agricultural land and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, S. Hodges expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, S. Owen expressing opposition for the proposal citing park.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, S. Rush expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, S. Shoker expressing support for the proposal.

- Email dated July 26, 2021, S. St-Onge expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, S. Wishloff expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, land designation and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, T. Etmanski expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Letter dated July 26, 2021, T. McNeice expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, T. Williams expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, V. Isler expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, agricultural land, traffic and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, V. Williams expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, W. Breckner expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and development.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, D. Carlson and R. Smith expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, aquifer, notification and endangered species.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, C. Chow expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, D. and S. Anderson expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, notification, agricultural land, traffic and endangered species.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, J. Varing expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, K. Thomas expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, N. Gillan expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, P. Veen expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, land designation and endangered species.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, S. Mast expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, S. Mast expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, V. Jang expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, W. Buckner expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, A. Baylis expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, A. Egmore expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, A. Neufeld expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, A. Schulz expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, A. Smith expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, A. Weir expressing opposition for the proposal citing development.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, A. Dooley expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and land designation.

- Email dated July 26, 2021, B. Cooper expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, B. Coote expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, aquifer and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, B. Gunson expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, B. Hunter expressing opposition for the proposal citing aquifer and traffic.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, B. So expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, notification, agricultural land, land designation, traffic and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, C. Bishop expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, C. Bray expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, C. Faw expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, notification and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, C. So expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, land designation and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, C. Williams expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Letter dated July 26, 2021, Deb Jack expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, C. Bray expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, D. Riley expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, E. Dossdall expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Letter received July 26, 2021, H. Greco expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, J. Barlow expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, J. Carter expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, aquifer and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, J. Coote expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, J. Inch expressing concern for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Submission dated July 7, 2021, 1064 Form Letters expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, K. Joly expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, L. Bordeleau expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, L. Gawthrop expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, M. Andersson expressing concern for the proposal citing environment, agricultural land and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, M. Balzar expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, M. Dalton expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.

- Email dated July 26, 2021, M. Gebauer expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, agricultural land and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, M. Lamont expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and development.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, N. Makepeace expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, N. Saunders expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, P. Kariya expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, P. Neufeld expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, aquifer and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, R. Balzer expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, R. Faw expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, R. Rick expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, aquifer, agricultural land and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, R. Groat expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, S. Atherton expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, S. Beck expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Submission received July 26, 2021, 458 Petition Signatures in support for the proposal.

The following expressed an opinion in writing and did not wish to speak:

- 32 in support; and
- 57 in opposition.

3. **"Surrey Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2013, No. 18020, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20417"**
"Surrey Zoning Bylaw, 1993, No. 12000, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20418"
Application: 7921-0139-00

CIVIC ADDRESS: 5510 – 180 Street

APPLICANT: Owner: Kwantlen Polytechnic University
 Agent: IBI Group (Tony Gill)

PURPOSE: The applicant is requesting an amendment to the Official Community Plan to redesignate a portion of the site for Figure 3: from Industrial to Mixed Employment and Figure 42: from Industrial to Mixed Employment and amend Table 7A: Land Use Designation to permit a density up to 2.50 FAR. In addition, the proposal includes rezoning a portion of the site from Light Impact Industrial Zone to Comprehensive Development Zone. The proposal also includes the development of a new Surrey Hospital and Cancer Centre with accessory child care centre.

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

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

D. Jack, Surrey Environmental Partners: The delegation spoke to the removal of trees from the subject site and replanting schedule, the proposed redesignation of the site from Industrial to Mixed Employment, and lack of information regarding the review of the Ecosystem Development Permit.

K. Mah, Fraser Health: The delegation provided an overview of the proposal and spoke to capital investments by the Province, future and current care needs and public consultation.

A. Kaps, North Surrey: The delegation spoke to the tree replanting schedule, the traffic impacts and protection of water courses on site.

Written submissions were received as follows:

- Email dated July 19, 2021, Ken Krasnikoff expressing concerns for the proposal citing parking, traffic, congestion and noise.
- Email dated July 19, 2021, W. and S. Arnot expressing concerns for the proposal citing decrease in property value, height of development and landscaping.
- Email dated July 20 and 22, 2021, R. Landale expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, D. Johnston expressing concern for the proposal citing parking, traffic and residential.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, D. Maloway expressing concern for the proposal citing traffic and location.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, A. Kaps expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, R. Stone expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 26, 2021, A. Price expressing opposition for the proposal citing traffic.

4. **"Surrey Zoning Bylaw, 1993, No. 12000, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20412"**
Application: 7920-0227-00

CIVIC ADDRESS: 16756 - 20 Avenue

APPLICANT: Owners: M. Sambhi, R. Binpal
 Agent: Hub Engineering Inc. (Mike Kompter)

PURPOSE: The applicant is requesting to rezone the site from One-Acre Residential Zone to Single Family Residential (10) Zone and to Single Family Residential (13) Zone in order to subdivide the site into nine single family small lots.

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

R. Landale, Fleetwood: The delegation spoke to the removal of trees from the subject site and contributions to the Green City fund to be determined, surrounding developments, proximity to local parks and development contribution fees.

D. Jack, Surrey Environmental Partners: The delegation spoke to the removal of trees from the subject site, benefits of trees, contributions to the Green City fund to be determined and proximity to local parks.

A. Kaps, North Surrey: The delegation spoke to the removal of trees from the subject site and student enrolment projections.

Written submissions were received as follows:

- Email dated July 15, 2021, D. Kusel expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 18, 2021, L. Bauder expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 20, 2021, D. Ivens expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 21, 2021, R. Quinn expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, R. Landale expressing opposition for the proposal citing trees, densification and schools.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, A. Kaps expressing concern for the proposal citing taxes and schools.

5. **"Surrey Zoning Bylaw, 1993, No. 12000, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20411"**
Application: 7921-0059-00

CIVIC ADDRESS: 3373 - 194 Street

APPLICANT: Owner: 0758220 B.C. Ltd. (Director Information: Parmjit Boparai, Chandrakant Shah)
 Agent: Orion Construction (Paul Bangma)

PURPOSE: The applicant is requesting to rezone the site from General Agriculture Zone to Business Park 1 Zone in order to allow the development of a 9,197 square metre industrial building.

In addition, the proposal includes a Development Variance Permit to reduce the minimum rear yard requirement from 7.5 metres to 0 metres.

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

R. Landale, Fleetwood: The delegation spoke to environmental impacts due to surrounding developments, removal of trees from the subject site, Green City fund contributions and traffic.

D. Jack, Surrey Environmental Partners: The delegation spoke to the removal of trees from the subject site, sidewalk realignment to retain trees and lack of planting on the flat roof.

A. Kaps, North Surrey: The delegation spoke to the single dimension provided for the setback and the tree replanting schedule.

Written submissions were received as follows:

- Email dated July 22, 2021, R. Landale expressing opposition for the proposal citing trees, environment and traffic.
- Letter dated July 24, 2021, I. Thielemann expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment and endangered species.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, A. Kaps expressing opposition for the proposal citing taxes and trees.

**6. "Surrey Zoning Bylaw, 1993, No. 12000, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20413"
Application: 7920-0126-00**

CIVIC ADDRESS: 14509, 14529, 14577, 14585 and 14595 – 104 Avenue;
14547 - 104 Avenue (14549 – 104 Avenue)

APPLICANT: Owner: Guildford 104 Ave Holdings Ltd.
Agent: Guildford 104 Ave Holdings Ltd. (Ross Moore)

PURPOSE: The applicant is requesting to rezone the site from
Downtown Commercial Zone to Comprehensive
Development Zone in order to allow the development of
two 6-storey apartment buildings with approximately
288 rental dwelling units and underground parking.

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

R. Landale, Fleetwood: The delegation spoke to service pipes, new road construction, removal of trees from the subject site, road safety and lack of development contribution fees.

Council recessed from 11:59 p.m. – 12:02 a.m.

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

A. Kaps, North Surrey: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing the removal of trees from the subject site and inadequate contribution to the Green City fund.

P. Garcha, Surrey: The delegation spoke in support of the proposal citing need for rental housing.

Written submissions were received as follows:

- Email dated July 22, 2021, R. Landale expressing opposition for the proposal citing sanitary and water mains, trees and traffic.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, J. Murphy expressing opposition for the proposal citing parking, housing and environment.

- Email dated July 24, 2021, A. Kaps expressing opposition for the proposal citing trees and health.

One individual expressed opposition and did not wish to speak.

7. **"Surrey Zoning Bylaw, 1993, No. 12000, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20410"**
Application: 7921-0071-00

CIVIC ADDRESS: 8826 - 140A Street

APPLICANT: Owner: J. Sandhu
Agent: M. Sandhu

PURPOSE: The applicant is requesting to rezone the site from Single Family Residential Gross Density Zone to Single Family Residential Zone in order to allow the development of a new single-family dwelling on an existing lot.

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

R. Landale, Fleetwood: The delegation spoke to concerns expressed by the Parks, Recreation & Culture department and the deferral of comments from the arborist.

D. Jack, Surrey Environmental Partners: The delegation spoke to the deferral of comments from the arborist.

A. Kaps, North Surrey: The delegation spoke to concerns expressed by the Parks, Recreation & Culture department and deferral of comments from the arborist.

Written submissions were received as follows:

- Email dated July 15, 2021, A. Castrillon expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, R. Landale expressing opposition for the proposal citing trees.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, A. Kaps expressing concern for the proposal citing staff concerns.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, J. Wright expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.
- Email dated July 25, 2021, S. Heer expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment.

8. "Surrey Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2013, No. 18020, Amendment Bylaw, 2020, No. 20141"
"Surrey Zoning Bylaw, 1993, No. 12000, Amendment Bylaw, 2020, No. 20142"
Application: 7919-0223-00, 7919-0223-01

CIVIC ADDRESS: 13430 and 13416 - 105A Avenue; 13437 - 105 Avenue;
10536, 10528, 10500, 10492 and 10516 University Drive;
10529, 10519, 10511, 10501 and 10537 - 134A Street

APPLICANT: Owner: 105 University View Homes Ltd.
Agent: IBI Group (Salim Narayanan)

PURPOSE: The applicant is seeking to amend the Official Community Plan to include the site in Figure 16: Central Business District Densities with a permitted density of 5.5 FAR. The applicant is also seeking to rezone the site from Single Family Residential Zone and Duplex Residential Zone to Comprehensive Development Zone.

The development was previously supported and includes two high-rise residential towers, a 12-storey mid-rise podium and ground level child care facility in City Centre. An additional Public Hearing is scheduled to address changes to the proposal that include current language related to the required amenity contributions, an increase to the density as well as modifications to parking and balcony requirements.

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

R. Landale, Fleetwood: The delegation spoke in opposition to the proposal citing density.

D. Jack, Surrey Environmental Partners: The delegation spoke to the removal of trees from the subject site and the location of the outdoor amenity area and children's play area under the SkyTrain.

A. Kaps, North Surrey: The delegation spoke to the student enrolment projections and additional density in exchange for removal of balcony space.

M. Smith, St. Helen's Park: The delegation expressed concerns regarding the state of trees in the City.

Written submissions were received as follows:

- Email dated July 22, 2021, R. Landale expressing opposition for the proposal citing densification.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, A. Kaps expressing concern for the proposal citing housing.

9. "Surrey Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2013, No. 18020, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20415"
"Surrey Zoning Bylaw, 1993, No. 12000, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20416"
Application: 7920-0244-00, 7920-0244-01

CIVIC ADDRESS: 9525 King George Boulevard

APPLICANT: Owners: Weststone One King George Developments Ltd.,
Weststone Two King George Developments Ltd.,
Weststone Three King George Developments Ltd.
Agent: Weststone Group (Kim Maust)

PURPOSE: The applicant is requesting an amendment to the Official Community Plan to redesignate the site by amending Figure 3: from Multiple Residential to Central Business District and Figure 16: to include the site as 3,5 FAR. In addition, the proposal includes rezoning the site from Tourist Accommodation Zone to Comprehensive Development Zone, in order to allow the phased development of three buildings in City Centre, including one 37 storey mixed-use tower, one 30 storey high-rise residential tower and one 12 storey mid-rise residential tower.

In addition, the proposal includes a Development Variance Permit to reduce the minimum streamside setback distance for a Class A (red-coded) Channelized Stream from 25 metres to a minimum of 12.9 metres, measured from top of bank, on the south side of the proposed realigned watercourse.

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

R. Landale, Fleetwood: The delegation spoke to man-made river diversions, removal of trees from the subject site, conveyance of riparian area setback to the City, parking, lack of a Traffic Impact Assessment, road safety and development contribution fees.

D. Jack, Surrey Environmental Partners: The delegation spoke to the removal of trees from the subject site, surrounding riparian areas conveyed to the City and appearance of riparian areas as parkland.

A. Kaps, North Surrey: The delegation expressed concerns regarding a creek located on site, traffic and proximity to local parks.

Written submissions were received as follows:

- Submission dated July 11, 2021, 67 Petition Signatures expressing opposition for the proposal.
- Letter dated July 6, 2021, Anita Huberman expressing support for the proposal.
- Email dated July 22, 2021, R. Landale expressing opposition for the proposal citing environment, trees, parking and traffic.
- Email dated July 24, 2021, A. Kaps expressing concern for the proposal citing traffic and schools.

Two individuals expressed opposition and did not wish to speak.

C. COMMITTEE REPORTS

1. Agricultural, Environment and Investment Advisory Committee - June 9, 2021

It was Moved by Councillor Guerra
Seconded by Councillor Patton
That the minutes of the Agricultural,
Environment and Investment Advisory Committee meeting held on June 9, 2021,
be received.

RES.R21-1489 Carried

D. BOARD/COMMISSION REPORTS

1. Board of Variance - April 14, 2021

It was Moved by Councillor Guerra
Seconded by Councillor Patton
That the minutes of the Board of Variance
meeting held on April 14, 2021, be received.

RES.R21-1490 Carried

2. Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission - June 9, 2021

(a) It was Moved by Councillor Guerra
Seconded by Councillor Patton
That the minutes of the Surrey Heritage
Advisory Commission meeting held on June 9, 2021, be received.

RES.R21-1491 Carried

(b) The recommendations of these minutes were considered and dealt with as follows:

**House and Cottage at 17707 & 17719 56A Avenue
Proposed Rezoning and Heritage Revitalization Agreement (HRA)
Addition to the Heritage Register
File: 7920-0223-00**

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

1. Receive the report dated May 28, 2021 regarding an application for a rezoning and Heritage Revitalization Agree (HRA) for the house and cottage located at 17707 and 17719 56A Avenue as information (Appendix I); and
2. Add the house and cottage at 17707 and 17719 56A Avenue to the Surrey Heritage Register.

RES.R21-1492 Carried

3. Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission – July 14, 2021

Council was requested to consider the following recommendation of the July 14, 2021 Surrey Heritage Advisory Commission meeting in advance of receiving the minutes:

Willard Kitchen House (2590 O'Hara Lane) – Application for Roof Repair

File: 6800-14

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

1. Receive the report dated June 30, 2021 regarding a financial grant for roof repair for the Willard Kitchen House located at 2590 O'Hara Lane as information;
2. Approve financial assistance in the amount of \$4,165.50 which represents 50% of the value of the works as per the quote provided by South-West Roof Restoration Inc.; and
3. Direct staff to advise the applicant that payment of financial assistance shall only be made following inspection by appropriate City staff to ensure that the works have been undertaken in accordance with the original terms of the application.

RES.R21-1493

Carried

E. MAYOR'S REPORT**1. Proclamations**

File: 0630-02

Councillor Guerra read the following proclamation:

- (a) National Polycystic Kidney Disease (PKD) Awareness Day – September 4, 2021

F. GOVERNMENTAL REPORTS

This section had no items to consider.

G. CORPORATE REPORTS

The Corporate Reports, under date of July 26, 2021, were considered and dealt with as follows:

**Item No. R148 Local Area Service – Sanitary Sewer Extension on 127A Street
from 1914 to 1941 -127A Street
File: 4721-006**

Note: See Bylaw No. 20419 in the H Section.

The General Manager, Engineering submitted a report to advise Council of a petition that has been received by the City for the installation of a sanitary sewer main extension by way of a Local Area Service ("LAS") process and to recommend that such works be constructed under a LAS Bylaw in accordance with City policy.

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

1. Approve the establishment of a Local Area Service to allow a sanitary sewer main extension on 127A Street from 1914 to 1941 - 127A Street, as illustrated on the map attached to the report as Appendix "I", at an estimated total cost of \$181,000, which costs will be fully recovered by a Local Area Service charge that will be apportioned based on final costs and on a frontage basis all in accordance with City policy; and
2. Authorize the City Clerk to bring forward the necessary Local Area Service Bylaw for the required readings.

RES.R21-1494

Carried

Item No. R149 E-Comm 9-1-1 Board of Directors Designate for Election and Designate to the 2021 Annual General Meeting
File: 0540-20

The General Manager, Corporate Services submitted a report to request Council's approval to designate a City of Surrey representative for election to the E-Comm Board of Directors, endorse the individual chosen by the City of White Rock as a designate for election to the Board and designate a City of Surrey representative to the 2021 AGM to the Shareholders of E-Comm, and to represent the City generally for any required business prior to the 2022 AGM.

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

1. Approve Terry Waterhouse, General Manager, Policing Transition, as a designate for election to the E-Comm Board of Directors (the "Board");
2. Endorse the individual chosen by the City of White Rock as a designate for election to the Board;
3. Designate Terry Waterhouse, General Manager, Policing Transition, as the City of Surrey's representative to the 2021 Annual General Meeting ("AGM") and generally for any required business prior to the 2022 AGM of the Shareholders of E-Comm; and
3. Authorize the City Clerk to forward a copy of the resolution to E-Comm, the City of Langley, City of White Rock and the Township of Langley.

RES.R21-1495

Carried

With Councillors Hundial and Locke
opposed.

Item No. R150 Recommendation for a Cloverdale Mural Project
File: 7800-01

The General Manager, Parks, Recreation & Culture submitted a report to provide information on the City's process for reviewing mural proposals, and to obtain Council approval to proceed with completing the design of the mural designs detailed in the report.

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

1. Receive Corporate Report R150 for information; and
2. Authorize the Cloverdale Mural Project group to proceed with the implementation of the three murals as generally described in the report and attached as Appendix "I".

RES.R21-1496

Carried

Item No. R151 Award of Contract No. 1220-040-2021-057
Civil Construction for Two Lit Synthetic Turf Fields and
One Rubberized Walking Track – Two Park Sites
File: 6140-20/C

The General Manager, Parks, Recreation & Culture submitted a report regarding the Award of Contract for Civil Construction for one lit synthetic turf field and walking track at Newton Athletic Park and a one lit synthetic turf field at South Surrey Athletic Park.

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

1. Award Contract No. 1220-040-2021-057 to GPM Civil Contracting Incorporated in the amount of \$5,738,250.00, including GST, for civil construction for two lit synthetic turf fields and one rubberized walking track at two athletic parks;
2. Set the expenditure authorization limit for Contract No. 1220-040-2021-057 at \$6,312,075.00 (including GST and contingency); and
3. Authorize the General Manager, Parks, Recreation & Culture, to execute Contract No. 1220-040-2021-057.

RES.R21-1497

Carried

Item No. R152 Award of Contract No. 1220-030-2021-020
Nicomekl Riverfront Park –Phase 1 Detailed Design Services –
Disaster Mitigation and Adaptation Fund
File: 2021-020

The General Manager, Parks, Recreation & Culture submitted a report to obtain approval to award a contract for detailed design and permitting of the Hadden Mill and Oxbow Zones, phase I of the Nicomekl Riverfront Park, generally as shown on the preliminary concept plan attached to the report as Appendix "I", in keeping with the approved Disaster Mitigation and Adaptation Fund Program. As shown in Appendix "I", the Hadden Mill and Oxbow Zones (phase 1) are envisioned to include multiple amenities like trails, a kayak/canoe launch, a natural styled playground, picnic areas, viewpoints, an amphitheatre, a great lawn, public art, heritage elements, washrooms, and parking lots. Also included are multiple ecological and flood adaptation elements like a habitat island, a new flood channel, wetlands, ponds, meadows, enhanced riparian area, new planting, and elements that are resilient to flooding like trails and parking lots.

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

1. Award Contract No. 1220-030-2021-020 to space2place design inc. in the amount of \$1,053,368.66, including GST, for the detailed design and permitting of the Hadden Mill and Oxbow Zones of the Nicomekl Riverfront Park, as a component of the City's Coastal Climate Adaptation Works;
2. Set the expenditure authorization limit for Contract No. 1220-030-2021-020 at \$1,264,042.40 (including contingency and GST); and
3. Authorize the General Manager, Parks, Recreation and Culture to execute Contract No. 1220-030-2021-020.

RES.R21-1498

Carried

**Item No. R153 Recommendation for a Mural on Old Yale Road at
 King George Hub
 File: 7800-01**

The General Manager, Parks, Recreation & Culture submitted a report to provide information on the City's process for reviewing mural proposals, and to obtain Council approval for a mural design to be installed at the PCI King George Hub located at 13640 George Junction.

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

1. Receive Corporate Report R153 for information; and
2. Authorize PCI King George Development Inc. to proceed with the implementation of a mural titled '*Star Field on Old Yale Road*', located at the new King George Hub development at 13640 George Junction as generally described in the report and attached as Appendix "I".

RES.R21-1499

Carried

**Item No. R154 Award of Contract No. 1220-060-2020-007
 Provision of Janitorial and Custodial Supplies at
 Parks, Recreation & Culture Facilities
 File: 0710-07**

The General Manager, Parks, Recreation & Culture submitted a report obtain Council's approval to award a Contract for the provision of janitorial and custodial supplies for use at Parks, Recreation & Culture facilities to A&G Supply Ltd.

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

1. Award Contract No. 1220-060-2020-007 to A&G Supply Ltd. for the provision of janitorial and custodial supplies for use at Parks, Recreation & Culture facilities for a one-year term in the amount of \$554,600 (including GST and PST);
2. Approve the option to extend Contract No. 1220-060-2020-007 for four additional one-year terms at the City's discretion to provide janitorial and custodial supplies for use at Parks, Recreation & Culture facilities;
3. Set the expenditure authorization limit for Contract No. 1220-060-2020-007, and subsequent one-year terms at \$610,000 (including all applicable taxes and contingency) plus annual Consumer Price Index ("CPI") rate adjustments; and
4. Authorize the General Manager, Parks, Recreation & Culture to execute Contract No. 1220-060-2020-007 and approve up to four optional one-year term extensions related to Contract No. 1220-060-2020-007 within the approved annual expenditure authorization limit of \$610,000 (including all applicable taxes and contingency), plus annual CPI rate adjustments.

RES.R21-1500

Carried

**Item No. R155 Partnering Agreement and License and Operating Agreement
 between the City of Surrey and Alexandra Neighbourhood
 House for Childcare at the Don Christian Childcare Facility
 File: 0450-01**

The General Manager, Parks, Recreation & Culture submitted a report to obtain Council's approval to enter into a Partnering Agreement and a License and Operating Agreement with Alexandra Neighbourhood House to operate childcare services at the new Don Christian Childcare facility.

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

1. Award Contract 1220-050-2021-013 to the Association of Neighbourhood Houses BC ("Alexandra Neighbourhood House") to operate the childcare at the new Don Christian Childcare facility located on the east side of the Don Christian Recreation Centre Site at 6220 - 184 Street;
2. Approve the execution by the General Manager of Parks, Recreation & Culture of a Partnering Agreement between the City and Alexandra Neighbourhood House, subject to compliance with the public notice provisions of the Community Charter, SBC 2003, C.26, as approved by the City Solicitor all as generally described in the report; and

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

1. Receive Corporate Report R158 for information;
2. Award Contract No. 1721-011-11 to Tybo Contracting Ltd. in the amount of \$15,524,250.00 (including GST) for the 84 Avenue corridor between King George Boulevard and 140 Street and associated park improvements;
3. Set the expenditure authorization limit for Contract No. 1721-011-11 at \$17,000,00.00 (including GST and contingency);
4. Award Consultant Construction Agreement No. 1721-011 C1 to Aplin & Martin Consultants Ltd. in the amount of \$682,500.00 (including GST) for the related engineering construction services;
5. Set the expenditure authorization limit for Contract No. 1721-011 C1 at \$750,000.00 (including GST and contingency); and
6. Authorize the General Manager, Engineering to execute Contracts 1721-011-11 and 1721-011 C1.

RES.R21-1504

Carried

With Councillors Annis, Hundial, Locke and Pettigrew opposed.

Item No. R159 Award of Contract No. 5520-001-21
District Energy Distribution Piping System Expansion
File: 5520-001/21

The General Manager, Engineering submitted a report regarding the Award of Contract for District Energy distribution piping system expansion.

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

1. Award Contract No. 5520-001-21 to Complete Utility Contractors Ltd. in the amount of \$1,395,464.18 (including GST) for the District Energy Distribution Piping Expansion project;
2. Set the expenditure authorization limit for Contract No. 5520-001-21 at \$1,540,000.00 (including GST and contingency); and
3. Authorize the General Manager, Engineering to execute Contract No. 5520-001-21.

RES.R21-1505

Carried

RES.R21-1511 It was Moved by Councillor Hundial
Seconded by Councillor Locke
That "Surrey Zoning Bylaw, 1993, No. 12000,
Text Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20318" pass its third reading.
Defeated by members remaining
With Mayor McCallum and Councillors
Elford, Guerra, Nagra and Patton opposed.

Development Variance Permit No. 7919-0306-00
15077 and 15153 – 20 Avenue
To increase the maximum building height; reduce the required on-site parking;
reduce the indoor amenity requirement of the new six storey building; and relax
setback requirements in order to retain two existing buildings on the subject site.

RES.R21-1512 It was Moved by Councillor Hundial
Seconded by Councillor Locke
That Council support Development Variance
Permit No. 7919-0306-00, and consider issuance of the Permit upon final approval
of the associated Development Permit.
Defeated by members remaining
With Mayor McCallum and Councillors
Elford, Guerra, Nagra and Patton opposed.

Councillor Annis rejoined the meeting at 1:11 a.m.

2. "Surrey Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2013, No. 18020, Text Amendment Bylaw, 2021,
No. 20393"
3900-20-20393 – Regulatory Text Amendment
This bylaw includes amendments to Figures 3, 4, 17, 42, 43, 51 and 63 of the
Official Community Plan to align with the revised Stage 1 Land Use Plan for
South Campbell Heights.

Council direction received July 12, 2021
Corporate Report Item No. 2021-R147

It was Moved by Councillor Guerra
Seconded by Councillor Patton
That "Surrey Official Community Plan Bylaw,
2013, No. 18020, Text Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20393" pass its third reading.

Before the question was put:

It was Moved by Councillor Annis
 Seconded by Councillor Hundial
 That "Surrey Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2013, No. 18020, Text Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20393" be referred back to staff to conduct additional consultation with community environmental groups and address environmental concerns that have been raised.

RES.R21-1513 Defeated
 With Mayor McCallum and Councillors Elford, Guerra, Nagra and Patton opposed

The vote was then taken on the main motion:

RES.R21-1514 Carried
 With Councillors Annis, Hundial, Locke and Pettigrew opposed

3. "Surrey Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2013, No. 18020, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20417"
 7921-0139-00
 Owner: Kwantlen Polytechnic University
 Agent: IBI Group (Tony Gill)
 To amend Figure 3: General Land Use Designations from Industrial to Mixed Employment and to amend Figure 42: from Industrial to Mixed Employment and amend Table 7A: Land Use Designation to permit a density up to 2.50 FAR for a portion of the site located at 5510 – 180 Street.

Council direction received July 12, 2021

It was Moved by Councillor Guerra
 Seconded by Councillor Patton
 That "Surrey Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2013, No. 18020, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20417" pass its third reading.

RES.R21-1515 Carried

"Surrey Zoning Bylaw, 1993, No. 12000, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20418"
 IL to CD – a portion of 5510 – 180 Street - to permit the development of a new Surrey Hospital and Cancer Centre with accessory child care centre.

Council direction received July 12, 2021

It was Moved by Councillor Guerra
 Seconded by Councillor Patton
 That "Surrey Zoning Bylaw, 1993, No. 12000, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20418" pass its third reading.

RES.R21-1516 Carried

4. "Surrey Zoning Bylaw, 1993, No. 12000, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20412"
7920-0227-00
Owners: M. Sambhi, R. Binpal
Agent: Hub Engineering Inc. (Mike Kompter)
RA to RF-10 and RF-13 – 16756 - 20 Avenue – to subdivide the site into nine single family small lots.

Council direction received July 12, 2021

RES.R21-1517
It was
Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20412" pass its third reading.
Moved by Councillor Guerra
Seconded by Councillor Patton
That "Surrey Zoning Bylaw, 1993, No. 12000,
Carried
With Councillor Pettigrew opposed.

5. "Surrey Zoning Bylaw, 1993, No. 12000, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20411"
7921-0059-00
Owner: 0758220 B.C. Ltd. (Director Information: Parmjit Boparai, Chandrakant Shah)
Agent: Orion Construction (Paul Bangma)
A-1 to IB-1 – 3373 - 194 Street – to permit the development of a 9,197 square metre industrial building.

Council direction received July 12, 2021

RES.R21-1518
It was
Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20411" pass its third reading.
Moved by Councillor Guerra
Seconded by Councillor Patton
That "Surrey Zoning Bylaw, 1993, No. 12000,
Carried
With Councillor Pettigrew opposed.

Development Variance Permit No. 7921-0059-00
3373 - 194 Street
To reduce the minimum rear yard requirement from 7.5 metres to 0 metres.

RES.R21-1519
It was
Permit No. 7921-0059-00, and consider issuance of the Permit upon final approval of the associated Development Permit.
Moved by Councillor Guerra
Seconded by Councillor Patton
That Council support Development Variance
Carried
With Councillor Pettigrew opposed.

"Surrey Zoning Bylaw, 1993, No. 12000, Amendment Bylaw, 2020, No. 20142" RF and RM-D to CD – 13416, 13430 - 105A Avenue; 10492, 10500, 10516, 10528, 10536 University Drive; 10501, 10511, 10519, 10529, 10537 - 134A Street; and 13437 - 105 Avenue – to permit the development of two high-rise market residential towers and one mid-rise rental apartment building with a ground level child care facility.

Council direction received July 12, 2021

RES.R21-1523	It was Amendment Bylaw, 2020, No. 20142"	Moved by Councillor Guerra Seconded by Councillor Patton That "Surrey Zoning Bylaw, 1993, No. 12000, pass its third reading. <u>Carried</u>
--------------	---	---

9. "Surrey Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2013, No. 18020, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20415"
 7920-0244-00, 7920-0244-01
 Owners: Weststone One King George Developments Ltd., Weststone Two King George Developments Ltd., Weststone Three King George Developments Ltd.
 Agent: Weststone Group (Kim Maust)
 To amend Figure 3: General Land Use Designations from Multiple Residential to Central Business District and to amend Figure 16: to add 3.5 FAR to the site located at 9525 King George Boulevard.

Council direction received July 12, 2021

RES.R21-1524	It was 2013, No. 18020, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20415"	Moved by Councillor Guerra Seconded by Councillor Patton That "Surrey Official Community Plan Bylaw, pass its third reading. <u>Carried</u> With Councillor Pettigrew opposed.
--------------	--	---

"Surrey Zoning Bylaw, 1993, No. 12000, Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20416" CTA to CD – 9525 King George Boulevard – to permit the phased development of three buildings in City Centre, including one 37 storey mixed-use tower, one 30 storey high-rise residential tower and one 12 storey mid-rise residential tower.

Council direction received July 12, 2021

RES.R21-1525	It was Amendment Bylaw, 2021, No. 20416"	Moved by Councillor Guerra Seconded by Councillor Patton That "Surrey Zoning Bylaw, 1993, No. 12000, pass its third reading. <u>Carried</u> With Councillor Pettigrew opposed.
--------------	---	---

Development Variance Permit No. 7920-0244-00
 9525 King George Boulevard
 To reduce the minimum streamside setback distance for a Class A (red-coded) Channelized Stream from 25 metres to a minimum of 12.9 metres, measured from top of bank, on the south side of the proposed realigned watercourse.

It was Moved by Councillor Guerra
 Seconded by Councillor Patton
 That Council support Development Variance Permit No. 7920-0244-00 and consider issuance of the Permit upon final adoption of the associated rezoning bylaw.

RES.R21-1526

Carried
 With Councillor Pettigrew opposed.

PERMITS - APPROVAL

10. Development Variance Permit No. 7921-0117-00
 16013 – Fraser Highway
 Owner: Van Ness Holdings Ltd., KJW Holdings Ltd
 Agent: J. Desrochers
 To allow for one (1) fascia sign to extend above the roofline of an existing multi-tenant commercial building in Fleetwood for a convenience store.

No concerns had been expressed by abutting property owners 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. 7921-0117-00.

RES.R21-1527

Carried

PERMITS - SUPPORT

11. Development Variance Permit No. 7921-0053-00
 4307 – 184 Street
 Owner: D. Janssens, A. Janssens
 Agent: A. Janssens
 To increase the maximum front lot line setback from 50 metres to 84 metres and to increase the maximum depth of the farm residential footprint from 60 metres to 90 metres in order to construct a new single family dwelling.

One piece of correspondence in support had been received prior to the printing of this agenda.

It was Moved by Councillor Guerra
 Seconded by Councillor Patton
 That Council support Development Variance
 Permit No. 7921-0053-00 and authorize referral of the application to the
 Agricultural Land Commission.

RES.R21-1528 Carried

12. Development Variance Permit No. 7920-0049-00
 2932 - 176 Street
 Owner: Radha Soami Society Beas Canada Inc
 Agent: WSP Canada Inc. (Scott Pelletier)
 To reduce the required minimum streamside setback of a red-coded Class A
 watercourse from 30 metres to 15 metres, and to vary the parking provisions of
 Part 5 of the Zoning Bylaw to allow grass parking in order to permit the
 development of a covered assembly structure for gatherings.

No concerns had been expressed by abutting property owners prior to the printing
 of this agenda.

It was Moved by Councillor Guerra
 Seconded by Councillor Patton
 That Council support Development Variance
 Permit No. 7920-0049-00, and consider issuance of the Permit upon final approval
 of the associated Development Permit.

RES.R21-1529 Carried
 With Councillor Pettigrew opposed.

13. Development Variance Permit No. 7921-0096-00
 9697 and 9779 - 190 Street
 Owner: Beedie (9697 Port Kells) Holdings Ltd.
 Agent: Beedie (Carl Funk)
 To reduce the minimum front yard (east) setback of the Light Impact Industrial
 (IL) Zone from 7.5 metres to 2.5 metres and the minimum rear yard (west) setback
 of the IL Zone from 7.5 metres to 0.3 metre to allow for the development of three
 multi-tenant industrial warehouse buildings.

One piece of correspondence expressing concerns had been received prior to the
 printing of this agenda.

It was Moved by Councillor Guerra
 Seconded by Councillor Patton
 That Council amend Development Variance
 Permit No. 7921-0096-00, to include the following variance:

"(c) In Section F. of Part 48, Light Impact Industrial Zone (IL), the minimum
 front yard (east) setback is varied to permit a wrapping projected canopy
 attached to the building face to be located up to 0.9 metre from the east lot
 line on Lots A and B."

RES.R21-1530 Carried

I. CLERK’S REPORT

1. Delegation Requests

- (a) Joanne Spruce, Head, and Alice Taylor, Member
Pickleball Committee
File: 0550-02-10

It was Moved by Councillor Guerra
Seconded by Councillor Patton
That Joanne Spruce, Head, and Alice Taylor,
Member, Pickleball Committee, be heard as a delegation at the Parks,
Recreation & Culture Committee.

RES.R21-1537

Carried

- (b) Christine Buttkus, Executive Director, and John Lawson, Board Chair
SurreyCares Community Foundation
File: 0550-02-10

It was Moved by Councillor Guerra
Seconded by Councillor Patton
That Christine Buttkus, Executive Director,
and John Lawson, Board Chair, SurreyCares Community Foundation, be
heard as a delegation at the Council-in-Committee.

RES.R21-1538

Carried

2. Amendments to the Council Meeting Schedule

File: 0550-01

It was Moved by Councillor Guerra
Seconded by Councillor Patton
That the 2021 Council Meeting Schedule be
amended to:

- 1. Allow for a Special Regular Council meeting to be scheduled for Thursday,
July 29, 2021 at 2:00 p.m.; and
- 2. Delete the Council meetings scheduled for September 20 and October 4, 2021
and add Council meetings on September 13 and 27, 2021.

RES.R21-1539

Carried

J. NOTICE OF MOTION

1. Illegal and Unauthorized Construction

File: 6410-01

At the July 26, 2021 Regular Council – Public Hearing meeting, Councillor Hundial provided the following Notice of Motion:

"That Council direct staff to report back regarding illegal and unauthorized construction, with a recommended course of action that includes enhanced enforcement, prosecution and public awareness that can be implemented to mitigate loss of life, destruction of property, and further compliance of the existing and new bylaws."

2. 2022 Budget Presentation Regarding Policing Costs

File: 7400-01

At the July 26, 2021 Regular Council – Public Hearing meeting, Councillor Locke provided the following Notice of Motion:

"That the presentation of the budget for 2022 with respect to policing costs be done on a line by line basis in order to provide residents with the most accurate and transparent information of where and how their tax dollars are being spent."

K. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Council Meetings

File: 0550-01

At the July 12, 2021 Regular Council – Public Hearing meeting, Councillor Annis provided the following Notice of Motion:

"That:

1. Staff explore options, including those taken by other cities, to ensure that Council meeting hours do not extend into the early hours of the morning or the following day; and
2. There is more time given for public engagement during Council meetings."

It was
Moved by Councillor Annis
Seconded by Councillor Locke
That

1. Staff explore options, including those taken by other cities, to ensure that Council meeting hours do not extend into the early hours of the morning or the following day; and
2. There is more time given for public engagement during Council meetings.

RES.R21-1540

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

L. ADJOURNMENT

It was
Moved by Councillor Guerra
Seconded by Councillor Patton
That the July 26, 2021 Regular Council -

Public Hearing meeting be adjourned.
RES.R21-1541

Carried

The Regular Council - Public Hearing meeting adjourned at 2:18 a.m.

Certified correct:

Jennifer Ficocelli, City Clerk

Mayor Doug McCallum