

## City of Surrey <br> PLANNING \& DEVELOPMENT REPORT <br> File: 7912-0028-00

Planning Report Date: October 22, 2012

PROPOSAL:

- OCP Amendment from Urban to Multiple Residential
- Rezoning from RF to CD (based on RM-30)
- Development Permit
in order to permit the development of approximately 22 townhouse units.

| LOCATION: | 13314, 13326, and 13344-96 Avenue |
| :--- | :--- |
| OWNERS: | Joginder S Bath <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br> Dilbag S Bath <br> Lakhvir S Bath |
| Sahib S Bath |  |
| ZONING: | RF |
| OCP DESIGNATION: | Urban |



## RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY

- By-law Introduction and set date for Public Hearing for:
o OCP Amendment; and
o Rezoning.
- Approval to eliminate indoor amenity space.
- Approval to eliminate outdoor amenity space.
- Approval to draft Development Permit.


## DEVIATION FROM PLANS, POLICIES OR REGULATIONS

- None.


## RATIONALE OF RECOMMENDATION

- The proposed density and building form are appropriate for this part of Whalley.
- The subject site is within close proximity of transit ( 0.5 kilometre / 0.3 mile to King George Boulevard and 1.2 kilometres / 0.75 mile to King George SkyTrain Station).


## RECOMMENDATION

The Planning \& Development Department recommends that:

1. a By-law be introduced to amend the OCP by redesignating the subject site from Urban to Multiple Residential and a date for Public Hearing be set.
2. Council determine the opportunities for consultation with persons, organizations and authorities that are considered to be affected by the proposed amendment to the Official Community Plan, as described in the Report, to be appropriate to meet the requirement of Section 879 of the Local Government Act.
3. a By-law be introduced to rezone the subject site from "Single Family Residential Zone (RF)" (By-law No. 12000) to "Comprehensive Development Zone (CD)" (By-law No. 12000) and a date be set for Public Hearing.
4. Council approve the applicant's request to eliminate the required indoor amenity space.
5. Council approve the applicant's request to eliminate the required outdoor amenity space.
6. Council authorize staff to draft Development Permit No. 7912-0028-00 generally in accordance with the attached drawings (Appendix II).
7. Council instruct staff to resolve the following issues prior to final adoption:
(a) ensure that all engineering requirements and issues including restrictive covenants, dedications, and rights-of-way where necessary, are addressed to the satisfaction of the General Manager, Engineering;
(b) submission of a subdivision layout to the satisfaction of the Approving Officer;
(c) submission of a finalized tree survey and a statement regarding tree preservation to the satisfaction of the City Landscape Architect;
(d) submission of a landscaping plan and landscaping cost estimate to the specifications and satisfaction of the Planning and Development Department;
(e) resolution of all urban design issues to the satisfaction of the Planning and Development Department;
(f) provision of community benefit to satisfy the OCP Amendment policy for Type 2 OCP amendment applications;
(g) the applicant address the concern that the development will place additional pressure on existing park facilities to the satisfaction of the General Manager, Parks, Recreation and Culture;
(h) removal of existing buildings and structures to the satisfaction of the Planning and Development Department;
(i) registration of a Section 219 Restrictive Covenant to specifically identify the allowable tandem parking arrangement and to prohibit the conversion of the tandem parking spaces into livable space;
(j) registration of a Section 219 Restrictive Covenant to adequately address the City's needs with respect to public art, to the satisfaction of the General Manager Parks, Recreation and Culture;
(k) registration of a reciprocal access easement for future shared access with the properties located to the east at 13352, 13360, 13370, 13380, and 13388-96 Avenue and 9573-134 Street;
(l) the applicant adequately address the impact of no indoor amenity space; and
(m) the applicant adequately address the impact of no outdoor amenity space.

## REFERRALS

Engineering: The Engineering Department has no objection to the project subject to the completion of Engineering servicing requirements as outlined in Appendix III.

## School District:

## Projected number of students from this development:

4 Elementary students at Cindrich Elementary School 2 Secondary students at Queen Elizabeth Secondary School

## (Appendix IV)

The applicant has advised that the dwelling units in this project are expected to be constructed and ready for occupancy by Winter 2013.

Parks, Recreation \& Culture:

The Parks, Recreation and Culture Department indicated concerns about the pressure this project will place on existing parks, recreation and culture facilities in the neighourhood.

## SITE CHARACTERISTICS

Existing Land Use: $\quad$ Three (3) single family residential lots, each with a single family dwelling and accessory buildings, all of which will be removed prior to development.

Adjacent Area:

| Direction | Existing Use | OCP Designation | Existing Zone |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| North (Across 96 <br> Avenue): | Single family dwellings. | Urban | RF |
| East: | Single family dwelling on <br> oversized lot. | Urban | RF |
| South: | Single family dwellings on <br> oversized lots. | Urban | RF |
| West: | Single family dwelling on <br> oversized lot. | Urban | RF |

## 【USTIFICATION FOR OCP AMENDMENT

- The subject site is located along, but just outside, the southern boundary of City Centre, and 125 metres ( 400 ft .) from the western boundary of City Centre.
- Surrey City Centre has been designated as a regional downtown and is intended to become the main business, cultural, and activity centre for both the City of Surrey and the South Fraser region.
- Surrey City Centre is to be home to a broad range of high density commercial, office, institutional and residential developments containing wide range of entertainment, cultural and social amenities, community facilities and diverse residential neighbourhoods.
- Although Surrey City Centre itself has been deemed appropriate for higher density development, the remainder of the Whalley area, especially those areas that lie to the west and east of City Centre, continue to be dominated by low-density single family dwellings, with small pockets of multiple residential or commercial development.
- However, the areas of Whalley that lie to the west and east of City Centre were developed in the 1950 s and 1960 and many of the homes within this area are now coming to the end of their life-span.
- At the same time, many areas of Whalley, particularly those areas that lie to the west of City Centre, are actually closer to the main core of City Centre, located around the new civic block and Central SkyTrain Station, and to the existing and proposed transit corridor along King George Boulevard, than some northern and eastern sections of City Centre.
- As a result, when lands to the immediate west and east of City Centre are considered for redevelopment, it may be appropriate for these areas to redevelop to higher densities, either smaller single family lots, or a variety of higher density multiple residential housing forms such as duplexes, four-plexes, row houses and townhouses, to take advantage of the services and transit available within City Centre.
- Under the Surrey City Centre Land Use and Density Concept, lands within City Centre east of 134 Street at 96 Avenue, 125 metres ( 400 ft .) from the subject site, are deemed appropriate for multiple residential developments with a floor area ratio (FAR) of up to 2.5 .
- The subject site is within close proximity of transit (o. 5 kilometre / 0.3 mile to King George Boulevard and 1.2 kilometres / 0.75 mile to King George SkyTrain Station) and is 0.6 kilometre ( 0.4 mile) from Surrey Memorial Hospital.
- The subject site is also close to various services and amenities, including Queen Elizabeth High School, A. H. P. Matthews Elementary School, A.H.P. Matthews Park, and Holland Park, all of which are located less than 1 kilometre ( 0.6 mile) away.
- As a result, the subject site is appropriate for higher-density multiple residential development and the request to redesignate the site from Urban to Multiple Residential can be supported.
- In accordance with the OCP, this application is considered a Type 2 OCP Amendment and as such, the provision of a significant community benefit is required. On October 9, 2012, the applicant confirmed in writing their offer to provide a community benefit contribution for the proposed 22 units in the amount of $\$ 1,200$ per unit, for a total of $\$ 26,400$, prior to the project being considered for Final Adoption. This offer is consistent with other recently approved Multiple Residential OCP Amendment applications.


## DEVELOPMENT CONSIDERATIONS

## Current Proposal

- The applicant is proposing to consolidate the three existing subject lots into one large lot, to redesignate this new lot from Urban to Multiple Residential, and to rezone this new lot from Single Family Residential (RF) Zone to Comprehensive Development (CD) Zone based on the RM-3o Zone, in order to permit the development of 22 townhouse units.
- The new proposed consolidated lot will have a gross area of approximately 4,232 square metres ( 1.05 ac .) but will be impacted by road dedication requirements along the north, west and south sides of the subject lot.
- The applicant will be required to dedicate approximately 5 metres ( 16 ft. ) along the northern frontage of the subject lot for the future widening of 96 Avenue. In addition, the applicant will also be required to dedicate and construct a $6.0-$ metre ( 20 ft .) wide lane along the western boundary of the subject lot and to dedicate and construct a 6.0-metre ( 20 ft .) wide lane along the southern boundary of the subject site.
- As a result, a total of 1,084 square metres ( 11,670 sq. ft .), or approximately $26 \%$, of the gross lot area will be required for road dedication, reducing the net site area of the subject site to 3,148 square metres ( 0.78 ac .).
- The block in which the subject site is located is 375 metres ( $1,200 \mathrm{ft}$. ) in length, which may have been appropriate for a suburban single family residential neighbourhood when the subject area was developed in the 1950s. The current block length is not appropriate for a neighbourhood transitioning from single family residential densities to multiple family residential densities and is contrary to the City's goals and objectives of creating increased vehicle and pedestrian connectivity, particularly in higher density areas of Surrey.
- In order to achieve this desired connectivity, a road network concept for the area has been developed which is attached as Appendix IX.
- As part of this concept, a lane is proposed for the middle of the block, linking 95A Avenue with 96 Avenue, that will be located along the western edge of the subject site.
- In order to achieve additional east-west connectivity through the block and to create alternate access for lands fronting both 96 Avenue and 95A Avenue when these lands redevelop at some time in the future, an east-west lane through the block is proposed, connecting 134 Street to 132A Street. This east-west lane will be located along the southern edge of the subject site (a portion of this lane alignment has already been dedicated, but not constructed, to the west of the subject site).
- In order to encourage both vehicle and pedestrian movement along these new lanes, it is anticipated that, in addition to the 6 -metre ( 20 ft .) wide vehicle travel lanes being dedicated and constructed by the subject development, a $2.0-m e t r e ~(~ 6.5 ~ f t) ~ w i d e$. landscaped boulevard and 1.5 -metre ( 5 ft .) sidewalk will eventually be constructed along the west side of the north-south lane and along the south side of the east-west lane when the lands to the west and south of the subject site redevelop.


## Proposed CD By-law

- The proposed CD Zone is based on the Multiple Residential 30 Zone (RM-30) with modifications to the allowable density and setback requirements.
- The proposed CD By-law will permit a net floor area ratio (FAR) of 1.10, which will accommodate the proposed project density but which is higher than the o.9o FAR permitted under the RM-3o Zone. The increase in density is supportable as a large portion ( $26 \%$ ) of the subject site is being dedicated for road and lanes.
- The proposed maximum unit density of 75 units per hectare ( 30 upa) is consistent with the requirements of the RM-3o Zone.
- The proposed setbacks are reduced from the standard 7.5 -metre ( 25 ft .) setbacks of the RM-30 Zone in order to create a more urban development with a more pedestrian-friendly streetscape.
- The table below provides a comparison between the RM-30 Zone and the proposed CD Bylaw.

|  | RM-30 Zone | Proposed CD-By-law |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Setbacks | 7.5 metres (25 ft.) from all lot lines. | Front yard: $5.2 \mathrm{~m} .(17 \mathrm{ft}$ ) <br> Rear yard: $3.0 \mathrm{~m} .(10 \mathrm{ft})$ <br> East Side yard: $2.5 \mathrm{~m} .(8 \mathrm{ft})$. <br> West Side yard: $3.6 \mathrm{~m} .(12 \mathrm{ft})$. |
| Floor Area Ratio (FAR) | 0.9 | 1.10 |
| Density (UPHa/upa) | 75 UPHa (30 upa) | $75 \mathrm{UPHa}(30 \mathrm{upa})$ |
| Principal Building Height | 13 metres (43 ft.) | 13 metres (43 ft.) |

- All other aspects of the proposed CD By-law are consistent with the RM-30 Zone.


## PRE-NOTIFICATION

Pre-notification letters were mailed on July 13, 2012. Staff received two responses:

- Both respondents expressed some opposition to the project. Their primary concern was related to the loss of mature trees due to the proposed development.
(The preliminary Arborist Report indicates there are 33 protected trees identified on the subject site. All 33 trees are proposed to be removed because they are either hazardous, located within, or near the building envelope or road dedication, or are only suitable for retention within a group of trees. 57 replacement trees are proposed which meets the requirements of the Tree By-law.)


## PUBLIC CONSULTATION PROCESS FOR OCP AMENDMENT

Pursuant to Section 879 of the Local Government Act, it was determined that it was not necessary to consult with any persons, organizations or authorities with respect to the proposed OCP amendment, other than those contacted as part of the pre-notification process.

## DESIGN PROPOSAL AND REVIEW

## Building Design and Site Layout

- The proposal comprises four buildings, two facing 96 Avenue and two facing the proposed lane along the southern edge of the subject site. The two northern buildings, Buildings A and B, will be set back 5.2 metres ( 17 ft .) from 96 Avenue. The two southern buildings, Buildings C and D , will be located approximately 9 metres ( 30 ft .) away from the rear property line of the RF-zoned lots to the south and 3 metres ( 10 ft .) from the proposed east-west lane.
- Proposed Buildings B and D will be located approximately 2.5 metres ( 8 ft .) away from the east property line.
- An internal 6-metre ( 20 ft .) wide east/west drive-aisle bisects the site that provides vehicle access to the ground-level garages in northerly Buildings A and B. Southerly Buildings C and D will have garage access from the proposed rear lane along the southern edge of the subject site.
- Each unit will have a private, north facing patio/yard.
- All of the units will have three bedrooms and a two car garage (either side by side or in a tandem arrangement).
- The majority of the living areas are proposed on the upper floors, with the exception of a small den that is proposed on the ground floor of units that have a side by side (double) garage.
- Units generally range in size from 140 square metres ( $1,500 \mathrm{sq}$. ft.) to 170 square metres ( $1,800 \mathrm{sq}$. ft .) excluding the garage. The width of units vary between 3.6 metres ( 12 ft .) to 6 metres ( 20 ft .).
- The buildings will have a contemporary aesthetic, characterized by vertical elements and flat roofs.
- The façade of the buildings will have subtle variations to avoid a repetitive look.
- Proposed building materials include the extensive use of hardie panel and plank siding, in seven colours (cream, red, grey, light grey, dark grey, goldenrod, and light brown) for all façades. The façades will be accented with stone finish cladding in a mahogany colour.


## Landscaping

- Each unit facing 96 Avenue will have a small front yard enclosed by a 1 -metre ( 3.2 ft .) tall black aluminum rail fence, behind which will be layered planting consisting of Little-Leaf Box, Sedum and Heavenly Bamboo shrubs with a Red Maple tree. Each front yard will have direct access to the sidewalk along 96 Avenue with each pedestrian entry defined by a rail gate.
- Existing homes along the east property line will be buffered from the proposed development through the planting of trees and shrubs.
- Stamped concrete will be used to distinguish the visitor parking stalls and the entry of the internal drive aisle. The parallel visitor parking stalls will be separated by pockets of small scale plantings.
- Along the south side of Buildings $C$ and $D$, there will be a small pocket of planting containing a tree and shrubs between each driveway. This will provide a softer interface with the proposed rear lane and existing homes to the south.
- Although there is no outdoor amenity space proposed, each unit will have a small private yard, patio space and a balcony.
- The entry to the complex off the new north-south lane, will be marked by a decorative wall feature containing the project name and address. The feature wall will be surrounded by ground oriented plantings.


## Parking

- The proposed development includes a total of 48 parking spaces, consisting of 44 resident parking spaces and 4 parking spaces for visitors, which complies with the parking requirements of the Surrey Zoning By-law.
- Resident parking spaces will be provided in a tandem garage for eight of the units, and a side by side double garage for the remaining 14 units.
- To ensure that the tandem garage parking spaces are not converted into liveable space, the applicant will be required to register a Section 219 Restrictive Covenant as a condition of Final Adoption.


## Indoor and Outdoor Amenity Space

- The applicant is not proposing to provide any indoor or outdoor amenity spaces due to the small scale nature of the development and the small size of the subject site.
- To mitigate this shortfall in indoor and outdoor amenity spaces, the applicant will be required to provide a monetary contribution in accordance with City Policy.


## Tree Survey and Preservation Plan

- Mike Fadum of Mike Fadum and Associates Ltd. prepared the Arborist Report and Tree Preservation/Replacement Plans. They are currently under review.
- The chart below provides a preliminary summary of on-site tree retention and removal by species:

| Tree Species | Total No. of <br> Trees | Total Proposed <br> for Retention | Total Proposed <br> for Removal |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alder, Red | 8 | 0 | 8 |
| Ash, Mountain | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Aspen, Trembling | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Cedar, Western Red | 6 | 0 | 6 |
| Cherry, Bitter | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Cherry | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cottonwood, Black | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Dogwood, Flowering | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Douglas-fir | 9 | 0 | 9 |
| Falsecypress | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Hawthorn | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Maple, Norway | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Spruce | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | $\mathbf{3 3}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{3 3}$ |

- All 33 trees proposed for removal are either hazardous, are located within, or near the building envelope or road dedication, or are only suitable for retention within a group of trees.
- Based upon 33 trees to be removed, 57 replacement trees are required. The development proposes 57 replacement trees.


## SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT CHECKLIST

The applicant prepared and submitted a sustainable development checklist for the subject site on October 9, 2012. The table below summarizes the applicant's responses based on the seven (7) criteria listed in the Surrey Sustainable Development Checklist.

| Sustainability Criteria | Sustainable Development Features Summary |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1. Site Context \& Location <br> (A1-A2) | - The project is located just outside City Centre. |
| 2. Density \& Diversity (B1-B7) | - The development allocates space for private gardens. |
| 3. Ecology \& Stewardship (C1-C4) | - The development contains provisions for recycling and organic waste pickup. |
| 4. Sustainable Transport \& Mobility ( $\mathrm{D}_{1}-\mathrm{D}_{2}$ ) | - N/A |
| 5. Accessibility \& Safety (E1-E3) | - The site incorporates Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles. |
| 6. Green Certification (F1) | - N/A |
| 7. Education \& Awareness (G1-G4) | - N/A |

## ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL

The application was not referred to the Advisory Design Panel but was reviewed by staff. The applicant has addressed most of the design concerns to the satisfaction of staff, however, there remains some outstanding concerns with respect to landscaping, façade treatment, window treatments, roof articulation and building materials.

A detailed summary of the design concerns has been provided to the applicant, who has agreed to resolve all concerns prior to Council being requested to consider Final Adoption of the Rezoning By-law and Development Permit issuance.

## INFORMATION ATTACHED TO THIS REPORT

The following information is attached to this Report:

Appendix I. Lot Owners, Action Summary and Project Data Sheets
Appendix II. Proposed Site Plan, Building Elevations, and Landscape Plan
Appendix III. Engineering Summary
Appendix IV. School District Comments
Appendix V. Summary of Tree Survey and Tree Preservation
Appendix VI. OCP Redesignation Map
Appendix VII. Proposed CD By-law
Appendix VIII. Aerial Photo
Appendix IX. Concept Plan by Applicant
Appendix X. City Centre Concept Plan
original signed by Judith Robertson
Jean Lamontagne
General Manager
Planning and Development

## Information for City Clerk

Legal Description and Owners of all lots that form part of the application:

1. (a) Agent: Name: Wojciech Grzybowicz

WG Architecture Inc
Address: Suite 1030470 Granville Street
Vancouver BC
V6C iV5
Tel: 604-331-2378
2. Properties involved in the Application
(a) Civic Addresses: 13344, 13326 and 13314-96 Avenue
(b) Civic Address: 13344-96 Avenue

Owner: Lakhbir S Bath
Dilbag S Bath
Joginder S Bath
PID: oo9-844-678
Lot 1 Section 32 Township 2 New Westminster District Plan 13640
(c) Civic Address: 13326-96 Avenue

Owner: Lakhbir S Bath
Dilbag S Bath
Joginder S Bath
PID: oo2-366-746
Lot 2 Section 32 Township 2 New Westminster District Plan 13640
(d) Civic Address: 13314-96 Avenue

Owner: Sahib S Bath
Lakhvir S Bath
Dilbag S Bath
Joginder S Bath
PID:
009-844-708
Lot 3 Section 32 Township 2 New Westminster District Plan 13640
3. Summary of Actions for City Clerk's Office
(a) Introduce a By-law to amend the Official Community Plan to redesignate the site.
(b) Introduce a By-law to rezone the site.

## DEVELOPMENT DATA SHEET

Proposed Zoning: CD (based on RM-30)

| Required Development Data | Minimum Required / Maximum Allowed | Proposed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LOT AREA* (in square metres) |  |  |
| Gross Total |  | 4,232 sq. m. |
| Road Widening area |  | 1,084 sq. m. |
| Undevelopable area |  | n/a |
| Net Total |  | 3,148 sq. m. |
|  |  |  |
| LOT COVERAGE (in \% of net lot area) |  |  |
| Buildings \& Structures | 45\% | 44\% |
| Paved \& Hard Surfaced Areas |  | 32\% |
| Total Site Coverage |  | 76\% |
|  |  |  |
| SETBACKS ( in metres) |  |  |
| Front |  | 5.2 m . |
| Rear |  | 3.0 m . |
| Side \#ı (E) |  | 2.5 m . |
| Side \#2 (W) |  | 3.6 m . |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| BUILDING HEIGHT (in metres/storeys) |  |  |
| Principal | 13 m. | 12.25 m . |
| Accessory |  | n/a |
|  |  |  |
| NUMBER OF RESIDENTIAL UNITS |  |  |
| Bachelor |  | o |
| One Bed |  | 0 |
| Two Bedroom |  | 0 |
| Three Bedroom + |  | 22 |
| Total |  | 22 |
|  |  |  |
| FLOOR AREA: Residential |  | 3,258 sq. m. |
|  |  |  |
| FLOOR AREA: Commercial |  |  |
| Retail |  |  |
| Office |  |  |
| Total |  | o |
|  |  |  |
| FLOOR AREA: Industrial |  | o |
|  |  |  |
| FLOOR AREA: Institutional |  | o |
|  |  |  |
| TOTAL BUILDING FLOOR AREA |  | 3,258 sq. m. |

[^0]
## Development Data Sheet cont'd

| Required Development Data | Minimum Required / Maximum Allowed | Proposed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DENSITY |  |  |
| \# of units/ha /\# units/acre (gross) |  | 52 upha / 21 upa |
| \# of units/ha /\# units/acre (net) | 75 UPHa / 30 upa | 66 upha / 27 upa |
| FAR (gross) |  | 0.77 |
| FAR (net) |  | 1.10 |
|  |  |  |
| AMENITY SPACE (area in square metres) |  |  |
| Indoor |  | o |
| Outdoor |  | O |
|  |  |  |
| PARKING (number of stalls) |  |  |
| Commercial |  | o |
| Industrial |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |
| Residential Bachelor +1 Bedroom |  | o |
| 2-Bed |  | 0 |
| 3-Bed |  | 44 |
| Residential Visitors |  | 4 |
|  |  |  |
| Institutional |  | o |
|  |  |  |
| Total Number of Parking Spaces |  | 48 |
|  |  |  |
| Number of disabled stalls |  | o |
| Number of small cars |  | 0 |
| Tandem Parking Spaces: Number / \% of Total Number of Units |  | 8/36\% |
| Size of Tandem Parking Spaces width/length |  | $\begin{gathered} 3.6 \mathrm{~m} \text {. wide } \times 13.5 \\ \mathrm{~m} \text {. long } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |


| Heritage Site | NO | Tree Survey/Assessment Provided | YES |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Proposed Zoning CD (Based on RM-30)













TO: Manager, Area Planning \& Development

- North Surrey Division
Planning and Development Department
FROM: Development Project Engineer, Engineering Department
DATE: October 18, $2012 \quad$ PROJECT FILE: 7812-0028-oo
RE: Engineering Requirements
Location: 1331496 Ave


## OCP AMENDMENT

There are no engineering requirements relative to the OCP Amendment.

## REZONE/SUBDIVISION

## Property and Right-of-Way Requirements

- dedicate 4.942 metres on $96^{\text {th }}$ Avenue for the future 30.0 metre wide road right-of-way
- register a 0.5 metre wide statutory right-of-way adjacent to the 96 Avenue dedication
- dedicate 6.0 metres (half of a Green Lane) along the west and south property lines of the development.


## Works and Services

- construct the ultimate road widening of 96 Avenue to full City Centre standards for the frontage of the site.
- construct temporary lanes for access to the site and provide cash in lieu for the ultimate construction of the developer's half of the City Centre Green Lane.
- construct new service connections to service the proposed development.
- provide onsite stormwater management features to mitigate drainage impacts to Quibble Creek.

A Servicing Agreement is required prior to Rezone/Subdivision.

## DEVELOPMENT PERMIT

The following issue is to be addressed as a condition of issuance of the Development Permit:

- The site plan is to be revised to show the required o. 5 metre statutory right-of-way


Rémi Dubé, P.Eng.
Development Services Manager
RWB

Friday, July 13, 2012
Planning

## THE IMPACT ON SCHOOLS

## APPLICATION \#:

12002800

## SUMMARY

The proposed 22 townhouse units
are estimated to have the following impact on the following schools:

Projected \# of students for this development:

| Elementary Students: | 4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Secondary Students: | 2 |

September 2011 Enrolment/School Capacity

| Cindrich Elementary |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Enrolment (K/1-7): | $55 \mathrm{~K}+500$ |
| Capacity (K/1-7): | $40 \mathrm{~K}+525$ |
| Queen Elizabeth Secondary |  |
| Enrolment (8-12): | 1506 |
| Nominal Capacity (8-12): | 1600 |
| Functional Capacity*(8-12); | 1728 |

## School Enrolment Projections and Planning Update:

The following tables illustrate the enrolment projections (with current/approved ministry capacity) for the elementary and secondary schools serving the proposed development.

Enrolment at Cindrich Elementary has a maturing trend. The elementary school's capacity in the table below has been adjusted for the implementation of full day Kindergarten and the inclusion of a "Strongstart" program for preschool age children and their parents. There are no capital construction projects identified for Cindrich Elementary or to Queen Elizabeth Secondary. The secondary school capacity in the table below includes an 8 classroom modular complex at Queen Elizabeth Secondary. The proposed development will not have an impact on these projections.

## Cindrich Elementary



Queen Elizabeth Secondary

*Functional Capacity at secondary schools is based on space utilization estimate of 27 students per instructional space. The number of instructional spaces is estimated by dividing nominal facility capacity (Ministry capacity) by 25.

## VEGETATION CONSULTANTS

## SURREY TREE PRESERVATION SUMMARY

Surrey Project No: 12-0028-00
Project Location: 13314 / 26 / 44-96 Avenue, Surrey, BC
Arborist: Peter Mennel ISA (PN-5611A)
Detailed Assessment of the existing trees or an Arborist's Report is submitted on file. The following is a summary of the tree assessment report for quick reference.

## 1. General Tree Assessment

The dominant trees include a stand of poorly structured red alder at the southwest corner and a row of poorly structured Douglas-fir at the north end. The Douglas-fir have been aggressively topped and pruned for hydro clearance and offer little retentive value along 96 Avenue.
2. Summary of Proposed Tree Removal and Replacement

The summary will be available before final adoption.

| Number of Protected Trees identified | (A) 33 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Number of Protected Trees declared hazardous due to | (B) 0 |
| natural causes | (C) 33 |
| Number of Protected Trees to be removed | (D) 0 |
| Number of Protected Trees to be retained (A-C) | (E) 57 |
| Number of Replacement Trees required | (F) 57 |
| (9 alder and cottonwood $X 1$ and 24 others $X 2$ ) | (G) 0 |
| Number of Replacement Trees proposed | (H) 57 |
| Number of Replacement Trees in deficit (E-F) | (I) NA |
| Total number of Prot. and Rep. Trees on site (D+F) | (J) N/A |
| Number of lots proposed in the project | (H/I) |

3. Tree Survey and Preservation/Replacement Plan

Tree Survey and Preservation Plan is attached. The Replacement Plan will be prepared and submitted by others.

Summary and plan prepared and submitted by Mike Fadum and Associates Ltd.
Date: September 27, 2012



THE CITY COUNCIL of the City of Surrey, in open meeting assembled, ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

1. Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000, as amended, is hereby further amended, pursuant to the provisions of Section 903 of the Local Government Act, R.S.B.C. 1996 c. 323, as amended by changing the classification of the following parcels of land, presently shown upon the maps designated as the Zoning Maps and marked as Schedule "A" of Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000, as amended as follows:

## FROM: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL ZONE (RF)

TO: COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT ZONE (CD)

Parcel Identifier: 009-844-708
Lot 3 Section 32 Township 2 New Westminster District Plan 13640
13314-96 Avenue

Parcel Identifier: 002-366-746
Lot 2 Section 32 Township 2 New Westminster District Plan 13640
13326-96 Avenue

Parcel Identifier: 009-844-678
Lot 1 Section 32 Township 2 New Westminster District Plan 13640
13344-96 Avenue
(hereinafter referred to as the "Lands")
2. The following regulations shall apply to the Lands:

## A. Intent

This Comprehensive Development Zone is intended to accommodate and regulate the development of medium density, ground-oriented multiple unit residential buildings and related amenity spaces which are to be developed in accordance with a comprehensive design.

## B. Permitted Uses

The Lands and structures shall be used for ground-oriented multiple unit residential buildings.
C. Lot Area

Not applicable to this Zone.

## D. Density

1. The floor area ratio shall not exceed 1.10.
2. The unit density shall not exceed 75 dwelling units per hectare [30 u.p.a.].
3. The indoor amenity space required in Sub-section J.1(b) is excluded from the calculation of floor area ratio.
E. Lot Coverage

The lot coverage shall not exceed $45 \%$.

## F. Yards and Setbacks

1. Buildings and structures shall be sited in accordance with the following minimum setbacks:

| Use Setback | Front <br> Yard | Rear <br> Yard | East Side <br> Yard | West Side <br> Yard |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Principal and Accessory Buildings and Structures | $\begin{aligned} & 5.2 \mathrm{~m} . \\ & {[17 \mathrm{ft} .]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.0 \mathrm{~m} . \\ & {[10 \mathrm{ft} .]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.5 \mathrm{~m} . \\ & {[8 \mathrm{ft} .]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.6 \mathrm{~m} . \\ & {[12 \mathrm{ft} .]} \end{aligned}$ |

Measurements to be determined as per Part 1 Definitions of Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000, as amended.
2. Notwithstanding Section F.l of this Zone, columns, balconies, entry canopies and porches may encroach up to 0.6 metre [ 2 ft .] into the front yard.

## G. Height of Buildings

Measurements to be determined as per Part 1 Definitions of Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000, as amended.

1. Principal buildings: The building height shall not exceed 13 metres [43 feet].
2. Accessory buildings and structures:
(a) Indoor amenity space buildings: The height shall not exceed 11 metres [36 ft.]; and
(b) Other accessory buildings and structures: The height shall not exceed 4.5 metres [ 15 ft. ].

## H. Off-Street Parking

1. Resident and visitor parking spaces shall be provided as stated in Table C.6. of Part 5 Off-Street Parking and Loading/Unloading of Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000, as amended.
2. All required resident parking spaces shall be provided as parking within building envelope.
3. Tandem parking is permitted, subject to the following:
(a) Parking spaces provided as tandem parking must be enclosed and attached to each dwelling unit;
(b) Parking spaces provided as tandem parking must be held by the same owner; and
(c) Access to parking spaces provided as tandem parking is not permitted within 6 metres [ 20 ft .] from lot entrances/exits.
4. Visitor parking within the required setbacks is not permitted.

## I. Landscaping

1. All developed portions of the lot not covered by buildings, structures or paved areas shall be landscaped including the retention of mature trees. This landscaping shall be maintained.
2. Along the developed sides of the lot which abut a highway, a continuous landscaping strip of not less than 1.5 metres [ 5 ft .] in width shall be provided within the lot.
3. The boulevard areas of highways abutting a lot shall be seeded or sodded with grass on the side of the highway abutting the lot, except at driveways.
4. Garbage containers and passive recycling containers shall be screened to a height of at least 2.5 metres [ 8 ft .] by buildings, a landscaping screen, a solid decorative fence, or a combination thereof.

## J. Special Regulations

1. Amenity space shall be provided on the lot as follows:
(a) Outdoor amenity space, in the amount of 3.0 square metres [32 sq.ft.] per dwelling unit and shall not be located within the required setbacks; and
(b) Indoor amenity space, in the amount of 3.0 square metres [32 sq.ft.] per dwelling unit.

## K. Subdivision

Lots created through subdivision in this Zone shall conform to the following minimum standards:

| Lot Size | Lot Width | Lot Depth |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |
| 3,000 sq.m. | 60 metres | 45 metres |
| $[0.75 \mathrm{acre}]$ | $[195 \mathrm{ft}]$ | $[150 \mathrm{ft}]$ |
| [in |  |  |

Dimensions shall be measured in accordance with Section E.21 of Part 4 General Provisions of Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000 as amended.

## L. Other Regulations

In addition to all statutes, by-laws, orders, regulations or agreements, the following are applicable, however, in the event that there is a conflict with the provisions in this Comprehensive Development Zone and other provisions in Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000, as amended, the provisions in this Comprehensive Development Zone shall take precedence:

1. Definitions are as set out in Part 1 Definitions, of Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000, as amended.
2. Prior to any use, the Lands must be serviced as set out in Part 2 Uses Limited, of Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000, as amended and in accordance with the servicing requirements for the RM-30 Zone as set forth in the Surrey Subdivision and Development By-law, 1986, No. 8830, as amended.
3. General provisions are as set out in Part 4 General Provisions of Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000, as amended.
4. Additional off-street parking requirements are as set out in Part 5 Off-Street Parking and Loading/Unloading of Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000, as amended.
5. Sign regulations are as set out in Surrey Sign By-law, 1999, No. 13656, as amended.
6. Special building setbacks are as set out in Part 7 Special Building Setbacks, of Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000, as amended.
7. Building permits shall be subject to the Surrey Building By-law, 1987, No. 9011, as amended.
8. Building permits shall be subject to Surrey Development Cost Charge By-law, 2012, No. 17539, as may be amended or replaced from time to time, and the development cost charges shall be based on the RM-30 Zone.
9. Tree regulations are set out in Surrey Tree Protection By-law, 2006, No. 16100, as amended.
10. Development permits may be required in accordance with the Surrey Official Community Plan, 1996, By-law No. 12900, as amended.
11. This By-law shall be cited for all purposes as "Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000, Amendment By-law, , No. ."
READ A FIRST AND SECOND TIME on the day of
PUBLIC HEARING HELD thereon on the $\quad$ day of 2012.
READ A THIRD TIME ON THE 2012.

RECONSIDERED AND FINALLY ADOPTED, signed by the Mayor and Clerk, and sealed with the Corporate Seal on the day of ,2012.
$\qquad$

## COSMS



CONTEXT PLAN



[^0]:    *If the development site consists of more than one lot, lot dimensions pertain to the entire site.

