INTER-OFFICE MEMO

| TO: | City Clerk, Legislative Services Division |
| :--- | :--- |
| FROM: | Manager, Area Planning \& Development - North Division <br> Planning \& Development Department |
| DATE: | May 19, 2020 |

RE: Request for Council Approval to Draft Development Permit No. 7917-0582-oo
ADDRESS: $\quad 11779$ and 11793-100 Avenue
11798 and 11808-River Road
PROPOSAL: Rezoning a portion from RF to RM-15.
Development Permit No. 7917-0582-oo.
Development Variance Permit No. 7917-0582-oo.
To permit to permit the development of 30 townhouse units and two single-family residential lots.

Development Application No. 7917-0582-oo proceeded to Council for introduction at the May 4, 2020 Regular Council - Land Use meeting. At the meeting, Council granted $1^{\text {st }}$ and $2^{\text {nd }}$ Reading to Rezoning By-law No. 20088 and approved corresponding Development Variance Permit No. 7917-0582-oo to proceed to Public Notification.

The Public Hearing for Rezoning By-law No. 20088 is scheduled for May 25, 2020.
Staff have identified an inadvertent omission in the Planning and Development Report for Application No. 7917-0582-00, in that the Recommendations section of the report did not include the recommendation for Council to authorize staff to draft corresponding Development Permit 7917-0582oo generally in accordance with the drawings attached as Appendix I to the May 4, 2020 Planning and Development Report.

The body of the report and the recommendations summary of the report are clear that the application includes a corresponding Development Permit for Form and Character for the proposed townhouse units.

As such, should Council grant Third Reading to Rezoning By-law No. 20088 and support Development Variance Permit No. 7917-0582-00 at the May 25, Regular Council - Public Hearing meeting, it is also recommended that Council authorize staff to draft Development Permit 7917-0582-oo.


Ron Gill
Manager
Area Planning \& Development - North Division

CLERKS DEPT. MAY 19, 2020
7917-0582-00
Memo Received After May 4, 2020 RCLU Meeting


PLANNING \& DEVELOPMENT REPORT Application No.: $\quad$ 7917-0582-00

Planning Report Date: May 4, 2020

## PROPOSAL:

- Rezoning a portion from RF to RM-15
- Development Permit
- Development Variance Permit
to permit the development of 30 townhouse units and the two single-family residential lots.

LOCATION: $\quad 11798$ \& 11808 - River Road 11779 \& 11793-100 Avenue

ZONING:
RF
OCP DESIGNATION: Urban


## RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY

- By-law Introduction and set date for Public Hearing for Rezoning of a portion of the site.
- Approval to draft Development Permit for Form and Character and Hazard Lands.
- Approval for Development Variance Permit to proceed to Public Notification.


## DEVIATION FROM PLANS, POLICIES OR REGULATIONS

- Proposing to reduce the setbacks requirements for principal building under the RM-15 Zone to all property lines for the townhouse component of the project.


## RATIONALE OF RECOMMENDATION

- The proposal complies with the Urban designation in the Official Community Plan (OCP).
- The proposal complies with the General Urban designation in the Metro Vancouver Regional Growth Strategy (RGS).
- The proposed density and building form are appropriate for this part of Whalley.
- The proposal complies with the Development Permit requirements in the OCP for Hazard Lands (Steep Slopes).
- The proposal complies with the Development Permit requirements in the OCP for Form and Character.
- The proposed setbacks achieve a more urban, pedestrian streetscape along River Road or are a side-of-unit configuration to existing lot lines. The proposed setbacks are consistent with other townhouse developments in the City and are in accordance with the Development Permit (Form and Character) design guidelines in the OCP. The setbacks are proposed to range from 2.4 to 6.8 metres.
- The proposed architectural design of the townhouse buildings achieves an attractive built form, which utilizes high quality, natural materials and contemporary lines. The street interface has been designed to a high quality to achieve a positive urban experience between the proposed building and the public realm.


## RECOMMENDATION

The Planning \& Development Department recommends that:

1. A By-law be introduced to rezone the portion of the subject site shown as Block A on the attached Survey Plan (Appendix I) from "Single Family Residential Zone (RF)" to "Multiple Residential 15 Zone (RM-15)" and a date be set for Public Hearing.
2. Council approve Development Variance Permit No. 7917-0582-oo (Appendix V) varying the following, to proceed to Public Notification:
(a) to reduce the minimum north yard setback of the RM-15 Zone from 7.5 metres to 6.7 metres to the principal building face and 4.9 metres to a balcony or veranda on proposed Lot 3 (townhouse lot);
(b) to reduce the minimum east yard setback of the RM-15 Zone from 7.5 metres to 2.3 metres to the principal building face on proposed Lot 3 (townhouse lot);
(c) to reduce the minimum south yard setback of the RM-15 Zone from 7.5 metres to 5.9 metres to the principal building face and 4.6 metres to a balcony or veranda on proposed Lot 3 (townhouse lot); and
(d) to reduce the minimum west yard setback of the RM-15 Zone from 7.5 metres to 4.5 metres to the principal building face and 3.5 metres to a balcony or veranda on proposed Lot 3 (townhouse lot).
3. 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 plan to the satisfaction of the Approving Officer;
(c) demolition of existing buildings and structures to the satisfaction of the Planning and Development Department;
(d) Approval from the Ministry of Transportation \& Infrastructure;
(e) resolution of all urban design issues to the satisfaction of the Planning and Development Department;
(f) submission of a finalized landscaping plan and landscaping cost estimate to the specifications and satisfaction of the Planning and Development Department;
(g) submission of a finalized tree survey and a statement regarding tree preservation to the satisfaction of the City Landscape Architect;
(h) the applicant satisfy the deficiency in tree replacement on the site, to the satisfaction of the Planning and Development Department;
(i) submission of a finalized Geotechnical Report to the satisfaction of City staff;
(j) demolition of existing buildings and structures to the satisfaction of the Planning and Development Department;
(k) registration of a Section 219 Restrictive Covenant to restrict the access to 100 Avenue to emergency vehicle and pedestrian access only, with removable bollards;
(1) 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; and
(m) registration of a Section 219 Restrictive Covenant to ensure that the site is constructed in accordance with the geotechnical report.

## SITE CONTEXT \& BACKGROUND

| Direction | Existing Use | OCP/NCP <br> Designation | Existing Zone |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Subject Site | Acreage properties <br> with single family <br> dwellings to be <br> demolished. | Urban | RF |
| North (across River Road): | Single family <br> dwellings | Urban | RF |
| East: | Townhomes | Urban | RM-15 |
| South (Across 10o Avenue): | Single family <br> dwellings | Urban | RF |
| West: | Single family <br> dwellings. | Urban | RF |

## Context \& Background

- The subject site consists of 4 properties and is currently designated Urban in the OCP and is currently zoned "Single Family Residential Zone" (RF). The subject site slopes from the south towards the Fraser River lowlands. There have been no previous development applications related to this property


## DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

## Planning Considerations

- The applicant is proposing to rezone a portion of the subject site from RF to "Multiple Residential 15 Zone (RM-15)" and a Form and Character and Hazards Lands (Steep Slopes) Development Permit, to facilitate the development of 30 townhomes and 2 single family residential lots.

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Proposed |  |
| Gross Site Area: |  |
| Road Dedication: | $9,330.44 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| Single Family Lot Area: |  |
| Net Site Area (Townhouses): | $55.85 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| $1.210 .25 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |  |
| $8,064.34 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |  |

## Referrals

| Engineering: | The Engineering Department has no objection to the project <br> subject to the completion of Engineering servicing requirements as <br> outlined in Appendix II. |
| :--- | :--- |
| School District: | The School District has provided the following projections for <br> the number of students from this development: |
| 9 Elementary students at Royal Heights Elementary School |  |
| 4 Secondary students at L.A. Matheson Secondary School |  |

Surrey Fire Service: $\quad$ A Building Permit may not be issued until a Construction Fire Safety Plan has been submitted, reviewed and accepted by the Fire Service.

## Transportation Considerations

- The townhouse portion of the development is proposed to be primarily accessed from River Road with an emergency and pedestrian access at the south end of the site to 100 Avenue. The proposed Single Family Residential lots are proposed to be accessed from 100 Avenue. The applicant is being required to construct both frontages along River Road and 100 Avenue to the City's local road standard with sidewalks and on-street parking.
- The proposed development is located along a Local Street Neighbourhood Bike Route on River Road.
- The subject site located approximately 320 metres (4-minute walking distance) from the nearest transit stop on Grace Road (Route 640), and approximately 580 metres ( 7 -minute walking distance) from the Frequent Transit Corridor on Scott Road.


## Sustainability Considerations

- The applicant has met all of the typical sustainable development criteria, as indicated in the Sustainable Development Checklist.


## School Capacity Considerations

- Royal Heights Elementary is currently operating below capacity. The 10 -year enrolment projections are showing modest growth in the catchment. Even though some parcels are looking to increase their housing density, the projected development is not enough to overcome a maturing enrolment trend in the area. Currently, there are no plans to expand this school.
- L.A. Matheson Secondary is currently operating at $80 \%$. Though the 10 -year enrollment projections do show modest growth, the current capacity of the building can accommodate it. Currently, there are no plans to expand this school.


## POLICY \& BY-LAW CONSIDERATIONS

## Regional Growth Strategy

- The subject site is located within and complies with the General Urban Land Use Designation of Metro Vancouver's Regional Growth Strategy.


## Official Community Plan

## Land Use Designation

- The subject site is located within and complies with the Urban Land Use Designation of City's Official Community Plan.


## Themes/Policies

- A1.1 - Support compact and efficient land development that is consistent with the Metro Vancouver RGS.
(The proposal complies with the RGS and represents appropriate infill density in a neighbourhood that is characterized by established single family residential homes and lower-density townhouses.
- A1.2 - Ensure that urban development occurs within the Urban Containment Boundary.
(The subject site is within Urban Containment Boundary.)
- A1.3 - Accommodate urban land development according to the following order of growth management priorities:
- C. - Serviced infill areas and redevelopment sites in appropriate locations within existing residential neighbourhoods, when developed compatibly with existing neighbourhood character.
(The proposed thirty-unit townhouse development and two single family lots will be compatible with the adjacent residential built form.)
- $\mathrm{A}_{3}$ - Encourage infill development that is compatible with existing neighbourhoods.
(The required Form and Character Development Permit will ensure compatibility with adjacent properties. The proposal complies with Urban Design Guidelines for infill development in the OCP.)
- A3.1 - Permit gradual and sensitive residential infill within existing neighbourhoods... in order to support significant transit improvements, utilize existing transportation infrastructure and implement improvements to the public realm.
(The proposed development represents appropriate scale infill development that will support nearby transit infrastructure.)
- A3.5 - Support infill development that is appropriate in scale and density to its neighbourhood context and that uses compatible design to reinforce neighbourhood character.
(The required Form and Character DP will ensure compatibility with adjacent properties.)


## Zoning By-law

- The applicant proposes to rezone a portion of the subject site from "Single Family Residential Zone (RF)" to "Multiple Residential 15 Zone (RM-15)" in order to accommodate the 30-unit townhouse component of the project (on proposed Lot 3).
- The table below provides an analysis of the townhouse development proposal in relation to the requirements of the Zoning By-law, including the "Multiple Residential 15 Zone (RM15)"and parking requirements.

| RM-15 Zone (Part 21) | Permitted and/or Required | Proposed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Unit Density: | 37 units per hectare | 37 units per hectare |
| Floor Area Ratio: | 0.70 | 0.60 |
| Lot Coverage: | 45\% | 23\% |
| Yards and Setbacks |  |  |
| North: | 7.5 metres | 6.7 metres |
| East: | 7.5 metres | 2.3 metres |
| South: | 7.5 metres | 5.9 metres |
| West: | 7.5 metres | 4.5 metres |
| Height of Buildings |  |  |
| Principal and Amenity buildings: Accessory buildings: | 11.0 metres 4.5 metres | Max. 10.92 metres 4.5 metres |
| Amenity Space |  |  |
| Indoor Amenity: $3 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ per dwelling unit | $90 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | The proposed $115 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ exceeds the Zoning Bylaw requirement. |
| Outdoor Amenity: $3 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ per dwelling unit | $90 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | The proposed $393 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ exceeds the Zoning Bylaw requirement. |
| Parking (Part 5) | Required | Proposed |
| Number of Stalls |  |  |
| Residential: 2 per dwelling unit | 60 | 60 |
| Residential Visitor: 0.2 per dwelling unit | 6 | 6 |
| Total: | 66 | 66 |
| Tandem (\%): | Max 50\% | o\% |
| Bicycle Spaces |  |  |
| Residential Secure Parking: <br> Residential Visitor: 6 per Building | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N/A } \\ & 6 \text { (30 units = } 1 \text { building) } \end{aligned}$ | 6 |

## Setback Variances

- The applicant is requesting the following variances on proposed Lot 3 (townhouse lot):
(a) to reduce the minimum north yard setback of the RM-15 Zone from 7.5 metres to 6.7 metres to the principal building face and 4.9 metres to a balcony or veranda;
(b) to reduce the minimum east yard setback of the RM-15 Zone from 7.5 metres to 2.3 metres to the principal building face;
(c) to reduce the minimum south yard setback of the RM-15 Zone from 7.5 metres to 5.9 metres to the principal building face and 4.6 metres to a balcony or veranda; and
(d) to reduce the minimum west yard setback of the $\mathrm{RM}-15$ Zone from 7.5 metres to 4.5 metres to the principal building face and 3.5 metres to a balcony or veranda.
- The proposed reduced north setback along River Road achieves a more urban, pedestrian oriented streetscape. The reduced east, and west setbacks are appropriate for the side of unit condition of the townhomes and the reduced south setback is suitable for a front of unit condition to future single family lots being created as part of this application. Overall, these reduced setbacks facilitate a more efficient use of the subject site and are consistent with other approved townhomes development in Whalley.
- Staff support the requested variances to proceed to Public Notification.


## Capital Projects Community Amenity Contributions (CACs)

- On December 16, 2019, Council approved the City's Community Amenity Contribution and Density Bonus Program Update (Corporate Report No. R224; 2019). The intent of that report was to introduce a new City-wide Community Amenity Contribution (CAC) and updated Density Bonus Policy to offset the impacts of growth from development and to provide additional funding for community capital projects identified in the City's Annual Five-Year Capital Financial Plan.
- The proposed development will be subject to the Tier 1 Capital Plan Project CACs and will provide $\$ 2,000 /$ unit if final adoption of the Rezoning By-law is approved by December 31, 2020. The contribution rates will be introduced based on a three-phase schedule, with rates increasing as of January $\mathbf{1 , 2 0 2 1 \text { . The proposed development will be required to pay the rates }}$ that are applicable at the time of Building Permit issuance.


## Affordable Housing Strategy

- On April 9, 2018, Council approved the City's Affordable Housing Strategy (Corporate Report No. Ro66; 2018) requiring that all new rezoning applications for residential development contribute $\$ 1$, ooo per unit to support the development of new affordable housing. The funds collected through the Affordable Housing Contribution will be used to purchase land for new affordable rental housing projects.
- As the subject application was instream on April 10, 2018, the contribution does not apply.


## Public Art Policy

- The applicant will be required to provide public art, or register a Restrictive Covenant agreeing to provide cash-in-lieu, at a rate of $0.5 \%$ of construction value, to adequately address the City's needs with respect to public art, in accordance with the City's Public Art Policy requirements. The applicant will be required to resolve this requirement prior to consideration of Final Adoption.


## PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

- Pre-notification letters were sent on December 19, 2019, and the Development Proposal Signs were installed on December 20, 2019. Staff received eight (8) responses from neighbouring property owners (staff comments in italics):
- Most concerns were regarding the potential for the townhouse project to have vehicular access to 100 Avenue and a resulting increasing in traffic.
(Staff have worked with the applicant to permit only emergency and pedestrian access to the townhouse project from 100 Avenue. This access will be bollarded to prevent vehicular traffic. Most residents who had this concern were satisfied with the proposed limited access configuration.)
- A number of residents expressed concern that there is currently no sidewalk along 100 Avenue or to transit service on Scott Road. Residents have raised safety concerns around additional pedestrians sharing the roadway with vehicles.
(The construction of sidewalks is achieved through redevelopment, road projects (such as road widening or adding bike lanes on arterial roads), or through the City's capital sidewalk program. Residents have been directed to Transportation staff to share their ideas and concerns regarding walking in the area. The applicant is required to improve the frontages on the subject site.)
- One resident had concerns with the availability of on-street parking, specifically on River Road.
(The proposed number of parking stalls for the townhouse component of the project meets the Zoning By-law requirements. The units in Buildings 1, 2, 3, 4 \& 5 will have small parking pads in front of their garage doors that will provide some additional parking spaces. There is an emergency vehicle and pedestrian access route to 100 Avenue that will also double as a pedestrian route allowing residents a relatively easy walk to transit routes that run along Scott Road. Through the redevelopment of the site, the applicant will be required to dedicate some land to increase the width of the River Road right-of-way and to install curb/gutter which will also allow for more usable parking spots which should also alleviate some of the parking concerns in the area.)


## DEVELOPMENT PERMITS

## Hazard Lands (Steep Slope) Development Permit Requirement

- The subject property falls within the Hazard Lands (Steep Slope) Development Permit Area (DPA) in the OCP, given that the site contains steep slopes in excess of $20 \%$ gradient. The Hazard Land (Steep Slope) Development Permit is required to protect developments from hazardous conditions.
- The site slopes from the south towards River Road in the north. There is an approximate 15 -metre elevation change across the site.
- A geotechnical report, prepared by Tegbir S. Bajwa, P. Eng., of Able Geotechnical Ltd. and dated August 18, 2019, was peer reviewed by John Meng, P. Eng., Ph. D., of Western Geotechnical Consultants Ltd. and found to be generally acceptable by the peer reviewer. The report and peer review were reviewed by staff and found to conform to the OCP Development Permit guidelines for Hazard Lands. The finalized geotechnical report will be incorporated into the Development Permit.
- The geotechnical report investigated issues related to slope stability and natural storm water drainage, from a geotechnical perspective, to determine the feasibility of development on the site and proposing recommendations to ensure the ongoing stability of the slope.
- The consultant has determined that the development is feasible provided that the recommendations in the geotechnical report are incorporated into the overall design of the site, including but not limited to:
- subgrade preparation;
- structural fill;
- foundation treatment (spread and strip footings on the native undisturbed till or overlying compacted sand and gravel);
- slab on grade construction on compacted soil;
- the use of retaining walls.
- Registration of a Section 219 Restrictive Covenant that requires the owner to develop the site in accordance with the conditions in the geotechnical report is required as a condition of final adoption.
- At Building Permit stage, the Building Division will require Letters of Assurance from a geotechnical engineer to ensure that the building plans comply with the recommendations in the approved geotechnical report.


## Form and Character Development Permit Requirement

- The proposed development is subject to a Development Permit for Form and Character.
- The proposed development generally complies with the Form and Character Development Permit guidelines in the OCP.
- The applicant has worked with staff to address the challenges associated with developing a sloped site and addressing the concerns of increased by traffic raised of residents on 100 Avenue.
- Eight townhouse buildings, comprising a total of thirty three-bedroom units are proposed which will provide a sensitive interface between the townhome development to the east and the single family dwellings to the west.
- The proposed architectural form incorporates ground-oriented townhomes with the building sited to take advantage of the natural grade and provide an appropriate interface with the public realm.
- Building materials consist of dark grey ledgestone, grey hardi-board, black flashing, and natural cedar.
- Buildings throughout the site have been modulated into clusters of between two (2) and six (6) units per building to maximize tree preservation, landscaping, and accessibility with a maximum permitted height of 11 metres ( 36 metres) respecting the scale and character of the neighbourhood.
- There are four (4) duplex buildings ( 2 townhomes per building) facing River Road, that are more compatible with the lower-scale buildings that currently front River Road and provide easier access to the internal driveway for these units' residents.
- The townhouse units range in size from 182 square metres ( 1.965 sq.ft.) to 245 square metres ( 2,020 sq.ft.), comprised entirely of three-bedroom units.
- Each of the 30 townhouse units will contain an attached side-by-side garage and bonus room on the ground floor with a living room, dining room and kitchen on the second floor, and bedrooms on the upper floor. No tandem parking is proposed.
- Each unit will have a small, front yard space, as well as a balcony
- 100 Avenue will retain a single family built form as the applicant is proposing to reconfigure the two existing RF lots to allow for the southern emergency vehicles and pedestrian access for the townhome portion of the development.


## Landscaping

- The landscaping for the proposed development includes a pedestrian pathway at the main entrance to the site, a variety of trees and shrubs, pervious pavers for parking areas, tiered and planted retaining walls, and lounging areas for the passive recreational use of residents.


## Indoor Amenity

- The Indoor Amenity building is located at the east end of Building 6, centrally located to the convenience of all residents of the proposed development.
- The proposed townhouse development requires 90 square metres of indoor amenity space under the Zoning By-law. The proposed indoor amenity space is 114 square metres over two-storeys and features two multi-purpose spaces.


## Outdoor Amenity

- The Outdoor Amenity Area consists of two areas, the first located west Building 1 adjacent to the one of visitor parking areas. The second larger Outdoor Amenity Area is located behind Building 6 in the southeast portion of the subject site. The second Outdoor Amenity Area is located adjacent to the Indoor Amenity Area.
- The outdoor amenity areas will feature benches and a children's play area.
- The outdoor amenity areas will be landscaped with a variety of trees and shrubs, including Japanese Maples, Cypresses, Dogwoods, Beeches, and flowering Cherry trees.
- The minimum requirements for outdoor amenity area have been exceeded.


## RF Lots on 100 Avenue

- The applicant is also proposing to create the two (2) RF Zoned lots along 100 Avenue. These lots will meet the minimum lot area and dimension requirements of the RF Zone.
- The applicant retained Mike Tynan of Tynan Consulting Ltd. as the Design Consultant. The Design consultant conducted a character study of the surrounding homes and based on the findings of the study, proposed a set of building design guidelines (Appendix VI).
- A preliminary lot grading plan, submitted by Hub Engineering Inc., and dated August 9, 2019, has been review by staff and found of be generally acceptable. The applicant proposes inground basements. The feasibility of in-ground basements will be confirmed once the City's Engineering Department has reviewed and accepted the applicant's final engineering drawings.


## TREES

- Terry Thrale, ISA Certified Arborist of Woodridge Tree Consulting Arborists Ltd. prepared an Arborist Assessment for the subject property. The table below provides a summary of the tree retention and removal by tree species:

Table 1: Summary of Tree Preservation by Tree Species:

| Tree Species | Existing | Remove | Retain |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alder and Cottonwood Trees |  |  |  |
| Alder | 4 | 4 | 0 |
| Cottonwood | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Deciduous Trees <br> (excluding Alder and Cottonwood Trees) |  |  |  |
| Cherry | 12 | 12 | 0 |
| Dogwood | 1 | 1 | O |
| Hazelnut | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Holly | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Magnolia | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Maple | 8 | 8 | 0 |
| Poplar | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Walnut | 1 | 1 | O |
| Coniferous Trees |  |  |  |
| Cedar | 20 | 17 | 3 |
| Larch | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Pine | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| Redwood | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Spruce | 8 | 1 | 7 |
| Total (excluding Alder and Cottonwood Trees) | 58 | 47 | 11 |
| Total Replacement Trees Proposed (excluding Boulevard Street Trees) |  | 103 |  |
| Total Retained and Replacement Trees | 114 |  |  |
| Contribution to the Green City Program | \$0 |  |  |

- The Arborist Assessment states that there is a total of fifty-eight (58) mature trees on the site, excluding Alder and Cottonwood trees. Five (5) existing trees, approximately $8 \%$ of the total trees on the site, are Alder and Cottonwood trees. It was determined that eleven ( 11 ) trees can be retained as part of this development proposal. The proposed tree retention was assessed taking into consideration the location of services, building footprints, road dedication and proposed lot grading.
- For those trees that cannot be retained, the applicant will be required to plant trees on a 1 to 1 replacement ratio for Alder and Cottonwood trees, and a 2 to 1 replacement ratio for all other trees. This will require a total of ninety-nine (99) replacement trees on the site. The applicant is proposing 103 replacement trees, exceeding City requirements.
- In addition to the replacement trees, boulevard street trees will be planted on 100 Avenue and River Road. This will be determined by the Engineering Department during the servicing design review process.
- The new trees on the site will consist of a variety of trees including Japanese Maples, Cypresses, Dogwoods, Beeches, Magnolias, Aspens, Cherry Trees, and Cedars.
- In summary, a total of 114 trees are proposed to be retained or replaced on the site with no contribution to the Green City Program.


## INFORMATION ATTACHED TO THIS REPORT

The following information is attached to this Report:
Appendix I. Site Plan, Survey Plan, Building Elevations, Landscape Plans and Perspective
Appendix II. Engineering Summary
Appendix III. School District Comments
Appendix IV. Summary of Tree Survey and Tree Preservation
Appendix V. Development Variance Permit No. 7917-0582-00
Appendix VI. Building Design Guidelines Summary
Appendix VII. Aerial Photo
approved by Ron Gill

Jean Lamontagne
General Manager
Planning and Development
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## SURVEY PLAN TO ACCOMPANY CITY OF SURREY

REZONING BYLAW NO. _ OF:

- LOT 1, PLAN 72320
- LOTS 20 AND 21, PLAN 58576

- LOT 17, PLAN 39872

ALL OF SECTION 25, BLOCK 5 NORTH,
RANGE 3 WEST,


Certified correct this 28th day of April, 2020.

Cameron Land Surveying Ltd.
B.C. Land Surveyors

Unit 234-18525-53rd Avenue
Surrey, B.C. V3S 7A4
Phone: 604-597-3777

## PROPOSED SUBDIVISION PLAN OF

LOT 1, PLAN 72320
LOTS 20 AND 21, PLAN 58576
LOT 17, PLAN 39872


ALL OF SECTION 25, BLOCK 5 NORTH,
SCALE $1: 1000$ All distances are in metres

RANGE 3 WEST, NEW WESTMINSTER DISTRICT

City of Surrey


Cameron Land Surveying Ltd.
B.C. Land Surveyors

Unit 234 - 18525-53rd Avenue
Surrey, B.C. V3S 7A4
Phone: 604-597-3777
This plan lies within the

Certified correct this 28th day of April, 2020.

TO: Manager, Area Planning \& Development

- North Surrey Division

Planning and Development Department
FROM: Development Services Manager, Engineering Department
DATE: April 28, $2020 \quad$ PROJECT FILE: $\quad \mathbf{7 8 1 7} \mathbf{- 0 5 8 2 - 0 0}$
RE: $\quad$ Engineering Requirements
Location: 11798/118o8 River Road, 11779/11793 100 Avenue

## REZONE/SUBDIVISION

## Property and Right-of-Way Requirements

- Register o.5-metre statutory rights-of-ways (SRW) along River Road and 100 Avenue.
- Register additional SRW along the existing sanitary SRW to a minimum width of 5.0-metres.


## Works and Services

- Construct south side of River Road and the north side of 100 Avenue to the local road standard.
- Construct an individual driveway letdown to each lot.
- Construct storm and sanitary mains.
- Provide on-site stormwater mitigation features to meet the requirements of the ISMP on all proposed lots along with the installation of a water quality sediment control feature for the townhouse lot.
- Provide each lot with a storm, water, and sanitary service connection to the fronting main.
- Register applicable restrictive covenants as determined through detailed design.

A Servicing Agreement is required prior to Rezone/Subdivision.

## DEVELOPMENT PERMIT/DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT

There are no engineering requirements relative to issuance of the Development Permit/ Development Variance Permit beyond those noted above.


Tommy Buchmann, P.Eng.
Development Services Manager
SK2

February 14, 2020

Planning

## THE IMPACT ON SCHOOLS

APPLICATION \#: 17058200 REVISED

## SUMMARY

The proposed 2 Single family with suites and 30 townhouse units
are estimated to have the following impact
on the following schools:
Projected \# of students for this development:

| Elementary Students: | 9 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Secondary Students: | 4 |

September 2019 Enrolment/School Capacity

| Royal Heights Elementary |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Enrolment (K/1-7): | $23 \mathrm{~K}+179$ |
| Operating Capacity (K/1-7) | $38 \mathrm{~K}+326$ |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| L. A. Matheson Secondary | 1111 |
| Enrolment (8-12): | 1400 |
| Capacity (8-12): |  |

## School Enrolment Projections and Planning Update:

Royal Heights Elementary is currently operating below capacity. The 10 year enrolment projections are showing modest growth in the catchment. Even though some parcels are looking to increase their housing density, the projected development is not enough to overcome a maturing enrolment trend in the area. Currently, there are no plans to expand this school.
L.A. Matheson Secondary is currently operating at $80 \%$. Though the 10 year enrollment projections do show modest growth, the current capacity of the building can accommodate it. Currently, there are no plans to expand this school.

Royal Heights Elementary



* Nominal Capacity is estimated by multiplying the number of enrolling spaces by 25 students. Maximum operating capacity is estimated by multipying the number of enrolling spaces by 27 students.


## Tree Preservation Summary

Surrey Project No: 17-0582
Address: 11779,11793 100th Ave and 11798, 11808 River Road
Registered Arborist: Woodridge Tree Consulting Arborists Ltd., Terry Thrale (PN-6766A)

| OnSite Trees | Number of Trees |  | Off-Site Trees |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Protected Trees Identified * | 57 |  | Protected Trees Identified |

Summary, report and plan prepared and submitted by:
Terry Thrale

Tree Plan for Development at 11779 \& 11793 100th Ave and 11798 \& 11808 River Road Surrey, BC

August 22, 2017
Updated: April 17, 2020


# CITY OF SURREY 

(the "City")

## DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT

NO.: 7917-0582-00
Issued To:
(the "Owner")

Address of Owner:

1. This development variance permit is issued subject to compliance by the Owner with all statutes, by-laws, orders, regulations or agreements, except as specifically varied by this development variance permit.
2. This development variance permit applies to that real property including land with or without improvements located within the City of Surrey, with the legal description and civic address as follows:

Parcel Identifier: 005-695-431
Lot 21 Section 25 Block 5 North Range 3 West New Westminster District Plan 58576 11798 - River Road

Parcel Identifier: 004-560-973
Lot 1 Section 25 Block 5 North Range 3 West New Westminster District Plan 72320 11808 - River Road

Parcel Identifier: oo8-677-590
Lot 17 Section 25 Block 5 North Range 3 West New Westminster District Plan 39872 11779-100 Avenue

Parcel Identifier: 005-695-406
Lot 20 Section 25 Block 5 North Range 3 West New Westminster District Plan 58576 11793-100 Avenue
(the "Land")
3. (a) As the legal description of the Land is to change, the City Clerk is directed to insert the new legal description for the Land once title(s) has/have been issued, as follows:

Parcel Identifier:
(b) If the civic address(es) change(s), the City Clerk is directed to insert the new civic address(es) for the Land, as follows:
4. Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000, as amended is varied as follows:
a) In Section F of Part 21 "Multiple Residential 15 Zone (RM-15)" the minimum north yard setback is reduced from 7.5 metres ( 25 ft .) to 6.7 metres ( 22 ft .) to the principal building face and 4.9 metres ( 16 ft .) to a balcony or veranda on proposed Lot 3 (townhouse lot);
b) In Section F of Part 21 "Multiple Residential 15 Zone (RM-15)" the minimum east yard setback is reduced from 7.5 metres ( 25 ft .) to 2.3 metres ( 7.5 ft .) to the building face on proposed Lot 3 (townhouse lot);
c) In Section F of Part 21 "Multiple Residential 15 Zone (RM-15)" the minimum south yard setback is reduced from 7.5 metres ( 25 ft .) to 5.9 metres ( 19 ft .) to the building face and 4.6 metres ( 15 ft .) to a balcony or veranda on proposed Lot 3 (townhouse lot); and
d) In Section F of Part 21 "Multiple Residential 15 Zone (RM-15)" the minimum west yard setback is reduced from 7.5 metres ( 25 ft .) to 4.5 metres ( 23 ft .) to the building face and 3.5 metres ( 11.5 ft .) to a balcony or veranda on proposed Lot 3 (townhouse lot).
5. This development variance permit applies to only the portion of the Land shown on Schedule A which is attached hereto and forms part of this development variance permit. This development variance permit does not apply to additions to, or replacement of, any of the existing buildings shown on attached Schedule A, which is attached hereto and forms part of this development variance permit.
6. The Land shall be developed strictly in accordance with the terms and conditions and provisions of this development variance permit.
7. This development variance permit shall lapse if the Owner does not substantially start any construction with respect to which this development variance permit is issued, within two (2) years after the date this development variance permit is issued.
8. The terms of this development variance permit or any amendment to it, are binding on all persons who acquire an interest in the Land.
9. This development variance permit is not a building permit.
AUTHORIZING RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE COUNCIL, THE DAY OF , 20 .
ISSUED THIS DAY OF , 20.

Mayor - Doug McCallum

City Clerk - Jennifer Ficocelli

SCHEDULE A


# APPENDIX VI 

## BUILDING GUIDELINES SUMMARY


#### Abstract

Surrey Project no: 17-0582-00 Project Location: 11779 and 11793-100 Avenue, Surrey, B.C. Design Consultant: Tynan Consulting Ltd., (Michael E. Tynan) The draft Building Scheme proposed for this Project has been filed with the City Clerk. The following is a summary of the Residential Character Study and the Design Guidelines which highlight the important features and form the basis of the draft Building Scheme.


## 1. Residential Character

### 1.1 General Description of the Existing and/or Emerging Residential Character of the Subject Site:

The subject site is located within an old urban (1950's - 1980's) development area. The style of most homes can be described as "West Coast Traditional", "Rural Heritage" or "Old urban". Home types include Bungalow (35\%), Two-Storey (24\%), Basement Entry (29\%), and 1 1/2 Storey (12\%). Homes range in size between 1000 sq.ft. and 2800 sq.ft.

A variety of massing designs are evident, including simple low mass homes (the Bungalows), homes with low to mid-scale massing ( $11 / 2$ Storey), homes with mid-scale massing (the Two Storey homes), and homes with high scale to box-like massing (the Basement Entry homes).

There are a wide variety of roof forms including common hip, common gable, Dutch Hip, Boston gable, Boston hip, carousel hip, and shed, which is a greater variety of forms than are commonly found in most post year 2000's developments. Roof slopes range from 2:12 to 10:12, but a majority of homes have roof slopes in the 4:12-7:12 range. Roof surfaces include asphalt shingles (clearly dominant), concrete roof tiles (one home) and tar and gravel ( 2 homes).

Wall cladding materials include vinyl, aluminum, stucco, and cedar in a colour range that includes neutral, natural, and primary colours. Only 18 percent of homes have a brick or stone accent. Trim and detailing standards are typical of those found on most homes constructed between the 1950's and 1980's.

Overall, landscaping standards are considered modest to average for homes from this era.
The subject site is comprised of two single family detached lots which are addressed by the proposed Statutory Building Scheme, and by a large CD zone lot, upon which 32 townhouse units are proposed. The Townhouse site will be substantially concealed behind the two new homes that are the subject of these guidelines.

### 1.2 Features of Surrounding Dwellings Significant to the Proposed Building Scheme:

1) Context Homes: The housing stock in the area surrounding the subject site does not provide suitable architectural context for a post year 2017 RF zone development. Massing scale, massing designs, roof designs, construction materials, and trim and
detailing elements have improved significantly since most homes in this area were constructed. It is more sensible therefore, to use updated standards that result in reasonable compatibility with the older homes and also result in standards that improve over time, than it is to specifically emulate the older homes by building to the older standards.

In some cases it is appropriate to match the style and building components between single family homes and multifamily units comprising the same development. However, in this case it would be better to have the two subject RF lots appear to be a part of the single family residential neighbourhood on 100 Avenue, than it would to have the two new RF homes appear to be a part of the townhouse site. Therefore, no attempt will be made for style or building component consistency between the townhouse site and the proposed two RF zone lots.
2) Style Character: Most neighbouring homes can be classified as old urban homes that have massing designs and exterior trim and detailing standards that do not meet modern standards. Rather than emulating the existing homes, the recommendation is to utilize compatible styles including "Neo-Traditional", "Neo-Heritage", and other compatible styles which could include compatible manifestations of the "West Coast Contemporary" style. Note that style range is not specifically restricted in the building scheme. However, the consultant refers to the character study when reviewing plans for meeting stylecharacter intent.
3) Home Types: There are a wide range of home types evident, and so some flexibility is justified. Home type (Two-Storey, Bungalow, Basement Entry, Split Level, etc..) will not be regulated in the building scheme.
4) Massing Designs : Massing designs should meet new standards for RF zoned subdivisions. New homes should exhibit "mid-scale" massing. Various elements and projections on the front of the home should be interesting architecturally, and should be in pleasing natural proportions to one another. These elements and projections should be located so as to create balance across the façade.
5) Front Entrance Design : Front entrance porticos are all one storey high. The recommendation however is to limit the range of entrance portico heights to between one and $1 \frac{1}{2}$ storeys to ensure there is not proportional overstatement of this one element, but also in recognition of the scale of the proposed homes.
6) Exterior Wall Cladding: A wide range of cladding materials have been used in this area, including vinyl, cedar, aluminum, stucco, brick, and stone. Reasonable flexibility should therefore be permitted, including the use of vinyl siding, provided the overall quality of wall cladding materials meets or exceeds common standards for post 2017 developments.
7) Roof surface: A wide range of roof surfacing materials have been used in this area including asphalt shingles, tar and gravel, and concrete roof tiles. The roof surface is not a uniquely recognizable characteristic of this area and so flexibility in roof surface materials is warranted. The recommendation is to permit cedar shingles, shake profile concrete roof tiles, shake profile asphalt shingles with a raised ridge cap, and new environmentally sustainable roof products that have a strong shake profile. Where required by the BC Building Code for lower slope applications membrane roofing products can be permitted subject to consultant approval. Small decorative metal roofs should also be permitted.
8) Roof Slope: The recommendation is to set the minimum roof slope at 6:12. A provision is also recommended to allow slopes less than $6: 12$ where it is determined by the consultant that the design is of such high architectural integrity that the roof slope
reduction can be justified, or that lower slopes are needed on feature projections or at the front entrance veranda to ensure upper floor windows can be installed without interference with the roof structure below.

Streetscape: The streetscape is comprised entirely of old urban homes that were constructed in the 1950's to 1980's. Homes include small simple low profile Bungalows, low to mid-scale $11 / 2$ Storey type, mid-scale mass TwoStorey type, and high mass box like Basement Entry homes in which the upper floor is positioned directly above the main floor, resulting in a fully exposed upper floor. Roof slopes range from $2: 12$ to $10: 12$, but most homes have a roof slope in the 4:12-7:12 range. Most homes have an asphalt shingle roof, but tar and gravel (two homes) and concrete tiles (one home) are also evident. Walls are surfaced with stucco, cedar, or vinyl, and only a small number of homes have a masonry accent. Trim and detailing standards are modest by modern standards. Landscapes are modest by modern standards.

## 2. Proposed Design Guidelines

### 2.1 Specific Residential Character and Design Elements these Guidelines Attempt to Preserve and/or Create:

- the new homes are readily identifiable as one of the following styles: "Traditional", "Heritage", "NeoTraditional", "Neo-Heritage", compatible forms of "West Coast Contemporary", or other compatible styles with appropriate transitions in massing and character, as determined by the design consultant. Note that the proposed style range is not contained within the building scheme, but is contained within the residential character study which forms the basis for interpreting building scheme regulations.
- a new single family dwelling constructed on any lot meets year 2017's design standards, which include the proportionally correct allotment of mass between various street facing elements, the overall balanced distribution of mass within the front facade, readily recognizable style-authentic design, and a high trim and detailing standard used specifically to reinforce the style objectives stated above.
- trim elements will include several of the following: furred out wood posts, articulated wood post bases, wood braces and brackets, louvered wood vents, bold wood window and door trim, highly detailed gable ends, wood dentil details, stone or brick feature accents, covered entrance verandas and other style-specific elements, all used to reinforce the style (i.e. not just decorative).
- the development is internally consistent in theme, representation, and character.
- the entrance element will be limited in height (relative dominance) to 1 to $1 \frac{1}{2}$ storeys.


### 2.2 Proposed Design Solutions:

Interfacing Treatment with existing dwellings)

Existing neighbouring homes do not provide suitable context for the proposed RF zone homes at the subject site. Interfacing treatments are therefore not contemplated. Rather, massing design, construction materials, and trim element treatments will meet or exceed standards commonly found in RF developments constructed in Surrey subsequent to the year 2017.
$\left.\begin{array}{ll}\text { Exterior Materials/Colours: } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Stucco, Cedar, Vinyl, Fibre-Cement Board, Brick, and Stone. } \\ \\ \\ \text { "Natural" colours such as browns, greens, clays, and other } \\ \text { earth-tones, and "Neutral" colours such as grey, white, and } \\ \text { cream are permitted. "Primary" colours in subdued tones such } \\ \text { as navy blue, colonial red, or forest green can be considered } \\ \text { providing neutral trim colours are used, and a comprehensive } \\ \text { colour scheme is approved by the consultant. "Warm" colours } \\ \text { such as pink, rose, peach, salmon are not permitted. Trim } \\ \text { colours: Shade variation of main colour, complementary, } \\ \text { neutral, or subdued contrast only. }\end{array} \\ \text { Roof Pitch: } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Minimum 6:12, with exceptions to prevent roof ridges from } \\ \text { becoming too high (overshadowing of neighbouring lots), to }\end{array} \\ \text { allow for veranda roofs that do not cover upper floor windows, to }\end{array}\right\}$

Compliance Deposit: $\$ 5,000.00$

Summary prepared and submitted by: Tynan Consulting Ltd. Date: Sept 18, 2019

Reviewed and Approved by:


## APPENDIX VII



## 7917-0582-00 | Aerial View of Subject Site
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