

City of Surrey PLANNING \& DEVELOPMENT REPORT Application No.: 7918-0149-00

Planning Report Date: October 18, 2021

## PROPOSAL:

- Rezoning from RF and C-4 to CD (based on C-5)
- Development Permit
to permit the development of a single-storey, multiunit commercial centre.

LOCATION: 13190-64 Avenue 6365-132 Street
13174-64 Avenue 6370-131A Street 6362-131A Street

ZONING: RF and C-4
OCP DESIGNATION: Urban


## RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY

- By-law Introduction and set date for Public Hearing for rezoning.
- Approval to draft Development Permit for Form and Character.


## RATIONALE OF RECOMMENDATION

- The proposal complies with the Urban designation in the Official Community Plan (OCP) and the General Urban designation in the Metro Vancouver Regional Growth Strategy (RGS).
- The proposal complies with the Development Permit requirements in the OCP for Form and Character of commercial developments. Compared to the existing commercial building, a more urban, pedestrian streetscape is proposed. The development has a sensitive interface to the adjacent single family lots to the south, with a large setback and landscape buffering.
- The neighbourhood-scale commercial development supports a number of OCP policies by expanding commercial amenities available by walking and cycling within an existing residential neighbourhood.
- The location and scale of the proposed development are appropriate, being at the intersection of two transit corridors, adjacent to Panorama Ridge Secondary School and within close proximity to residential neighbourhoods on the north and south sides of 64 Avenue.


## RECOMMENDATION

The Planning \& Development Department recommends that:

1. A By-law be introduced to rezone the subject site from "Single Family Residential Zone (RF)" and "Local Commercial Zone (C4)" to "Comprehensive Development Zone (CD)" and a date be set for Public Hearing.
2. Council authorize staff to draft Development Permit No. 7918-o149-oo generally in accordance with the attached drawings (Appendix I).
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) resolution of all urban design issues to the satisfaction of the Planning and Development Department;
(d) payment of the applicant's voluntary contribution as highlighted in this report towards park upgrades in the neighbourhood;
(e) submission of a finalized landscaping plan and landscaping cost estimate to the specifications and satisfaction of the Planning and Development Department;
(f) submission of a finalized tree survey and a statement regarding tree preservation to the satisfaction of the City Landscape Architect;
(g) the applicant satisfy the deficiency in tree replacement on the site, to the satisfaction of the Planning and Development Department;
(h) demolition of existing buildings and structures to the satisfaction of the Planning and Development Department;
(i) completion of the road closure and acquisition of the east/west lane; and
(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.

## SITE CONTEXT \& BACKGROUND

| Direction | Existing Use | OCP Designation | Existing Zone |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Subject Site | Existing <br> commercial <br> building and <br> commercial <br> parking lot, City <br> detention pond, <br> and one single <br> family home. | Urban | C-4 and RF |
| North (Across 64 Avenue): | Single family <br> residential lots, <br> two of which are <br> currently under <br> application to <br> rezone and <br> subdivide <br> (Applications No. <br> 7921-0201-oo and <br> $7921-0237-$ oo). | Urban | RF |
| East (Across 132 Street): | Panorama Ridge <br> Secondary School | Urban | Urban |
| South and West (Across 131A <br> Street): | Single family <br> residential lots | RF |  |

## Context \& Background

- The subject site consists of five properties and a City lane, located between 131A Street and 132 Street, on the south side of 64A Avenue.
- The property at the northeast corner of the site (13190-64 Avenue) is the current location of a building containing local commercial businesses, including a Fruiticana grocery store. The properties to the west and south of the existing commercial building (13174-64 Avenue and 6365-132 Street) are being used for parking.
- In the northwest corner of the subject site ( $6370-131 \mathrm{~A}$ Street) is a grassed stormwater detention pond owned by the City.
- To the south of the detention pond is an existing single family home at 6362-131A Street, in the southwest portion of the proposed development site.
- An existing City lane, running east/west through the site, is also proposed to be purchased and consolidated as part the development.
- The total site area is 0.66 hectares. To the south, west, and north of the site are established single family neighbourhoods. To the east, across 132 Street, is Panorama Ridge Secondary School.
- The subject properties are designated "Urban" in the Official Community Plan (OCP) and are not located within a secondary plan area. They are currently zoned "Local Commercial Zone (C-4)" and "Single Family Residential Zone (RF)."


## DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

## Planning Considerations

- The applicant proposes to rezone the site from "Local Commercial Zone (C-4)" and "Single Family Residential Zone (RF)" to Comprehensive Development Zone (CD), based on "Neighbourhood Commercial Zone (C-5)" in order to allow a single-storey multi-tenant commercial development consisting of two buildings.
- The existing Fruiticana grocery store, currently located at 13190-64 Avenue, will relocate and occupy all of Building A. Building B, which is larger, will contain 8 commercial units.
- The existing City stormwater detention pond is proposed to be purchased and consolidated with the site. A new stormwater detention system is proposed to be installed under the west side of the parking lot in order to retain the storm detention function.
- The total proposed building area is 2,211 square metres and the density is o.37 FAR.

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Pot Area |  |
| Gross Site Area: | 6,613 square metres |
| Road Dedication: | 608 square metres |
| Undevelopable Area: | N/A |
| Net Site Area: | 6,005 square metres |
| Number of Lots: | 5 lots plus City lane to be consolidated into one lot |
| Building Height: | one storey (7.9 metres) |
| Floor Area Ratio (FAR): | o.37 |
| Floor Area |  |
| Residential: | N/A |
| Commercial: | 2,211 square metres |
| Total: | 2,211 square metres |

## Referrals

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

Parks, Recreation \& Culture:

Surrey Fire Department: The Fire Department has no concerns with the proposed development.

Advisory Design Panel: The proposal was considered at the ADP meeting on July 8, 2021, and was conditionally supported.

The applicant has resolved most of the outstanding items from the ADP review as outlined in the Development Permit section of this report. Any additional revisions will be completed prior to Council's consideration of Final Adoption of the rezoning by-law, to the satisfaction of the Planning and Development Department.

## Transportation Considerations

- The existing east/west lane is proposed to be consolidated with the development site.
- The applicant will be required to dedicate road right-of-way on the north (64 Avenue) and east ( 132 Street) sides of the site, as well as dedicating a new east-west lane adjacent to the south property line. The new east-west lane will span the eastern half of the length of the site along the southern property line. The lane will be required in the future to provide rear access to lots fronting 132 Street when and if those lots redevelop.
- Driveway access to the new development will be from 131A Street and from the new lane. The new east-west lane will serve only the proposed development until such time as the lots to the south redevelop.
- The proposed development has been designed for pedestrian-friendly access from 64 Avenue and 132 Street, where entrances to retail units will be located. It is anticipated that the development will receive pedestrian traffic from the surrounding neighbourhood and adjacent school and transit on 64 Avenue and 132 Streets.


## Parkland Considerations

- The applicant proposes to purchase and consolidate the property at 6370-131A Street, which currently serves as a stormwater detention pond (Pond ${ }_{71} \mathrm{C}$ ).
- Stormwater detention will be incorporated into the development in order to maintain the required function, through a system located under the west side of the parking lot.
- Area residents have expressed concern about the proposed loss of green space (storm pond area) in their neighbourhood. In response to this concern, the applicant has volunteered to contribute \$30,000 towards improvements in Panorama Heights Park which is a linear park with one entrance located approximately 150 metres from the subject site. The improvements may include path upgrades and installation of other landscape features to improve the experience of the park for residents.


## Sustainability Considerations

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


## POLICY \& BY-LAW CONSIDERATIONS

## Regional Growth Strategy

- The properties are designated "General Urban" in Metro Vancouver's Regional Growth Strategy (RGS) and the proposal complies with the land-use designation.


## Official Community Plan

## Land Use Designation

- The proposal complies with the "Urban" land-use designation in the Official Community Plan (OCP).


## Themes/Policies

- Theme A3 (Sensitive Infill), Policy A3.7: Encourage local neighbourhood commercial centres and associated local gathering places to appropriately locate within existing neighbourhoods in order to increase walking and cycling options and contribute to neighbourhood character.
- The proposed commercial development is sensitive in scale to the existing single family neighbourhood and will expand the commercial amenities available within walking distance of nearby residents.
- Theme B3 (Transit Corridors), Policy B3.7: Orient new buildings to directly face and front onto streets along all transit corridors, providing convenient access to residences and businesses from transit routes.
- The proposed new commercial buildings will be street-oriented, with primary access to all retail units from the adjacent public sidewalks. It is located at the intersection of two transit routes, on 64 Avenue and 132 Street.
- Theme B4 (Healthy Neighbourhoods), Policy B4.11: Create mixed-use neighbourhood centres that support the needs of local residents by including local-oriented shopping, services, schools, and amenities within easy walking and cycling distance in order to reduce dependency on private vehicles.
- Although the subject site is not located in a defined neighbourhood centre, it does provide expanded commercial amenities to local residents in a location that is walkable, transit-oriented, and adjacent to Panorama Ridge Secondary School.


## CD By-law

- The applicant proposes to rezone the subject site from "Single Family Residential Zone (RF)" and "Local Commercial Zone (C-4)" to "Comprehensive Development Zone (CD)."
- The applicant is proposing a "Comprehensive Development Zone (CD)" to accommodate a 517 square metre unit for Fruiticana in Building A, which is larger than the maximum 370 square metre unit size permitted in the C-5 Zone. The proposed CD By-law for the proposed development site identifies the uses, densities, and setbacks. The CD By-law will have provisions based on the "Neighbourhood Commercial Zone (C-5)."
- A comparison of the density, lot coverage, setbacks, building height and permitted uses in the C-5 Zone and the proposed CD By-law is illustrated in the following table:

- The C-5 Zone includes a restriction on the maximum unit size. This cap (370 square metres) aligns with a unit size threshold in the parking section of the Zoning Bylaw. For retail uses, units below this threshold require parking at 2.75 spaces per 100 square metres. Above this size, a parking rate of 3.0 spaces per 100 square metres applies.
- The Fruiticana grocery store proposes to occupy all of Building A, which is 517 square metres. A business of this size would not comply with the C-5 Zone, which is why a CD Bylaw has been proposed.
- The applicant will provide parking for Building A at the higher rate of 3.0 spaces per 100 square metres, and will apply the lower rate of 2.75 spaces per square metres to Building B.
- The Fruiticana grocery store is considered to be an appropriate scale for the neighbourhood, and the applicant is able to provide sufficient parking to accommodate the higher rate, so this departure from the typical C-5 requirements is supported.
- The CD Bylaw will not allow individual units in Building B to be combined or enlarged beyond the maximum 370 square metres.
- The proposed building setback reductions noted in the table above will achieve pedestrianoriented access to all retail units from an urban, split-commercial sidewalk. The building orientation and setbacks are in keeping with the commercial Form \& Character Design Guidelines in the City's Official Community Plan (OCP) relating to street-oriented development.


## 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 November 21, 2019, and the Development Proposal Signs were installed on November 5, 2019. Staff have received twelve responses from area residents in response to the proposal (staff comments in italics):
- Many residents are opposed to the sale of City land (the stormwater detention pond at 6370 - 131A Street) to facilitate private development. They believe that the detention pond is usable green space for the area and, because it was established as part of the subdivision that created the existing RF neighbourhood, it is an integral part of the neighbourhood, providing a green amenity to residents.
(The lot at 6370 is intended to serve as utility infrastructure- a stormwater detention pond. It is an open grassy area that is mostly sunken below the sidewalk elevation and is not buffered from 64 Avenue. Due to its location on this busy street and its lack of programming, it is not considered a high-value park amenity when compared to other park spaces in the City. If the proposed development is approved, the applicant will pay market value for the land, which will allow the City to invest in higher-quality park land elsewhere.

The developer has also volunteered to contribute $\$ 30,000$ to improvements in Panorama Heights Park. These improvements will help to compensate residents of the immediate area for the loss of the green space at 6370-131A Street.)

- Some neighbours oppose the expansion of the commercial-zoned area, stating that residential lots and the detention pond should not be converted to commercial use.
(Although four RF-Zoned lots are proposed to be rezoned for commercial use, only one of those lots is currently being used for residential purposes. Two of the RFZoned lots currently serve as parking for the existing commercial development.

Expansion of the commercial use to span the block between 131A Street and 132 Street will allow for a continuous retail frontage with parking in the rear, which provides a pedestrian-friendly environment, in compliance with OCP Form \& Character Development Permit Guidelines.

Where the proposed commercial site will abut single family homes, a 5-metre wide landscaping buffer is proposed to provide separation between the uses.)

- Traffic is a concern for many residents. They feel that existing traffic volumes are high around the commercial building and the high school, and they object to the increased traffic that may be generated by the proposed development.
(In concept, neighbourhood-oriented commercial developments such as the one proposed will allow residents to access these amenities by walking or cycling, allowing for alternatives to the private vehicle. It is not anticipated that the proposed neighbourhood commercial development will lead to a significant increase in traffic.

The improved design of the proposed development will eliminate driveway access from 64 Avenue, reducing the potential for conflict between vehicles and pedestrians in this area and enhancing the pedestrian environment on the 131A Street, 64 Avenue, and 132 Street frontages.

The applicant has submitted a traffic study as part of the application review requirements. Transportation Engineering has determined that the traffic generated by the proposed development will not be significant enough to warrant any additional traffic safety measures.)

- Concerns were raised about existing crime and drug use in the area, and some believe that the development will foster more crime.
(The design of the proposed new development will meet current CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) standards and allow for more "eyes on the street" than the existing, older commercial building and detention pond.)
- Concerns were also raised about the loss of the stormwater detention pond and the potential increase for flooding and runoff.
(The applicant has demonstrated, to the satisfaction of the City's Engineering Department, that the full stormwater detention capacity of the existing pond can be met through an enclosed detention system that will be installed under the commercial parking lot. Details will be established as part of the Servicing Agreement.)
- Some residents commented that there is already sufficient commercial space in the Newton area.
(The applicant believes that there is demand for the proposed commercial units in this neighbourhood, which will include an expanded space for the existing Fruiticana store. The City's Official Community Plan supports the establishment of small-scale commercial nodes in residential areas in order to allow more residents to access amenities close to home.)
- Neighbours are concerned about the amount of tree removal proposed.
(The applicant proposes to remove 34 on-site trees from the subject properties, which includes 6 alder and cottonwood. Prior to final approval, staff will work with the applicant to try to retain nine off-site trees that are currently identified for removal. The landscaping plan shows a proposed 53 trees to be planted as part of the development.)
- Some commenters object to the potential noise and nuisance from possible pubs or other new businesses that this development may bring.
(Although neighbourhood pubs are permitted in the C-5 Zone, the applicant has indicated that there are no plans at this time to introduce this use on the property.)


## Public Information Meeting

- The applicant held an in-person Public Information Meeting on February 26, 2020, at the Holiday Inn in Cloverdale. There were many community members in attendance, though only 17 provided contact information on the sign-in sheet.
- Neighbours had a number of concerns about the proposal, most of which were also noted in written comments received by staff and are discussed above.
- Two additional comments that arose at the Public Information Meeting are as follows (staff comments are in italics):
- Some residents had concerns about the character of the neighbourhood changing over time, with changes to the style and setbacks of newer homes making the area feel more urban than suburban. They worried that the development of additional commercial space would further alter the character of the area.
(Small commercial nodes in residential areas are desirable from the perspectives of community building, sustainability, and accessibility. Because it faces 64 Avenue and is buffered from the residential lots to the south, the visual impact on the surrounding neighbourhood will be minimal.)
- One attendee stressed that there should be trees planted in the parking lot.
(The applicant proposes to plant 33 trees within and around the parking lot.)


## DEVELOPMENT PERMITS

## 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 Official Community Plan (OCP).
- The applicant has worked with staff to create a pedestrian-friendly and accessible splitcommercial sidewalk along the street frontages, that allows flush access to all street-oriented commercial units and works with the natural grades on-site.
- Because the site is at the intersection of two transit routes, is located close to Panorama Ridge Secondary School, and is surrounded by residential neighbourhoods, it is anticipated that many trips to the site will be by foot or cycling so accessibility from the street frontages is important. The applicant also proposes a breezeway between the buildings to allow convenient access to all units from the rear parking area.
- The breezeway has been designed with CPTED principles in mind. Glazing will be wrapped around the sides of units to provide surveillance and activation of the space. The design includes lighting, awnings, landscaped islands, and benches to make the area inviting, comfortable, and secure for pedestrians.
- Rear access to units is proposed from the parking area. These entrances will be secondary to the main entrances from the public street sidewalks. In order to ensure that the street sidewalk entrances remain the primary access to the commercial units, future business owners will not be allowed to obscure any glazing on the street frontages of the units. Glazing on the south elevations will be permitted to be partially obscured if desired.
- These single storey buildings consist of a contemporary rectilinear architectural form. The grading is stepped in between some units to maintain flush unit entrances with the adjacent street sidewalk, The varying façade and parapet heights further serves to differentiate individual units.
- The building material, colours, and finishes are light to dark grey stucco with horizontal wood-toned siding and black metal cantilevered canopies wrapping around the building on street frontages and intermittent at the rear (south), over the secondary unit entrances.
- Signage will consist of illuminated channel letters and will comply with the provisions of the Sign Bylaw.


## Landscaping

- In-ground landscape planters are located on private property within the walkway on the 64 Avenue and 132 Street frontages. Planters are sufficiently spaced to allow access to unit entrances from the public street sidewalk. Maples, dogwood, and maidenhair trees are proposed to be planted in the walkway.
- Three additional in-ground planters with maple trees are proposed within the breezeway.
- On the south side of the property, a 5 -metre wide landscaping buffer is proposed between the parking lot and the adjacent single family lots. A 1.8 -metre tall solid wood fence is proposed adjacent to the south property line. Planting within the buffer will consist of pine and maple trees, as well as a variety of shrubs and grass.
- Decorative paving is proposed at all vehicle entrances, both from 131 A Street and from the lane. There will also be some decorative paving on the private portion of the walkway and within the breezeway.


## Outstanding Items

- The applicant is required to resolve all outstanding urban design and landscaping issues and Advisory Design Panel (ADP) comments. Principal outstanding items are as follows:
- The design of the breezeway needs further refinement in order to address comments raised by the Advisory Design Panel;
- Locations of fascia signs need to be resolved;
- Co-ordination between the architectural and landscape drawings is required;
- Some detailed labels on the architectural drawings need correction and clarification;
- The applicant has been provided a detailed list identifying these requirements and has agreed to resolve these prior to Final Approval of the Development Permit, should the application be supported by Council.


## TREES

- Peter Mennel, ISA Certified Arborist of Mike Fadum \& Associates 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 \& Cottonwood | 6 | 6 | 0 |
| Deciduous Trees <br> (excluding Alder and Cottonwood Trees) |  |  |  |
| Fig, Common | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Hawthorn | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Linden | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Maple, Hedge | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Maple, Morgan | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Maple, Sycamore | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Oak, Red | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| Sweetgum, American | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| Coniferous Trees |  |  |  |
| Cedar, Western Red | 10 | 10 | 0 |
| Spruce, Norway | 8 | 8 | 0 |


| Tree Species | Existing | Remove | Retain |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total (excluding Alder and <br> Cottonwood Trees) | 28 | 28 | 0 |
| Total Replacement Trees Proposed <br> (excluding Boulevard Street Trees) | 53 |  |  |
| Total Retained and Replacement Trees | 53 |  |  |
| Contribution to the Green City Program |  |  |  |

- The Arborist Assessment states that there is a total of 28 mature trees on the site, excluding Alder and Cottonwood trees. 6 existing trees, approximately $18 \%$ of the total trees on the site, are Alder and Cottonwood trees. It was determined that no 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 62 replacement trees on the site. Since only 53 replacement trees are proposed, the deficit of 9 replacement trees will require a cash-in-lieu payment of $\$ 3,600$, representing $\$ 400$ per tree, to the Green City Program, in accordance with the City's Tree Protection By-law. Final tree removal and replanting numbers, and the final cash-in-lieu requirement will be confirmed by Trees \& Landscaping prior to final approval.
- Additional investigation is required to determine whether City boulevard trees on 131A Street and a cluster of trees at the rear of 6354-131A Street are viable for retention. As a condition of Final Approval, the applicant will be required to resolve any issues around the retention of these off-site trees.
- In addition to the replacement trees, boulevard street trees will be planted on 64 Avenue, 131A Street, and 132 Street. 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 maple, dogwood, mainenhair, honey locust, and pine.
- In summary, a total of 53 trees are proposed to be retained or replaced on the site with a contribution of $\$ 3,600$ to the Green City Program. Final numbers and amounts will be confirmed before final approval of the application.


## INFORMATION ATTACHED TO THIS REPORT

The following information is attached to this Report:
Appendix I. Site Plan, Building Elevations, Landscape Plans, and Perspective
Appendix II. Engineering Summary
Appendix III. Summary of Tree Survey and Tree Preservation
Appendix IV. ADP Comments and Response
approved by Shawn Low

Rémi Dubé
Acting General Manager
Planning and Development
MJ/cm

## Appendix I

COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT
FOR TONY SINGH CIO RAM CONSTRUCTION
6365132 ST \& 13174/ 1319064 AVE, SURREY, BC
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FROM: Acting Development Services Manager, Engineering Department
DATE: October 09, $\mathbf{2 0 2 1} \quad$ PROJECT FILE: 7818-0149-00

## Engineering Requirements (Commercial/Industrial) <br> Location: 6362/6370 131A Street, 6365-132 Street and 13174/13190-64 Avenue

## REZONE/SUBDIVISION

## Property and Right-of-Way Requirements

- dedicate 4.942 m fronting 132 Street.
- dedicate 2.808 m fronting 64 Avenue.
- dedicate 6.0 m east/west lane.
- dedicate $5.0 \mathrm{~m} \times 5.0 \mathrm{~m}$ corner cut at the intersection of 64 Avenue and 132 Street.
- dedicate $3.0 \mathrm{~m} \times 3.0 \mathrm{~m}$ corner cut at the intersection of 131 A Street and 64 Avenue.
- dedicate $3.0 \mathrm{~m} \times 3.0 \mathrm{~m}$ corner cut at the intersection of the lane and 132 Street.
- register o.5m SRW fronting 64 Avenue, 131A Street and 132 Street.
- provide necessary SRW on-site over proposed detention facility.


## Works and Services

- provide Transportation Impact Study and implement its recommendations.
- construct east side of 131A Street.
- construct 6.0 m east/west lane.
- construct storm and sanitary mains to support the development.

A Servicing Agreement is required prior to Rezone/Subdivision. A processing fee of $\$ 7,785.75$ is required.

## DEVELOPMENT PERMIT/DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT

There are no engineering requirements relative to the issuance of the Development Permit and Development Variance Permit other than those noted above.


Jeff Pang, P.Eng. Acting Development Services Manager

## Tree Preservation Summary

## Surrey Project No: 14-0301-00

Address: 6362 / 6370-131A Street, 6365-132 Street and 13174 / 13190-64 Avenue, Surrey, BC Registered Arborist: Vanessa Melney

| On-Site Trees | Number of Trees |
| :---: | :---: |
| Protected Trees Identified <br> (on-site and shared trees, including trees within boulevards and proposed streets and lanes, but excluding trees in proposed open space or riparian areas) | 34 |
| Protected Trees to be Removed | 34 |
| Protected Trees to be Retained <br> (excluding trees within proposed open space or riparian areas) | 0 |
| Total Replacement Trees Required: <br> - Alder \& Cottonwood Trees Requiring 1 to 1 Replacement Ratio $6 X$ one $(1)=6$ <br> - All other Trees Requiring 2 to 1 Replacement Ratio $28 X$ two (2) = 56 | 62 |
| Replacement Trees Proposed | TBD |
| Replacement Trees in Deficit | TBD |
| Protected Trees to be Retained in Proposed [Open Space / Riparian Areas] | NA |


| Off-Site Trees | Number of Trees |
| :---: | :---: |
| Protected Off-Site Trees to be Removed | 6 |
| Total Replacement Trees Required: <br> - Alder \& Cottonwood Trees Requiring 1 to 1 Replacement Ratio 0 X one (1) = 0 <br> - All other Trees Requiring 2 to 1 Replacement Ratio 6 X two (2) $=12$ | 12 |
| Replacement Trees Proposed | NA |
| Replacement Trees in Deficit | NA |

Summary report and plan prepared and submitted by: Mike Fadum and Associates Ltd.

| Signature of Arborist: Munef | Date: June 9, 2021 |
| :--- | :--- |



Present:<br>Panel Members:<br>R. Drew, Chair<br>W. Chong<br>N. Couttie<br>L. Mickelson<br>M. Patterson<br>J. Packer

## Guests:

Fariba Gharaei, Urban Design Group
Niki Sharoodi, Urban Design Group
Mary Chan-Yip, PMG Landscape Architects

## Staff Present:

A. McLean, City Architect
N. Chow, Urban Design Planner
W. Lee, Recording Secretary

## A. RECEIPT OF MINUTES

It was

Panel meeting of June 24, 2021, be received.
Moved by Leroy Mickelson
Seconded by Jason Packer
That the minutes of the Advisory Design

## Carried

## B. NEW SUBMISSIONS

1. Time:

File No.: 7918-0149-oo
Address:

New or Resubmit: New
Last Submission Date:
Description:

Developer:
Architect:
Landscape Architect:
Planner:
Urban Design Planner: Nathan Chow

The Urban Design Planner advised that staff support the proposed use, form and density and have no specific issues. Staff worked closely with the applicant to advance the concept and support the project. The Panel was asked to comment on the overall site planning, landscape treatment mass and form, architectural expression of the building, and public realm interfaces.

The Project Architect presented an overview of the site and building plans, streetscapes and elevations.

The Landscape Architect presented an overview of the general concept for the Landscape plans.

## ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL STATEMENT OF REVIEW

It was

Moved by Leroy Mickelson<br>Seconded by Norm Couttie<br>That the Advisory Design Panel (ADP)

is in CONDITIONAL SUPPORT of the project and recommends that the applicant address the following issues to the satisfaction of the Planning \& Development Department and, at the discretion of Planning staff, resubmit the project to the ADP for review.

## Carried

Key Points:

- Consider developing a second breezeway or relocate to another portion of site where it can have windows.
The addition of another breezeway results in the loss of valuable square footage, this square footage is required to maintain the economic viability of this small neighbourhood project.
- Reconsider intent of breezeway to allow more uses like sidewalk sales. We are replacing the smaller planter in the middle with a larger planter to allow for more room for outdoor merchandise display and seating.
- Consider further refinement to the building expression, alternating grey and cedar.
Further building expression by alternating the grey and cedar building materials has been implemented.
- $\quad$ Consider utilizing the energy model to inform the design process. Use future climate files to best understand the resiliency of the project.
Energy modeling is a requirement of the Building Permit and will be completed and coordinated during the Building Permit stage. Energy modeling is a comprehensive approach that will achieve the design in order to maintain the form and character of the project. For example if we have too much glazing beyond the acceptable prescriptive approach, energy model will allow for the enhancement of other elements of the building in order to achieve the intended energy saving. This is to confirm the energy model will not change the design as it is presented in our development permit drawings.
- Consider operable windows on the south side to enhance passive ventilation.
The buildings will be fitted with high efficiency HVAC mechanical systems complete with full exhaust and fresh air intake. Additionally we are proposing operable transom glazing to allow for cross
ventilation and allow the tenant to switch to natural ventilation at different season.
- Consider further refinement of the sign strategy.

A comprehensive signage guideline will be prepared for the management of the future tenant's signage design and installation.

- Suggest ensuring open doors and other displays do not impede on the ability of wheelchair users and shopping carts to use on site sidewalks. We shifted the planters along $6 \mathbf{4}^{\text {th }}$ Avenue from side to side to ensure no conflicts in front of the storefront doors. On the south side of the building, we increased the sidewalk width by o.76 meter. The widened edge of the sidewalk will act as a wheel stop that will not let a car overhang onto the sidewalk. There is $\mathbf{1 . 9}$ meters clear width of the sidewalk beyond car overhang.
- $\quad$ Consider reconciling landscape along CRU entries.

As mentioned above, we have shifted the planters away from doors to allow for open space in front of the doors facing $64{ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave.
Site

- Suggest that the breezeway pathways are confusing, and walkways do not seem to go anywhere.
The breezeway and paths are important. They provide pedestrian linkage around the buildings to the adjacent city sidewalks, and the parking area on the south side of the development. We create three large planters in the middle of the breezeway that were oriented toward north/south direction in lieu of two big planters and three smaller planters that were oriented in east west direction. Our change created more direct path for connecting the north sidewalk to the south sidewalk.
- Consider further design development on introducing another breezeway and break Building B into two for the movement of pedestrians from the parking to 64 Avenue.
Directional signage will be provided. The addition of another breezeway results in the loss of valuable square footage, this square footage is required to maintain the economic viability of this small neighbourhood project.

Suggest that the breezeway is an opportunity to really create a vibrant shared space. Encourage the applicant to create more visibility and access into both the east and west CRU's, allow opportunities for fruit and vegetable space to spill out and work with the landscape to better articulate the landscape pattern of trees and furniture to create usable spaces to complement the internal uses.
We are replacing the three smaller planters in the middle with one larger planter to allow for more room for outdoor merchandise display and seating. More glazing and direct access is provided from building B to the breezeway. We added more light fixtures for
additional enhancement of the breezeway and additional spandrel glazing is proposed for building A facing the breezeway.

- $\quad$ Suggest that the amount of space along the south side seems quite tight with the potential for cars/trucks to overhang. Consider additional curb stops.
We increased the sidewalk width by 2'-6". The widened edge of the sidewalk will act as a wheel stop that does not let a car overhang onto the sidewalk. There is 6'-4" clear width of the sidewalk beyond car overhang.
- Consider widening the south sidewalk to allow more space for shopping carts, security bollards, outdoor displays, exterior door swings and wheelchair access.
We increased the sidewalk width by 2'-6". The widened edge of the sidewalk will act as a wheel stop that does not let a car overhang onto the sidewalk. There is 6'-4" clear width of the sidewalk beyond car overhang. Tenants who needs glass protection, will add security laminate to the inside of the glazing. The landlord will not be permitting storefront bollards.
- Recommend that shopping cart storage be identified on the plans. Shopping carts and baskets will be provided inside the Fruiticana space. An attendant will be on duty during business hours ensuring that the carts are kept in order.

Form and Character

- Suggest that the oversize of Building A is OK.

Agreed.

- Consider adding more glazing in the breezeway (for "eyes on the street"). Some additional glazing and a storefront door has been added to Building B. It is not feasible to add clear glazing to Building A, as the east wall of this space will have the tenant's walk-in coolers, and the mechanical room and a loading door to the tenant warehouse area. We are proposing spandrel glazing for building Afacing the breezeway with extra light fixtures.
- Recommend more transparency at east elevation of Building B fronting $132^{\text {nd }}$ St. allows for more inviting and visual elevation. The glazing / transparency has been increased along this elevation as recommended.
- Consider further refinement to the building expression, alternating grey and cedar.
Further building expression by alternating the grey and cedar building materials has been implemented.
- Recommend the elevations to maintain vertical language (grey portion, cedar panel portion), the wrap elements at the corner ends are not necessary.
Wrap elements have been simplified and removed as recommended.
- Consider reducing the amount of allowable opaque glazing at south facing glazing.

Change note on drawings A.A3.1 and A.B3.1 to allow only $80 \%$ of the glazing to be made obscure, not 100\%.
Agreed, and completed.

- Recommend a sign design guideline (size, hierarchy, justification, colour, etc.) for the development to unify a stronger rationale.
A comprehensive signage guideline will be prepared for the management of the future tenant's signage design and installation.

Commend applicant for an attractive project.

## Landscape

- Consider making the breezeway a more useful space. If this is not achievable due to fire separation and structure, place the landscape elements at the perimeter to diminish the "blank walls."
We added glazing to Building B West wall and spandrel glazing to Building A East wall. We are suggesting eliminating the smaller planter in the middle for more space for display and seating area.
- Consider reconciling the alignment of the landscape features along 64 Avenue and the CRU entries.
Planters spacing was as per the City's request and we don't have any issue and conflict with door opening and H/C accessibility. Our sidewalk is 6'-7" and we have enough clearance that meets the accessibility codes.
- Encourage the applicant to work/adjust the streetscape pattern to better work with the rhythm of the building/CRU and to create clear open path to the front doors. If some of these CRU's are restaurants, look for opportunities to create room for spill out onto the sidewalk.
We shifted the planters facing $64^{\text {th }}$ Ave. to create a clear open path to the front doors.
- Recommend maximizing hard surface on west side of building A. The hard surface is already maximized due to the bylaw requirements of the landscape buffer.
- $\quad$ Commend shade trees in parking.

We meet the bylaw requirement for the required island and trees in the parking lot having tree at every 6 parking stalls.

CPTED

- $\quad$ No specific issues were identified.


## Sustainability

- Consider utilizing the energy model to inform the design development. Energy modeling is a requirement of the Building Permit and will be completed and coordinated during the Building Permit stage. Energy modeling is a comprehensive approach that will achieve the design in order to maintain the form and character of the project. For example if we have too much glazing beyond the acceptable prescriptive approach, energy model will allow to enhance the other elements of the building in order to achieve the intended energy saving. This is to confirm the energy model will not change the design as it is presented in our development permit drawings.
- $\quad$ Recommend using future climate files to best understand the resiliency of the project and thermal comfort modelling.
We will follow standards of step two code for the energy modeling.
- Consider operable clearstory windows for passive cooling and ventilation, particularly on the South side where there is not traffic noise and there is extra solar gain to be mitigated.
The buildings will be fitted with high efficiency HVAC mechanical systems complete with full exhaust and fresh air intake. Additionally we are proposing operable transom glazing to allow for cross ventilation and allow the tenant to switch to natural ventilation at different season.
- Consider skylights to allow daylight deeper into the CRUs. Operable skylights would allow passive ventilation, complimenting operable clearstory windows.
Due to the unknowns of tenant's and their type of operation and floor plan, introducing skylights would have a negative impact for the landlord when trying to lease the space to the smaller "mom and pop" type tenants. Tenants will have a T Bar ceiling to cover the 3o" metal joist and Mechanical distribution which makes the construction of skylights impractical. Installation of the T- bar with lighting will increase electrical consumption which will be addressed by the energy modeling as a comprehensive approach to overall energy saving of the building.
- Consider larger, exterior insulated concrete upstand instead of glazing to the ground.
Glazing to the ground has been very successful in multi-tenant commercial buildings. It allows for greater flexibility to where doors can be added, shifted or deleted. It is also a cost effective construction solution for our client.
- $\quad$ Suggest designing for robust heat recovery taking advantage of the refrigeration.
We will consider heat recovery during the detailed BP design process with our mechanical engineer.
- Consider if gas is really required. Ask the tenants if they can operate electrically (i.e., with induction cooktops).
Gas reduces the electrical loads required for these buildings. Gas powered high efficient RTU's are industry standard for multi-tenant commercial buildings.
- Commend the thermally broken, low E double glazing. We are proposing thermally broken, low E glazing.
- Commend the dark sky compliant lighting design. All the exterior lighting is dark sky compliant.
- Commend the rainwater strategy.

We are proposing underground tanks with the capacity of 850 cubic meters for storm water management.

## Accessibility

- Recommend ensuring open doors and other displays do not impede on the ability of wheelchair users to use on site sidewalks.
Clearances have been provided to accommodate accessibility.
- Recommend ensuring curb let downs are located to allow wheelchair accessibility from parking to buildings.
Curb let downs are located next to H/C parking stalls and close to main entrances at two locations.
- Recommend power doors at all entrances. Auto power doors will be provided as per building code requirement.
- Recommend adequate space for wheelchairs to enter washrooms in CRU's. This will be done as part of the future tenant improvements for each unit and will need to meet BCBC 2018.


## C. NEXT MEETING

The next Advisory Design Panel is scheduled for Thursday, July 22, 2021.

## D. ADJOURNMENT

The Advisory Design Panel meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

