

City of Surrey
PLANNING \& DEVELOPMENT REPORT
Application No.: 7921-0035-00
Planning Report Date: February 13, 2023

## PROPOSAL:

- Development Variance Permit
to reduce the rear yard setback to facilitate tree retention as part of a proposed subdivision.

LOCATION: 12464-25 Avenue
2485-124B Street

ZONING:
RF
OCP DESIGNATION: Urban


## RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY

- Approval for Development Variance Permit to proceed to Public Notification.


## DEVIATION FROM PLANS, POLICIES OR REGULATIONS

- The applicant is proposing to reduce the rear yard setback requirements of the Single Family Residential (RF)Single Family Residential (RF) Zone for a proposed lot.


## RATIONALE OF RECOMMENDATION

- The applicant proposes a subdivision from two into four single family lots based on the existing RF zoning.
- Some area residents have raised concerns with the subdivision proposal based on the mature tree loss through subdivision applications in the Ocean Park area. The proposed variance to reduce the rear yard setback for Proposed lot 1 would support the retention of three mature trees in the front yard with the proposed rear yard setback reduction from 7.5 metres to 6.0 metres.
- 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 Ocean Park.


## RECOMMENDATION

The Planning \& Development Department recommends that Council approve Development Variance Permit No. 7921-0035-oo (Appendix VI) to reduce the minimum rear yard setback of the Single Family Residential (RF) Zone from 7.5 metres to 6 metres to the principal building face for Proposed lot 1, to proceed to Public Notification.

## SITE CONTEXT \& BACKGROUND

| Direction | Existing Use | OCP Designation | Existing Zone |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Subject Site | Single Family | Urban | RF |
| North (Across: 25 Avenue) | Single Family | Suburban | RH |
| East (Across: 124B Street) | Single Family | Urban | RF, RM-D |
| South (Abutting): | Single Family | Urban | RF |
| West (Abutting): | Single Family | Urban | RF |

## Context \& Background

- The two subject properties are located at 1246425 Avenue and 2485 148B in the Ocean Park area. The properties are designated "Urban" in the Official Community Plan (OCP) and are zoned "Single Family Residential Zone (RF)". The gross site area of the properties is 2,437 square metres.
- Subdivision of the subject properties into four lots is permitted under the Urban designation and RF zone. Similar proposals for subdivisions under the RF zone in the surrounding area have been proposed and include Development Application Nos. 7991-0217-00, 7905-0110-00, and 7921-0088-oo.
- Development Application No. 7991-0217-oo proposed a subdivision that created the five lots abutting the subject property on the west side. This subdivision was finalized on October $30^{\text {th }}$, 1992.
- Development Application No. 7905-0110-oo proposed rezoning and a subdivision to create the properties at 12509 and 1251725 Avenue. The rezoning to RF for a two-lot subdivision received final adoption at the Regular Council - Land Use meeting on June $\mathbf{1 r}^{\text {th }}, 2007$.
- Development Application No. 7921-oo88-oo is a subdivision application that has been issued a Preliminary Layout Approval (PLA) letter and has been provided the requirements for final subdivision approval.


## DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

## Planning Considerations

- The applicants are proposing to subdivide the subject properties into four lots.
- The subdivision proposal conforms with the sites existing Urban OCP designation and can be accommodated under the "Single Family Residential Zone (RF)."
- To increase the number of mature trees that may be retained through this application, the applicant proposes to reduce the rear yard setback of Proposed lot 1 from 7.5 metres to 6.0 metres.
- This will result in the property's building envelope moving towards the rear of the property, which would permit construction of a standard RF home without encroachment into the critical root zones of the mature trees in the front yard.

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Proposed |  |
| Lot Area | 2437 square metres <br> Gross Site Area: <br> Road Dedication: <br> Net Site Area: |
| Number of Lots: | 2428 square metres |
| Unit Density: | 4 |
| Range of Lot Sizes | 16.47 units per hectare |
| Range of Lot Widths | $560-654$ square metres |
| Range of Lot Depths | $16.5-19.4$ metres |

## Referrals

## Engineering:

School District:

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

The School District has advised that there will be approximately 3 school-age children generated by this development, of which the School District has provided the following expected student enrollment.

2 Elementary students at Crescent Park Elementary / Annex School 1 Secondary students at Elgin Park Secondary School
(Appendix IV)

Parks, Recreation \& Culture:

Crescent Park is the closest active park with amenities that include playgrounds, a cricket pitch, baseball diamonds, pickleball courts, a recreational trail network, and contains natural areas. The park is 820 metres walking distance from the development.

Parks accepts the removal of 5 City Trees and compensation on a 2 to 1 replacement ratio at $\$ 550$ per tree, with a total compensation amount of \$5,500.00.

## Transportation Considerations

- The applicant is required to construct the west side of 124 B Street and south side of 25 Avenue to the Through Local Road standard with pavement, barrier curb, gutter, and a sidewalk with street lighting and trees.
- The applicant is required to dedicate a 3.0 metre $\mathbf{x} 3.0$ metre corner cut at the intersection of 124 B and 25 Avenue.


## POLICY \& BY-LAW CONSIDERATIONS

## Official Community Plan

## Land Use Designation

- The property is designated Urban in the Official Community Plan (OCP), which limits density to 37 units per hectare. The proposal has a unit density of 16.47 units per hectare, and therefore complies with the property's OCP designation.


## Themes/Policies

- The proposed single family residential subdivision is supported by the following OCP policies:
- A3.5 - Support infill development that is appropriate in scale and density to its neighbourhood context that uses compatible design to reinforce neighbourhood character.

The OCP promotes sensitive infill of new housing forms that are complementary to the existing neighbourhood. "Single Family Residential Zone (RF)" lots between 560 and 654 square metres in area will result in similar sized homes, streetscape and yard space that fits the character of the existing neighbourhood.

The applicant completed design guidelines for the proposed subdivision (summarized later in this report), which was based upon a character study of the existing neighbourhood, ensuring new single-family dwellings are of complementary design.

## Zoning By-law

## Rear Yard Setback Variance

- The applicant is requesting the following variance:
- to reduce the minimum rear yard setback of the RF Zone from 7.5 metres to 6 metres to the principal building face for Proposed lot 1.
- The minor reduction of the rear yard setback for Proposed lot 1 would support the retention of three mature trees in the front yard.
- As the rear of Proposed Lot 1 abuts Proposed Lot 3, the proposed variance would not impact an existing home.
- Staff support the requested variances to proceed for consideration.


## Lot Grading and Building Scheme

- The applicant retained Ran Chahal of Apex Design Group Inc. as the Design Consultant. The Design Consultant conducted a character study of the surrounding homes and based on the findings of the sturdy, proposed a set of building design guidelines (Appendix V).
- Styles recommended for this site include modestly sized two-storey, bungalow, and split level type homes constructed to the local modern standard.
- A preliminary lot grading plan, submitted by Hub Engineering Inc. and dated December 1, 2020, has been reviewed by staff and found to be generally acceptable. The applicant does propose in-ground 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.


## 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. The contribution will be payable at the rate applicable at the time of Final Subdivision Approval. The current rate is $\$ 4,000$ per new unit.
- The proposed development will not be subject to the Tier 2 Capital Plan Project CACs as the proposal complies with the densities in the OCP designation.


## 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 new 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.
- The applicant will be required to contribute $\$ 1,000$ per new lot to support the development of new affordable housing.


## PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

- Pre-notification letters were sent on July 30, 2021 and October 25, 2022, and the Development Proposal Signs were installed on July 30, 2022. Staff received 15 responses from neighbouring residents. Twelve respondents were opposed to the proposal, two respondents expressed concerns about the development process, and one respondent requested more information.
- Residents' comments are noted below with staff comments in italics.
- Seven respondents expressed opposition based on changes to the neighbourhood character, the increased density of the lots, smaller building sizes, and implications that the area may develop further.

The proposed subdivision conforms with the existing OCP designation and zoning and there is precedent for similar sized single-family lots in the surrounding area. The layout mirrors the properties to the west which were created under Development Application No. 7991-0217-oo. Those neighbouring properties range from 623 to 704 square metres in area and the proposed lots range from 560 to 654 square metres.

- Six respondents expressed opposition based on increased traffic and construction in the neighbourhood. These concerns included a lack of oversight on construction, a lack of sidewalk services, higher traffic on local roads, and a lack of suitable off and onstreet parking.

> The applicants are required to construct 25 Avenue and 124 B Street and plant boulevard trees. The proposed lots are required to have a minimum of three off-street parking spaces based on the Zoning By-law.

- Six respondents expressed opposition based on the removal of mature trees that would be required for a four lot subdivision. Some respondents noted that builders can damage or kill trees that are not authorized for removal and that the penalty for this is insufficient to enforce compliance. Respondents also referred to tree removal across the Ocean Park area more broadly due to subdivision applications.
- One respondent indicated that they were not opposed to the project in principle, but that the loss of mature trees should be avoided. The respondent supported relaxations of the setback and height requirements, noting that thinner and taller building envelopes would permit densification without as much tree removal required.

During the review, City staff sought to increase the quantity of mature trees retained under this application. The proposed variance is intended to support tree retention. Based on the location of the on-site trees and critical root zones, the applicant is able to accommodate the retention of 4 trees.

The applicant will be required to plant replacement trees to bring each lot to the maximum quantity permitted based on the City's Tree Protection Bylaw. The cap for subdivided lots between 581 to 700 square metres is 4 trees and the lots will have an average of 4.5 replacement and retained trees each. The street construction will include planting of new boulevard trees.

## TREES

- Tim Vandenberg, ISA Certified Arborist of Mike Fadum and 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 | 2 | 2 | O |
| Deciduous Trees <br> (excluding Alder and Cottonwood Trees) |  |  |  |
| Cherry | 1 | 1 | O |
| Hazelnut | 1 | 1 | O |
| Vine Maple | 5 | 5 | O |
| Coniferous Trees |  |  |  |
| Douglas-Fir | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Falsecypress | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Western Red Cedar | 21 | 18 | 3 |
| Total (excluding Alder and Cottonwood Trees) | 31 | 27 | 4 |
| Total Replacement Trees Proposed (excluding Boulevard Street Trees) | 14 |  |  |
| Total Retained and Replacement Trees | 18 |  |  |
| Contribution to the Green City Program | \$23,100.00 |  |  |

- The Arborist Assessment states that there are a total of 31 mature trees on the site, excluding Alder and Cottonwood trees. Two additional trees ( $6 \%$ of the total trees on the site), are Alder trees. It was determined that 4 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.
- The proposed rear yard setback for Proposed lot 1 needs to be reduced in order to maximize tree preservation on the site (see By-law Variance section). A No-Build restrictive covenant will be required to identify the tree preservation area.
- The proposed tree preservation on the site will include the meandering of the sidewalk on 25 Avenue, suspended slab for the placement of the driveway on Proposed lots 1 and 4, directional drilling to install services and supervision by an arborist during construction.
- For those trees that cannot be retained, the applicant will be required to plant trees on a 1 to 1 replacement ratio for Alder trees, and a 2 to 1 replacement ratio for all other trees. This will require a total of 56 replacement trees on the site. Since only 14 replacement trees can be accommodated on the site, the deficit of 42 replacement trees will require a cash-in-lieu payment of $\$ 23.100 .00$, representing $\$ 550$ per tree, to the Green City Program, in accordance with the City's Tree Protection By-law.
- The application proposes the removal of 5 City trees (4 vine maples and 1 hazelnut tree) located along the frontage of Proposed lots 3 and 4 on 25 Avenue. As these trees are off-site and not shared, they are not included in the table above. The trees are directly impacted by construction of 25 Avenue and driveway access for the lots. Parks accepts the removal of these 5 City Trees and compensation on a 2 to 1 replacement ratio at $\$ 550$ per tree, with a total compensation amount of \$5,500.00.
- In addition to the on-site replacement trees, City boulevard street trees will be planted on 25 Avenue and 124 B Street. This will be determined by the Engineering Department during the servicing design review process.
- In summary, a total of 18 trees are proposed to be retained or replaced on the site with a contribution of $\$ 23,100.00$ to the Green City Program.


## INFORMATION ATTACHED TO THIS REPORT

The following information is attached to this Report:
Appendix I. Site Plan
Appendix II. Engineering Summary
Appendix III. School District Comments
Appendix IV. Summary of Tree Survey and Tree Preservation
Appendix V. Design Guidelines Summary
Appendix VI. Development Variance Permit 7921-0035-oo
approved by Shawn Low

Jeff Arason
Acting General Manager
Planning and Development
HK/JK/ar

TO: Manager, Area Planning \& Development

- South Surrey Division
Planning and Development Department
FROM: Development Services Manager, Engineering Department
DATE: January 23, 2023 PROJECT FILE: 7821-0035-0o


## RE: $\quad$ Engineering Requirements

Location: $\mathbf{2 4 8 5} \mathbf{1 2 4 B}$ St

## SUBDIVISION

## Property and Right-of-Way Requirements

- Dedicate 3.0mx3.om corner cut at the intersection of 124B St \& 25 Ave.
- Register 0.5m statutory right-of-way (SRW) along 124B St \& 25 Ave.


## Works and Services

- Construct the west side of 124 B St.
- Construct the south side of 25 Ave.
- Construct concrete driveway letdowns to each lot.
- Extend the 250 mm drainage main along 25 Ave.
- Extend the 200 mm sanitary main along 25 Ave.
- Provide on-site mitigation features as determined through detailed design.
- Provide storm, sanitary and water service connections to each lot.
- Register restrictive covenant (RC) for the installation and maintenance of on-site mitigation features.

A Servicing Agreement is required prior to Subdivision.

## DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT

There are no engineering requirements relative to issuance of the Development Variance Permit.


Jeff Pang, P.Eng.
Development Services Manager
II

## THE IMPACT ON SCHOOLS

## APPLICATION \#: 21003500

## SUMMARY

The proposed 4 Single family with suite
are estimated to have the following impact
on the following schools:

## Projected enrolment at Surrey School District for this development:

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Elementary Students: | 2 |
| Secondary Students: | 1 |

September 2022 Enrolment/School Capacity

| Crescent Park Elementary/ANNEX |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Enrolment (K/1-7): | $31 \mathrm{~K}+311$ |
| Operating Capacity (K/1-7) | $38 \mathrm{~K}+419$ |
|  |  |
| Elgin Park Secondary | 1270 |
| Enrolment (8-12): | 1200 |
| Capacity (8-12): |  |


| Projected population of school-age children for this development: | 8 |
| :--- | :---: |

Population : The projected population of children aged 0-19 Impacted by the development. Enrolment: The number of students projected to attend the Surrey School District ONLY.

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

Crescent Park Elementary enrollment projections are indicating that enrolment will remain pretty constant over the next 10 years: and what growth the school might experience, the existing capacity of the school is large enough to accommodate it. There are no current plans to expand the existing school.

Grandview Heights Secondary opened September 2021; resulting in, significant boundary changes in the South Surrey, White Rock Education Region. All boundary changes are now in effect. As for Elgin Park Secondary, enrolment is expected to modestly grow over the next 10-years as the new boundary changes are intended to move enrolment growth westward towards Elgin Park providing enrolment relief to Semiahmoo and Earl Marriott secondary schools. There are no current plans to expand the Elgin Park Secondary.

## Crescent Park Elementary/ANNEX



Elgin Park Secondary


* 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: 7921-0035-00
Address: 2485-124B Street \& 12464-25 Avenue
Registered Arborist: Tim Vandenberg

| On-Site Trees | Number of Trees |
| :---: | :---: |
| Protected Trees Identified (on-site and shared trees, including trees within boulevards and proposed streets and lanes, but excluding trees in proposed open space or riparian areas) | 33 |
| Protected Trees to be Removed | 29 |
| Protected Trees to be Retained (excluding trees within proposed open space or riparian areas) | 4 |
| Total Replacement Trees Required: <br> - Alder \& Cottonwood Trees Requiring 1 to 1 Replacement Ratio 2 X one (1) $=2$ <br> - All other Trees Requiring 2 to 1 Replacement Ratio 27X two (2) = 54 | 56 |
| Replacement Trees Proposed | 14 |
| Replacement Trees in Deficit | 42 |
| 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 | 0 |
| 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 $0 \times$ two (2) $=0$ | 0 |
| Replacement Trees Proposed | TBD |
| Replacement Trees in Deficit | TBD |

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

Signature of Arborist:




Surrey Project no.: 21-0035
Property Location:

## Design Consultant: Ran Chahal, Architectural Technologist AIBC, CRD.ASTTBC Apex Design Group Inc. \#157- 8120-128 Street, Surrey, BC V3W 1R1 Off: 604-543-8281 Fax: 604-543-8248

The draft Building Scheme proposed for this Project has been files 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 area surrounding the subject site is an urban area built out in the Pre-1960's 2000's. Most homes are simple "West Coast Traditional" style structures with habitable areas of between 2000-3000sf.
$40 \%$ of the existing homes have mid-scale massing characteristics with $84.0 .00 \%$ of the homes having a one storey front entry.

Roof pitch varies from economical low pitch of $4-5 / 12$ or lower to a medium pitch of $6-9 / 12$ and over common truss roofs with simple gables and common hips with $84 \%$ Asphalt Roof Shingles being most common.

Wall surface materials are limited in the most part to one of the following: 46\% Cedar (dominant), 38\% Vinyl and 16\% Stucco. 46\% Brick or Stone for an accent material. Accent trims are evident on most of the existing homes.

Landscaping is of a moderate planting standard with 81.00\% of the homes have double garage with Asphalt and Exposed Aggregate driveways.

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

The result is that many of these homes do not reflect characteristics we would be in favor of today. Therefore, rather than use the existing homes to provide architectural context for the new development, the best strategy will be to employ modern development standards especially with respect to overall massing and balance in each design and to proportional massing between individual elements. Trim and detailing
standards and construction materials standards will meet 2000's levels. Continuity of character will be ensured through style and home type restrictions as described below.


Window/Door Details: $\quad 100.00 \%$ of all homes have rectangular windows
Streetscape: A variety of simple "Two Story", 10-20 year old "West Coast Traditional" homes in a common urban setting. Roofs on most homes are simple medium pitch common hip or common gable forms with Asphalt Roof Shingles is on most of the homes. Most homes are clad in Cedar, Vinyl and Stucco.

Other Dominant
Elements:
Most of the existing homes located in the immediate study area have covered front verandas.

## 2. Proposed Design Guidelines

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

The guidelines will ensure that the existing character of the homes are maintained with modestly sized Two-Storey, Bungalow and Split Level type homes are constructed to 2000's standard. Continuity of character will be achieved with restrictions permitting the use of compatible styles, roof forms and exterior construction materials. Landscapes will be constructed to a modern urban standard.

### 2.2 Proposed Design Solutions:

| Dwelling Types: | Two-Storey, Split Levels and Ranchers (Bungalows). |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Dwelling Sizes: | Two-Storey or Split Levels - | 2000 sq.ft. minimum |
| Floor Area/Volume: | Basement Entry | - |
|  |  | 2000 sq.ft. minimum |

Rancher or Bungalow - 1400 sq.ft. minimum (Exclusive of garage or in-ground basement)

## Exterior Treatment /Materials:

Exterior Materials /Colours:

Roof Pitch:

No specific interface treatment. However, all permitted styles including: "Neo-Traditional", "Neo-Heritage", "Rural-Heritage" or "West Coast Modern" will be compatible with the existing study area homes.

Stucco, Cedar, Vinyl, Hardiplank, Brick and Stone in "Neutral" and "Natural" colours. "Primary" and "Warm" colours not permitted on cladding. Trim colours: Shade variation on main colour, complementary, neutral or subdued contrast.

Minimum 3:12

Roof Materials/Colours: Treated Cedar Shakes or Cedar shingles, Concrete roof tiles In a shake profile, asphalt shingles in a shake profile and Environmentally Sustainable Roofing Products. Grey or Brown or Black tones.

Window/Door Details: Dominant: Rectangular or Gently arched windows and of a consistent geometrical shape.

In-ground basements: Permitted if servicing allows.
Landscaping:
Trees as specified on Tree Replacement Plan plus min. 20 shrubs (min. 5 gallon pot size).

Compliance Deposit: $\quad \$ 5,000.00$

## Summary prepared and submitted by:



Ran Chahal, Design Consultant
Architectural Technologist AIBC, CRD.ASTTBC Apex Design Group Inc.

August 26, 2022
Date

# DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT 

NO.: 7921-0035-00
Issued To:

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: ooo-581-356
Lot 42 Section 19 Township 1 New Westminster District Plan 26237 1246425 Avenue

Parcel Identifier: oo8-896-8o1
Lot 43 Section 19 Township 1 New Westminster District Plan 26237 2485 124B Street
(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:

Surrey Subdivision and Development By-law, 1986, No. 8830, as amended is varied as follows:

- to reduce the minimum rear yard setback of the RF Zone from 7.5 metres to 6 metres to the principal building face for Proposed lot 1.

5. This development variance permit applies to only to that portion of the buildings and structures on 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 - Brenda Locke

City Clerk - Jennifer Ficocelli

