PROPOSAL:
- Rezoning of a portion from RF to RF-13
- Development Permit (Sensitive Ecosystems)
- Development Variance Permit
to allow subdivision into two (2) Single Family Small Lots and one (1) Single Family Residential lot.

LOCATION: 14224 - 68 Avenue
ZONING: RF
OCP DESIGNATION: Urban
RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY

- By-law Introduction and set date for Public Hearing for Rezoning.
- Approval to draft Development Permit for Sensitive Ecosystems.
- Approval for Development Variance Permit to proceed to Public Notification.

DEVIAITION FROM PLANS, POLICIES OR REGULATIONS

- Proposing to reduce the lot depth and principal building setback requirements of the "Single Family Residential (RF) Zone" and the "Single Family Residential (RF-13) Zone".
- Proposing to vary the driveway requirements of the "Single Family Residential (RF-13) Zone" for proposed Lot 1.

RATIONALE OF RECOMMENDATION

- The proposal complies with the Development Permit guidelines in the OCP for Sensitive Ecosystems (Streamside Areas) in proposing a restoration and protection plan for the on-site Streamside Protection and Enhancement Area (SPEA).
- 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 Newton and are in-keeping with the character of the neighbourhood.
- Two RF-13 lots and one RF lot would be consistent with the lot dimensions, building form, and previous adjacent development on the south side of 68 Avenue.
- The proposed variances to the front yard setbacks are supportable for the purpose of increased tree retention and providing further distance from a Class B stream and the abutting BC Hydro railway.
- Increasing the width of the 2.5 metre long driveway on proposed Lot 1 will permit three on-site parking spaces with access to a stall at the side of the garage. The design satisfies the minimum parking requirements of an RF-13 lot and prevents encroachment into the streamside setback or further proximity to the railroad.
- Land on the south side of 68 Avenue are impacted by adjacency to the BC Hydro railway on lands to the south. The proposed depth variances will permit the subdivision of Lot 2 and Lot 3. These lots will be respectively larger and wider than the RF and RF-13 minimums.
• Despite the significant site constraints and irregular configuration of the lots, the applicant has demonstrated a reasonable building envelope for each lot, driveways of sufficient length for two car garages and functional rear yards for each property. The proposed development would be located further from the abutting railway than was achieved on lands to the west under Development Application No. 7913-0221-00 and is in full compliance with an on-site streamside setback originating from a Class B watercourse to the southwest of the site.
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 Survey Plan attached as Appendix I from “Single Family Residential Zone (RF)” to “Single Family Residential (13) Zone (RF-13)” and a date be set for Public Hearing.

2. Council authorize staff to draft Development Permit No. 7921-0232-00 for Sensitive Ecosystems (Streamside Areas) generally in accordance with the attached drawings (Appendix VIII).

3. Council approve Development Variance Permit No. 7921-0232-00 (Appendix III) varying the following, to proceed to Public Notification:

   (a) to reduce the minimum lot depth of the RF-13 Zone from 24 metres to 12.3 metres for proposed Lot 1;

   (b) to reduce the minimum lot depth of the RF-13 Zone from 24 metres to 15.71 metres for proposed Lot 2;

   (c) to reduce the minimum lot depth of the RF Zone from 28 metres to 19.07 metres for proposed Lot 3;

   (d) to reduce the minimum front yard setback of the RF-13 Zone from 6.0 metres to 2.0 metres to the principal building face for proposed Lots 1 and 2;

   (e) to reduce the minimum front yard setback of the RF Zone from 6.0 metres to 2.0 metres to the principal building face for proposed Lot 3;

   (f) to reduce the minimum rear yard setback of the RF-13 Zone from 7.5 metres to 3.0 metres for proposed Lot 1;

   (g) to reduce the minimum rear yard setback of the RF-13 Zone from 7.5 metres to 4.5 metres for proposed Lot 2;

   (h) to reduce the minimum rear yard setback of the RF Zone from 7.5 metres to 6.0 metres for proposed Lot 3;

   (i) to increase the maximum driveway width of the RF-13 Zone from 6.0 metres to 8.93 metres for proposed Lot 1.

4. Council instruct staff to resolve the following issues prior to final adoption:

   (a) ensure that all engineering requirements and issues including restrictive covenants, dedications, and rights-of-way where necessary, are addressed to the satisfaction of the General Manager, Engineering;

   (b) submission of a subdivision layout and road dedication plan to the satisfaction of the Approving Officer;
(c) completion of a Peer Review of the finalized Ecosystem Development Plan to the satisfaction of City staff;

(d) submission of the finalized Ecosystem Development Plan, Landscape, Monitoring, and Fencing Security, to the satisfaction of the Planning and Development Department;

(e) submission of a finalized tree survey and a statement regarding tree preservation to the satisfaction of the City Landscape Architect;

(f) demolition of existing buildings and structures to the satisfaction of the Planning and Development Department;

(g) registration of a Section 219 Restrictive Covenant that requires the owner to develop the site in accordance with the conditions in the Ecosystem Development Plan;

(h) registration of a Section 219 Restrictive Covenant prohibiting the addition of a secondary suite on proposed Lot 1 if the applicant cannot provide the minimum of three on-site parking spaces at the detailed design stage; and

(i) registration of a combined Statutory Right-of-Way / Section 219 Restrictive Covenant over the designated Streamside Protection Area for both “No Build” and conveyance access.

**SITE CONTEXT & BACKGROUND**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Existing Use</th>
<th>OCP Designation</th>
<th>Existing Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject Site</td>
<td>Single Family Housing</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>RF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North (Across 68 Avenue):</td>
<td>Single Family Housing</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>RF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East :</td>
<td>Single Family Housing</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>RF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South :</td>
<td>BC Hydro (Newton) Railway</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>RF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West :</td>
<td>Single Family Housing</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>RF, RF-12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Context & Background

- The subject property is an existing single family lot located at 14224 68 Street that is 1,490 square metres in area. The site is designated “Urban” in the Official Community Plan (OCP) and is zoned “Single Family Residential” (RF).

- The subject property abuts the BC Hydro Newton Railroad. Multiple lots on the south side of 68 Street in this area have been redeveloped with wider or slimmer single family residential lots, similar to the proposal.

- The subject property is next to subdivision file no. 7913-0221-00, which achieved final approval on April 21, 2017. This file achieved a three lot subdivision on a similarly wide and shallow site and required a number of variances for reductions to lot depth, front yard setback, east yard setback, and side yard setbacks. Despite the irregular dimensions, this application was supported in demonstrating reasonable building envelopes, sufficient length for the driveways, and functional yard space.

- An unmarked Class B watercourse with a streamside setback impacting the property at the southwest corner was identified through this application.

DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

Planning Considerations

- The applicant is proposing to rezone a portion of the site from "Single Family Residential Zone (RF)" to "Single Family Residential (13) Zone (RF-10)" to permit subdivision into one RF and two RF-13 lots.

- The RF-13 housing form is considered an appropriate land use for lots abutting 68 Avenue and provides for a complementary interface with adjacent single-family lots.

- The three subdivided lots will exceed minimum requirements for area and width.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot Area</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Site Area:</td>
<td>1,490 square metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Dedication:</td>
<td>148.22 square metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Site Area:</td>
<td>1341.78 square metres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of Lots: 3
Unit Density: 20.13 units per hectare
Range of Lot Sizes: 367 – 563 square metres
Range of Lot Widths: 21.1 – 29.3 metres
Range of Lot Depths: 12.3 – 19.07 metres

Referrals

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

School District: The School District has advised that there will be approximately 4 school-age children generated by this development, of which the School District has provided the following expected student enrollment.

1 Elementary students at Georges Vanier Elementary School
1 Secondary students at Frank Hurt Secondary School

(Appendix V)

Note that the number of school-age children is greater than the expected enrollment due to students attending private schools, home school or different school districts.

Parks, Recreation & Culture: Parks accepts the removal of six (6) off-site city trees in the City right-of-way abutting the property’s frontage on 68 Avenue (depicted in Appendix VI.) to be compensated at a 1:1 ratio payable to the Green City Program.

The nearest park is Hazelnut Meadows Community Park, which is approximately 80 metres from the development, and contains both active amenities and natural areas.

Transportation Considerations

- The applicant will provide the following road dedication as part of the proposed application:
  - Approximately 1.942 metres width of dedication along the north property line to widen 68 Avenue to an ultimate width of 24 metres.

POLICY & BY-LAW CONSIDERATIONS

Regional Growth Strategy
- The subject site is designated and compliant with the "General Urban" designation in the Metro Vancouver Regional Growth Strategy (RGS).

**Official Community Plan**

**Land Use Designation**

- The subject property is designated Urban in the Official Community Plan (OCP). The proposed rezoning and subdivision into two (2) RF-13 and one (1) RF lot complies with the Urban designation.

**Themes/Policies**

- A3.1 - Permit gradual and sensitive residential infill within existing neighbourhoods, particularly in areas adjacent to Town Centres, neighbourhood centres and transit corridors, in order to support significant transit improvements, utilize existing transportation infrastructure and implement improvement to the public realm.

*(The proposed development is located in an established single-family neighbourhood that has experienced some gradual densification in recent years. The site is also located on a collector road (68 Avenue) and in proximity to transit, parks, and single family small lot development. The development will continue the pattern of infill development over lots with less depth due to the abutting railway.)*

**Zoning By-law**

- The applicant is proposing to rezone a portion of the subject site from "Single Family Residential Zone (RF)" to "Single Family Residential (13) Zone (RF-13)".

- The table below provides an analysis of the development proposal in relation to the requirements of the Zoning By-law, the "Single Family Residential (13) Zone (RF-13)", streamside setbacks and parking requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RF-13 Zone Type II (Part 16B)</th>
<th>Permitted and/or Required</th>
<th>Proposed: Lots 1 and 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit Density:</strong></td>
<td>28 units per hectare</td>
<td>25.74 units per hectare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yards and Setbacks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard (direction): North</td>
<td>6 metres</td>
<td>2.0 metres*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Yard (direction): West, East</td>
<td>1.2 metres</td>
<td>1.2 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Yard Flanking (direction): West</td>
<td>2.4 metres</td>
<td>2.4 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear (direction): South</td>
<td>7.5 metres</td>
<td>3.0 – 4.5 metres*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lot Size</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corner Lot Size:</td>
<td>380 square metres</td>
<td>407.3 square metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Lot Size:</td>
<td>336 square metres</td>
<td>367.0 square metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Width:</td>
<td>13.4 metres</td>
<td>21.1 – 29.3 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Depth:</td>
<td>24 metres</td>
<td>12.3 – 15.6 metres*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Streamside (Part 7A)</strong></td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Streamside Setbacks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table below provides an analysis of the development proposal in relation to the requirements of the Zoning By-law, the "Single Family Residential Zone (RF)", streamside setbacks and parking requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RF-13 Zone Type II (Part 16B)</th>
<th>Permitted and/or Required</th>
<th>Proposed: Lots 1 and 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class B (yellow-coded) Ditch:</td>
<td>7 metres</td>
<td>7 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking (Part 5)</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Spaces</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Variance required

- The applicant is requesting the following variances:
  
  (a) to reduce the minimum lot depth of the RF-13 Zone from 24 metres to 12.3 metres for proposed Lot 1;
  
  (b) to reduce the minimum lot depth of the RF-13 Zone from 24 metres to 15.71 metres for proposed Lot 2;
  
  (c) to reduce the minimum lot depth of the RF Zone from 28 metres to 19.07 metres for proposed Lot 3;
  
  (d) to reduce the minimum front yard setback of the RF-13 Zone from 6.0 metres to 2.0 metres to the principal building face for proposed Lots 1 and 2;
  
  (e) to reduce the minimum front yard setback of the RF Zone from 6.0 metres to 2.0 metres to the principal building face for proposed Lot 3;
  
  (f) to reduce the minimum rear yard setback of the RF-13 Zone from 7.5 metres to 3.0 metres for proposed Lot 1;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RF Zone (Part 16)</th>
<th>Permitted and/or Required</th>
<th>Proposed: Lot 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Density:</td>
<td>14.80 units per hectare</td>
<td>17.76 units per hectare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yards and Setbacks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard (direction): North</td>
<td>6 metres</td>
<td>2.0 metres*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Yard (direction): West, East</td>
<td>1.8 metres</td>
<td>1.8 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear (direction): East, South</td>
<td>7.5 metres</td>
<td>6.0 metres*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Size:</td>
<td>560 square metres</td>
<td>563 square metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Width:</td>
<td>15 metres</td>
<td>26.0 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Depth:</td>
<td>28 metres</td>
<td>19.07 metres*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking (Part 5)</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Spaces</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Variance required

**Lot Width/Lot Depth Variances**

- The applicant is requesting the following variances:
(g) to reduce the minimum rear yard setback of the RF-13 Zone from 7.5 metres to 4.5 metres for proposed Lot 2;

(h) to reduce the minimum rear yard setback of the RF Zone from 7.5 metres to 6.0 metres for proposed Lot 3;

(i) to increase the maximum driveway width of the RF-13 Zone from 6.0 metres to 8.93 metres for proposed Lot 1.

- Land on the south side of 68 Avenue in this area is impacted by the abutting BC Hydro railway and watercourses. The proposed depth and setback variances will permit lots that complement the neighbourhood.

- The proposed variances will permit subdivision into 3 units which conforms with the site’s “Urban” designation in the OCP and is aligned with the development pattern on the south side of 68 Avenue.

- Proposed Lot 1 and 2 are significantly wider than the minimum 13.4 metre width of the RF-13 Zone for a Type II Lot while being slightly larger than the zone’s minimum area for an interior and corner lot.

- Proposed Lot 1 cannot have frontage on the abutting 142 Street right-of-way, which is to remain an unopened road and service corridor.

- Increasing the width of the 2.5 metre long driveway on proposed Lot 1 will permit three on-site parking spaces with access to a stall at the side of the garage. The design satisfies the minimum parking requirements of an RF-13 lot and prevents encroachment into the streamside setback or further proximity to the railroad.

- Proposed Lot 3 is 11 metres wider than the minimum 15 metre width of the RF Zone while being larger than the zone’s minimum 560 square metres in area.

- The subject property is located to the east of Development Application No. 7913-0221-00, which was approved by Council at the April 28, 2014, Regular Council - Land Use Meeting to permit subdivision into three single family lots. The variances associated with this application included reducing the minimum lot depth from 28 metres to 11.8 metres, reducing the minimum front yard setback from 7.5 metres to 2.4 metres, and reducing the minimum rear yard setback from 7.5 metres to 1.8 metres. The subject variances are reasonable based on this precedent and more modest in reducing the minimum requirements.

- Despite the site constraints and irregular configuration of the lots, the applicant has demonstrated a reasonable building envelope for each lot, driveways of sufficient length (Proposed Lots 2 & 3), and functional rear yards on each property. The proposed development would be located further from the abutting railway than was achieved under adjacent applications and is in full compliance with the on-site streamside setback originating from a Class B watercourse to the southwest of the site.

- Staff support the requested variances to proceed for consideration.
Lot Grading and Building Scheme

- The applicant retained Tejeshwar Singh of Simplex Consultants Ltd. 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 VII).

- A preliminary lot grading plan, submitted by GurSimer Design and Management Inc., and dated June 30th 2021, 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 dwelling unit when proposed outside a secondary plan area.

- 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 $1,000 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 May 18, 2021, and the Development Proposal Signs were installed on September 23, 2021. Staff received one (1) response from a neighbouring resident.

- One resident expressed concern about a “seeking tenants” sign being placed on the property concurrent with a rezoning and subdivision application, given that the existing building would have to be demolished for final approval.
Staff indicated that a development proposal sign must be maintained on-site, and that this should help inform potential tenants as to the possibility of imminent redevelopment at the site. An occupant would be notified of the Public Hearing and can provide comments on the subject application or request further information from City staff.

DEVELOPMENT PERMITS

Sensitive Ecosystems (Streamside Areas) Development Permit Requirement

- The subject property falls within the Sensitive Ecosystems Development Permit Area (DPA) for Streamside Areas in the OCP, given the location of an existing Class B (yellow-coded) watercourse at the southwest corner of Lot 1. The Sensitive Ecosystems (Streamside Areas) Development Permit is required to protect aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems associated with streams from the impacts of development.

- In accordance with Part 7A Streamside Protection setbacks of the Zoning By-law, a Class B (yellow-coded) watercourse requires a minimum streamside setback of 7 metres, as measured from the top of bank. The proposed setbacks comply with the requirements outlined in the Zoning By-law.

- The riparian area will be protected through the registration of a combined Restrictive Covenant/Right-of-Way against the property to ensure safeguarding and maintenance of the Protection Area in perpetuity, in compliance with the OCP.

- An Ecosystem Development Plan, prepared by Rémi Masson, R.P. Bio., of Red Cedar Environmental Consulting and dated May 25, 2022, was reviewed by staff and found to be generally acceptable, with some modifications to content and format of the report still required. The finalized report and recommendations will be incorporated into the Development Permit.

- Rémi Masson, R.P. Bio., of Red Cedar Environmental Consulting prepared a Riparian Area Protections Regulations (RAPR) report for the Ministry of Forests, Lands, Natural Resources Operations and Rural Development (FLNRORD) confirming that the proposal was compliant with the RAPR setback. FLNRORD selected the report for exclusion from formal Ministry review based on an evaluation of the risk of non-compliance with regulatory standards.

- The applicant is required to have a peer review completed to confirm the findings of the Ecosystem Development Plan as a condition of Final Adoption, should the proposal be supported by Council. Any required changes resulting from this review will be incorporated into the SEDP prior to consideration of Final Adoption.

TREES

- Francis Klimo, ISA Certified Arborist of Klimo & Associates 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree Species</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Remove</th>
<th>Retain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alder and Cottonwood Trees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alder</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottonwood</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciduous Trees (excluding Alder and Cottonwood Trees)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese Maple</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Holly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Hazel</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Red Oak</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coniferous Trees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawara Cypress</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas Fir</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Hemlock</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (excluding Alder and Cottonwood Trees)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Replacement Trees Proposed (excluding Boulevard Street Trees) | 8

Total Retained and Replacement Trees | 20

Contribution to the Green City Program | $18,700.00

- The Arborist Assessment states that there are a total of 32 mature trees on the site, excluding Alder and Cottonwood trees. Two (2) or approximately 6% of the total trees on the site, are Alder and Cottonwood trees.

- It was determined that 12 trees, mainly along the southern property line can be retained as part of this development proposal through arborist supervision, tree protection fencing as depicted in Appendix VI, and a Section 219 tree protection restrictive covenant.

- 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 42 replacement trees on the site.

- The applicant is currently proposing 8 replacement trees, not meeting City requirements. The tree protection barrier on Proposed Lot 3 may be sufficient for retention of further trees along the property line.
• The applicant proposes 8 new replacement trees. If 8 replacement trees can be accommodated on the site and the total number of retained trees is ultimately 12, the deficit of 34 replacement trees will require a cash-in-lieu payment of $18,700, representing $550 per tree to the Green City Program, in accordance with the City’s Tree Protection By-law.

• In summary, a total of twenty (20) trees are proposed to be retained or replaced on the site with a contribution of $18,700 to the Green City Program.

• Final approval of the applicant’s tree protection plan is pending further review of tree retention opportunities across the site and a tree replacement plan that accounts for these requirements to the satisfaction of the Planning & Development Department.

INFORMATION ATTACHED TO THIS REPORT

The following information is attached to this Report:

Appendix I. Block Plan
Appendix II. Lot Layout Plan
Appendix III. Development Variance Permit 7921-0232-00
Appendix IV. Engineering Summary
Appendix V. School District Comments
Appendix VI. Summary of Tree Survey and Tree Preservation
Appendix VII. Summary of Building Design Guidelines
Appendix VIII. Environmental Development Plan Drawing

approved by Shawn Low

Jeff Arason
Acting General Manager
Planning and Development
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Appendix I
CITY OF SURREY  
(the "City")

DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT

NO.: 7921-0232-00

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: 008-167-044
   Lot 1 Section 16 Township 2 New Westminster District Plan 21008

   14224 - 68 Avenue

   (the "Land")

3. Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000, as amended is varied as follows:

   (a) To reduce the minimum lot depth of the RF-13 Zone from 24 metres to 12.3 metres for proposed Lot 1;

   (b) to reduce the minimum lot depth of the RF-13 Zone from 24 metres to 15.71 metres for proposed Lot 2;

   (c) to reduce the minimum lot depth of the RF Zone from 28 metres to 19.07 metres for proposed Lot 3;

   (d) to reduce the minimum front yard setback of the RF-13 Zone from 6.0 metres to 2.0 metres to the principal building face for proposed Lots 1 and 2;

   (e) to reduce the minimum front yard setback of the RF Zone from 6.0 metres to 2.0 metres to the principal building face for proposed Lot 3;
(f) to reduce the minimum rear yard setback of the RF-13 Zone from 7.5 metres to 3.0 metres for proposed Lot 1;

(g) to reduce the minimum rear yard setback of the RF-13 Zone from 7.5 metres to 4.5 metres for proposed Lot 2;

(h) to reduce the minimum rear yard setback of the RF Zone from 7.5 metres to 6.0 metres for proposed Lot 3; and

(i) to increase the maximum driveway width of the RF-13 Zone from 6.0 metres to 8.93 metres for proposed Lot 1.

4. This development variance permit applies to only the portion of the Land and Buildings 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.

5. The Land shall be developed strictly in accordance with the terms and conditions and provisions of this development variance permit.

6. This development variance permit shall lapse unless the subdivision, as conceptually shown on Schedule A which is attached hereto and forms part of this development variance permit, is registered in the New Westminster Land Title Office within three (3) years after the date this development variance permit is issued.

7. The terms of this development variance permit or any amendment to it, are binding on all persons who acquire an interest in the Land.

8. This development variance permit is not a building permit.

ISSUED THIS DAY OF , 20 .

______________________________________
Mayor – Doug McCallum

______________________________________
City Clerk – Jennifer Ficocelli
DVP 7921-0232-00:
(a) To reduce the minimum lot depth of the RF-13 Zone from 24 metres to 12.3 metres for proposed Lot 1;
(b) to reduce the minimum lot depth of the RF-13 Zone from 24 metres to 15.71 metres for proposed Lot 2;
(c) to reduce the minimum lot depth of the RF Zone from 28 metres to 19.07 metres for proposed Lot 3;
(d) to reduce the minimum front yard setback of the RF-13 Zone from 6.0 metres to 2.0 metres to the principal building face for proposed Lot 1 and 2;
(e) to reduce the minimum front yard setback of the RF Zone from 6.0 metres to 2.0 metres to the principal building face for proposed Lot 3;
(f) to reduce the minimum rear yard setback of the RF-13 Zone from 7.5 metres to 3.0 metres for proposed Lot 1;
(g) to reduce the minimum rear yard setback of the RF-13 Zone from 7.5 metres to 4.5 metres;
(h) to reduce the rear yard setback of the RF Zone from 7.5 metres to 6.0 metres for Lot 3;
(i) to increase the maximum driveway width of the RF-13 Zone from 6.0 metres to 8.93 metres for Proposed Lot 1.
TO: Manager, Area Planning & Development
- South Surrey Division
Planning and Development Department

FROM: Development Services Manager, Engineering Department

DATE: June 21, 2022

PROJECT FILE: 7821-0232-00

RE: Engineering Requirements
Location: 14224 68 Ave

REZONE AND SUBDIVISION

Property and Right-of-Way Requirements
- Register 0.5m Statutory Right of Way along the south side of 68 Ave.
- Dedicate 1.942m along 68 Ave for road widening.

Works and Services
- Construct the south side of 68 Ave.
- Construct concrete driveway letdowns to each lot.
- Provide storm, sanitary and water service connections to each lot.
- Provide on-site mitigation features as determined through detailed design.

A Servicing Agreement is required prior to Rezone and Subdivision.

DEVELOPMENT PERMIT AND DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT

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

Jeff Pang, P.Eng.
Development Services Manager

IJ

NOTE: Detailed Land Development Engineering Review available on file
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.

As of September 2021, George Vanier Elementary operates at 98% capacity. This school has
traditionally accepted out of catchment overflow students from TE Scott, Chimney Hill and MB
Sanford. Our projections are showing that growth will continue modestly. Though the projections
indicate that the school will operate over capacity, the anticipated growth will be handled with 4
portables or less over the next 10 years.

Frank Hurt Secondary continues to accept overflow from Sullivan Heights Secondary that currently
has capped in-catchment enrollment to the school. As a result, as part of the District’s 2022/23
Capital Plan submission to the Ministry of Education, there is a capital request to construct a 400-
capacity addition targeted to open September 2027. The Ministry has yet to approve capital
funding for this project.

The Impact on Schools
Application #: 21 0232 00

Summary
The proposed 3 Single family with suites
are estimated to have the following impact
on the following schools:

Projected enrolment at Surrey School District for this development:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Students:</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Students:</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

September 2021 Enrolment/School Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Georges Vanier Elementary</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrolment (K/1-7):</td>
<td>65 K + 522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Capacity (K/1-7)</td>
<td>38 K + 559</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frank Hurt Secondary</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrolment (8-12):</td>
<td>1360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity (8-12):</td>
<td>1250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projected population of school-age children for this development: 4

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.

* Nominal Capacity is estimated by multiplying the number of enrolling spaces by 25 students.
Maximum operating capacity is estimated by multiplying the number of enrolling spaces by 27 students.
### 8.0 TREE PRESERVATION SUMMARY

Surrey Project No: N/A

Address: 14224 68 Ave, Surrey

Registered Arborist: Francis Klimo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On-Site Trees</th>
<th>Number of Trees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Trees Identified</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(on-site and shared trees, including trees within boulevards and proposed streets and lanes, but excluding trees in proposed open space or riparian areas and non-bylaw protected trees)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Trees to be Removed</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Trees to be Retained</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(excluding trees within proposed open space or riparian areas)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Replacement Trees Required:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alder &amp; Cottonwood Trees Requiring 1 to 1 Replacement Ratio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 X one (1) = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other Trees Requiring 2 to 1 Replacement Ratio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 X two (2) = 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Replacement Trees Proposed</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Replacement Trees in Deficit</strong></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protected Trees to be Retained in Proposed [Open Space / Riparian Areas]</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Off-Site Trees</th>
<th>Number of Trees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Off-Site Trees to be Removed</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Replacement Trees Required:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alder &amp; Cottonwood Trees Requiring 1 to 1 Replacement Ratio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 X one (1) = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other Trees Requiring 2 to 1 Replacement Ratio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 X two (2) = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Replacement Trees Proposed</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Replacement Trees in Deficit</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary, report and plan prepared and submitted by:

Francis Klimo

May 10, 2022

(Signature of Arborist) Date
During the construction process, no storage or staging of materials, equipment, or debris can be placed within the TPZ of the protected Trees.

Consultants
ISA Certified Tree Risk Assessor (TRAQ)
ISA Certified Arborist #PN-8149A
Checked
Dimitri Khomko
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GENERAL FOR ALL TREES

TREE MANAGEMENT PLAN

Klimo & Associates

14224 68 AVE, SURREY
During the construction process, no storage or staging of materials, equipment, or debris can be placed within the TPZ of the protected Trees.

Francis R. Klimo
BC Wildlife Danger Tree Assessor #7193
ISA Certified Tree Risk Assessor (TRAQ)
ISA Certified Arborist #PN-8149A

Drawn
1:150 Scale
Jul. 5, 2022

Sheet # 1
Date
May 12, 2022

2
Date
July 29, 2021

No. Project Number

Klimo & Associates

Trees of Critical Roots: (ESPECIALLY EQUIPMENT HEAVY ROOTZONES. STUMPS UNDERLYING AND BARRIERS MUST NOT BE PULLED OUT BY HEAVY MACHINERY IN ORDER TO ENSURE THE PROTECTION OF THE RETAINED TREES.)

Please note: the remaining stumps will not be required to be placed towards any other areas within the property or near the protected Trees. In order to limit the potential disturbance within the TPZ of the protected Trees, no heavy equipment (If required) will be allowed to encroach, park, or traverse through their TPZ(s).

Removal of surrounding invasive growth / Site Clearing work: Where clearing through the TPZ(s) of the retained trees, all clearing work as well as the grade preparation works are required to be performed by hand and all excavation machines or back haul equipment would be allowed to encroach into their TPZ(s) throughout the clearing, with the exception of those operators and their equipment that operate under the direction and supervision of a certified arborist and performed in accordance with relevant Best Management Practices produced by ISA and ANSI A-300.

Due to the nature of the site, heavy equipment cannot be pulled out by heavy machinery in order to ensure the protection of the retained trees.

General for all Trees: Retain

TREE REPLACEMENT PLAN
14224 68 AVE, SURREY

Klimo & Associates

Francis R. Klimo
ISA Certified Arborist #PN-8149A
ISA Certified Tree Risk Assessor (TRAQ)
BC Wildlife Danger Tree Assessor #7193

Revisions
Review Date
1
May 12, 2022
2
Apr. 9, 2022

Plan 1:150

Plan 2:1008
BUILDING GUIDELINES SUMMARY

Surrey Project #: 7921-0232-00
Project Location: 14224 68 Avenue, Surrey, B.C.
Design Consultant: Simplex Consultants Ltd., (Tejeshwar Singh, b.t.arch, AScT, CRD, at.aibc)

This building scheme draft is proposed for the above noted project and has been filed with the City Clerk. Below is the Residential Character Study and the Design Guidelines summary which highlights the important features and forms 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 property consists of homes built approximately 5-7 years ago along with a handful of older homes built about 20-25 years ago. The style of the homes in the area “traditional west coast” and “neo-traditional” which range from 2500sf up to 3000 sf. The subject property is located on a main road.

Homes in the neighborhood include the following:

- The context homes surrounding the property which are approximately 5-7 years old “traditional west coast” style homes with mid-scale massing characteristics. These homes have various roof pitches from 6:12 up to 10:12. Roof surfaces are asphalt shingles and the cladding is hardi with stone or brick accents. These newer homes can be used as context homes.

- There are some older “neo-traditional” style homes that are approximately 20-25 year old with roof pitches of 4:12 up to 8:12. These homes are comprised of simple rectangular shapes with low-slope common gable roofs, covered with interlocking tab type asphalt shingle roof surfaces. The homes are clad with mainly siding or stucco.

1.2 Features of the Existing and Surrounding Dwelling Homes Significant to the Proposed Building Scheme:

1) Context styles of homes for the proposed building scheme are “neo-traditional”.

2) All context homes are 2 and 3 storey homes.

3) Front entrances are 1 storey in height.

4) Massing: Old homes are mostly traditional west coast or ranchers context.

5) Exterior cladding: variation of wall cladding materials allows for a wide range of
selection for cladding.

6) Roof surface: variation of roofing materials allows for a wide range of selection for roofing.

7) Roof pitch is a minimum 6:12 for the newer context homes.

Dwelling Types/Locations: 2 and 3 storey split levels.

Exterior Treatment /Materials: Context homes are clad in stucco, or vinyl siding, and have a stone or brick accent veneer.

Roof Pitch and Materials: A variety of roofing products have been used, and a variety could be permitted.

Window/Door Details: Rectangle or arched.

Streetscape: The neighborhood is fairly new with a similar character within each dwelling. Homes include West Coast Modern style 2 and 3 storey homes that meet modern massing design, modern trim and detailing standards, and modern roofing and construction materials standards. Landscapes range from 'modest old urban' to 'moderate modern urban'.

2. Proposed Design Guidelines

2.1 Proposed Design Solutions:

Dwelling Types/Location: 2 storey or 3 storey split levels.

Interfacing Treatment with existing dwellings: Strong relationship with neighboring "context homes" including new homes will be of a similar home type and size. Similar massing characteristics, roof types, roof pitches, roofing materials, and siding materials.

Restrictions on Dwellings: No basement entry homes.


Colours: "Natural" colours such as browns, greens, clays, and other earth-tones, and "Neutral" colors such as grey, white, and cream are permitted. "Primary" colors in subdued tones such as navy blue, or forest green can be considered as approved by the consultant. Colours such as pink, rose, peach, salmon are not permitted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Roof Pitch:</strong></th>
<th>Minimum roof pitch must be 4:12.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roof Materials:</strong></td>
<td>Shake profile concrete roof tiles, and shake profile asphalt shingles with a raised ridge caps are permitted in Grey, Brown, or Black.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-ground basements:</strong></td>
<td>Permitted subject to determination that service invert locations are sufficiently below grade. Basements will appear underground from the front.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscaping:</strong></td>
<td>Landscaping: Moderate modern urban standard: minimum 25 shrubs of a minimum 3 gallon pot size. Sod from street to face of home. Driveways: exposed aggregate, interlocking masonry pavers, stamped concrete, or “broom” or “brush-finished” concrete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tree Planting Deposit:</strong></td>
<td>$1,000 (to developer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>50% will be refunded after inspection by developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Remaining 50% one year after completion of construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compliance Deposit:</strong></td>
<td>$5,000 (to developer)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary prepared and submitted by:**    Simplex Consultants Ltd.  
**Date:** June 30, 2022  

**Reviewed and Approved by:**    Tejeshwar Singh, b.t.arch, AScT, CRD, at.aiabc  
**Date:** June 30, 2022