



**City of Surrey**  
**Development Advisory Committee**  
**Meeting Notes for January 25, 2007**

File: 360-20 (DAC)  
Date: January 25, 2007  
Time: 2:30 PM  
Location: Planning Room #1,  
Surrey City Hall

**Attendees:**

**Councillor:**

Marvin Hunt

**Members:**

Andy Aadmi  
Chris Barbati  
Gordon Dickson  
Jake Friesen  
Deanna Grinnell  
Ragbir Gurm  
Avtar Johl  
Bill Kruger  
Steve Kurrein  
David Porte  
Greg Sewell  
Kevin Shoemaker  
Marvin Ward

**City Staff:**

How Yin Leung (Planning and Development)  
Judith Robertson (Planning and Development)  
Rob Wilson (Engineering)  
Mark Allison (Planning and Development)  
Judy McLeod (Planning and Development)  
  
Umur Olcay (Surrey School District)

**1. Review of Market Conditions**

The following is a summary of some of the matters discussed:

- Steve Kurrein advised that there have been sales in Richmond at 100 per sq ft. The market is somewhat softer but prices are remaining high.
- Chris Barbati observed that the market picked up late last year. There was an up ticked in the new year. Buyers are not as anxious. They are still making money but it is a struggle finding new sites. It is active in row homes throughout the region.
- Michael Ward advised that Grosvenor is not currently selling any townhouses in Surrey but are in the apartment market, with available land to accommodate another 110 units. He noted that there may be an over supply of townhouse product in South Surrey.
- Deana Grinnell noted that Parklane is anxious to get started on the Eglin project consisting of 61 townhouse units in South Surrey.
- David Porte advised that they have no residential projects in Surrey now but have two buildings in process in Campbell Heights. That market is coming along nicely.
- Andy Aadmi stated that sales in detached houses are slowing, however land values are still going up. They are watching the market. Andy expressed the concern that it is not sustainable when 70percent of income for many families is going to housing.
- Avtar Johl noted that the market is settling. They are not selling much right now, and have some single family and townhouse product coming on. Vendors are sticking to guns in terms of price and the prices are not coming down.
- Jake Friesen stated that the last quarter of last year saw market a slow down, and it is too early this year to predict. Costs are going up tremendously, and the highest increases are civic driven fees.

- Kevin Shoemaker advised that Polygon is finishing up one project in Panorama, and noted that there are still entry-level buyers in the market. They are still seeing significant cost increases in framing and other trades. He observed that land prices are softening.
- Raghbir Gurm echoed these comments.
- Greg Sewell noted that the consultants are very busy and under pressure due to the DCC deadline. They are seeing some hold-ups with the review of arborist reports and backlog of applications. They are now dealing mostly with applications that have been to Council and are concentrating on getting them through before the DCC deadline.
- Bill Kruger observed that single family has slowed down over the last few months because clients are having difficulty finding sites. Commercial/industrial is doing well. PLAs will be keeping them busy for the next few months.

## **2. Parks, Recreation and Culture Department Strategic Plan Process (Cari St. Pierre)**

Cari St Pierre made a presentation on behalf of Tiina Mack of the Parks, Recreation and Culture Department. She advised that a process is underway to update the Parks, Recreation and Culture Strategic Plan. This will be a new Plan for 2007 to 2016 which will replace the 1996 master plan. A consultant has been retained to lead this process. Cari distributed a handout outlining the process that will be followed, and how the DAC and other Advisory Committees will be involved and consulted. The process for the Strategic Plan Review will include focus groups, including with advisory committees including the DAC. There will also be an interdepartmental advisory group. A draft report will be distributed for discussion and input.

She noted that there have been significant demographic shifts which will result in the need for services for the many new families in Surrey as well as the need for services for seniors. They will explore opportunities for how to partner with the private sector. There will also be an examination of opportunities for increasing for natural areas in the City.

How Yin advised that the Parks and Recreation Strategic Plan is a parallel document to the OCP, and acts as an Official Plan for parks and recreation facilities in the City.

Steve Kurrein noted that it appears that the School district is not included in the consultation, and noted that there should be much more coordination between the city and the school district.

***Action: Further comments from members to be provided directly to Tiina Mack.***

## **3. Sustainability Charter (Mark Allison)**

How Yin advised that this matter was reported to Council in the Fall at Council's request. Mark Allison presented a power point presentation based on a workshop that was held with the Environmental advisory Committee (EAC) last Saturday. The process will look at the scope of the project, the definition of sustainability and the means by which the City may implement a sustainability charter. A copy of the presentation is attached.

The EAC is the steering committee for this process, and there will be considerable stakeholder input. In addition to the development of a charter, it will be very important to develop an implementation strategy. The City will examine where it can take direct

action in its areas of responsibility, areas where it can regulate and areas where it can have influence over others and lobby other levels.

Mark noted that the DAC/development industry would be invited to participate in the steering committee. Gordon Dickson noted that the UDI would be interested in participating.

Steve Kurrein asked if this might be ahead of its time in asking for things that the public may not be ready to pay for. There will have to be incentives to ensure that initiatives can be done affordably. He noted that it would be interesting to do something like a town in England that was the first town to become carbon neutral.

Mark advised that the province is interested in “early adopters”. For example, on northern Vancouver Island, Energuide 80 has become the norm.

Raghibir expressed concerned about the training element for staff. Their emphasis is on process. There has to be a skill mix in staff to ensure that this does not hold up the process. There will need to be an identification of new skill sets and training that staff will need.

Michael Ward asked how this will be recognized through the planning process. How Yin advised that there may b an attachment to the staff report that indicates how a particular project satisfies sustainability objectives.

Councillor Hunt noted that we have had supposedly “transit oriented” developments that may be adjacent to transit but have not really been transit-oriented development. We do not look at how to truly integrate transit with development though means such as direct connections and climate protection, and we need to design bus routes that go to the front door of the mall.

Chris Barbati noted that Port Coquitlam is using a sustainability checklist. The problem there is that there is not yet a satisfactory way to rate developments. There are some councillors who look at the checklist and support a development or not depending on the score. A carefully phased implementation will be important.

As an example of this, How Yin advised of a letter from Ken Cameron of HPO indicating that many of the insurers will not ensure green roofs. He noted that the city needs to proceed carefully.

Kevin Shoemaker noted that he welcomes this initiative, and commented on the Al Gore documentary “An Inconvenient Truth”. He noted that this is much more in the public’s eye. Polygon got caught in the Green Roof issue in Southeast False Creek where the city demands them but they cannot get insurance. He noted that LEEDS does not apply to frame construction. There are municipalities jumping on certain types of systems. He advised that he would be interested in being on a sub-committee.

David Porte noted that this initiative looks good but cautioned that it should not add to costs as economic rationality needs to be considered. People will have to pay for it. Mark noted that in each of the areas where the City is doing studies we have required a business case.

Gordon Dickson noted that Seattle and Portland often come up as examples, but in the US there is a 10 to 1 federal incentives program. We are losing incentive programs here. Currently the dollars may not be there in support of industry.

**Action:** Kevin to represent DAC on the steering committee and staff will report back at regular intervals.

#### 4. Capital Expenditures for Schools and School Site Acquisition Charge (Umur Olcay)

How Yin distributed the Corporate Report which provided information on this topic that was received by Council on January 22. Umur Olcay from School District 36 advised the committee that the district has gone through the process of identifying the required sites and determining the cost of acquiring and servicing the sites in the growth areas. The Board passed By-law #101B which will increase the School Site Acquisition fees by an average of 54% and taking effect as of March 12 of this year. The fee increase is shown on the following table. Umur noted that this is the cap to which the District is allowed to go under the provincial legislation.

<b>Prescribed Category of Eligible Development (BC Regulation 17/00)</b>	<b>D = (Factor set by BC Regulation 17/00)</b>	<b>Amended School Site Acquisition Charge Rates</b> <i>(The SSAC rate is capped at maximum allowed pursuant to Provincial regulations)</i>	<b>Current School Site Acquisition Charge Rates per Unit</b>	<b>Increase in School Site Acquisition Charge Rates</b>
Low Density (<21 units / ha.)	1.25	\$1,000 per unit	\$647 per unit	\$353
Medium Low (21-50 units / ha)	1.125	\$900 per unit	\$582 per unit	\$318
Medium (51 -125 units / ha)	1.0	\$800 per unit	\$518 per unit	\$282
Medium High (126-200 units / ha)	0.875	\$700 per unit	\$453 per unit	\$247
High Density (>200 units / ha)	0.75	\$600 per unit	\$388 per unit	\$212

This is a process that the district goes through every year. Umur advised that sites have been acquired in Clayton Heights and North Grandview. He noted that they are buying sites in areas where, as soon as the NCP is approved and the sewers are constructed, the cost of acquiring the sites increases dramatically.

Umur distributed spreadsheets identifying the anticipated school age population by age cohort and area. The second sheet showed the sites that have not yet been acquired but that will be needed for schools in the next 10 years. There are also some projects that have been previously approved but the acquisition has not yet been completed. The revised land costs for all of the sites is in the order of \$103 million. The total approved 12 sites account for about \$50 million and the remaining sites account for \$53 million. The new sites, while fewer, are more expensive because they are all in the Clayton and Grandview areas where land costs are high.

There is a 60 day grace period for developers to get their applications in – to March 12, 2007, and then there is a one-year period to complete to the issuance of the building permit, similar to the DCC process. Chris noted that there may be a rush particularly through the development permit process to get to building permit within the year.

Avtar asked about the revenue from school closings. Umur noted that money would go back into capital construction and site acquisition. The District does not have vacant land holdings generally.

Jake noted that the taxpayers are concerned when the city sells assets to the district. This should not be used as an excuse to tax again.

Steve noted that in the analysis, the district is still taking 6 acres for elementary school sites and 12 for high schools. With land values what they are, should they be looking at smaller sites and multi-level schools? Umur noted that multi-level schools have been built on sites where the environmental requirements have reduced the site available. The standard has been increased from 7.5 to 6 acres generally which is the Ministry standard but sometimes they can go lower.

Chris asked about the typical size of sites in places like Vancouver and New Westminster. Umur noted that the sites are typically smaller within urban areas. Chris expressed the view that if we are looking at intensifying the city the school sites should be smaller as well. Developers are struggling to get land. Umur noted that in Vancouver as part of the amenity packages they are moving to provide air space for future schools. As well, two level schools are often more expensive to build.

David Porte asked about the timing of the acquisition in relation to the area plan process, and why the District not buy land in advance. Umur indicated that it depends how quickly the ministry approves the project so that they proceed to acquire. The acquisition is also competing with renovation and seismic upgrades. In 2006 nothing was approved by the province. If sites are approved in the 2007 capital plan, it can not proceed to acquisition until 2009.

***Action: Umur was asked to take the comments from this meeting back to the district – especially about site size and two storey buildings.***

## **5. Application forms on Website**

How Yin advised that it is now possible to download all application forms and supporting documentation from the City's web site. It is not possible to apply on-line at this time. The pertinent pages of the web site were distributed for the Committee's information.

Chris asked if there could be access to applications to determine which departments had signed off. This could save a number of phone calls. Staff noted that this is in the plans but will not be available for a year.

Kevin asked if the full planning reports with all attachments could be on the web. This is also in the works.

## 6. Suggested Future Items

The following suggestions were made:

- New Building Code requirements for vinyl cladding a rain screens. Could the city provide information on how this will be interpreted?
- Information on how we can save trees and provide the densification the City wants. Need for staff training on this.
- Construction/building code requirements for the commercial/residential townhouse zone.
- Air space parcel development rights.

Other suggestions for agenda items can be directed to the Adrian Kopystynski at the Planning and Development Department.

## 7. Next Meeting and Adjournment

The next Committee meeting is scheduled on Thursday, February 22, 2007.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:20 pm.