

Present:

Chairperson - Councillor Hayne
Mayor Watts
Councillor Hepner
Councillor Martin
Councillor Rasode
Councillor Steele
Councillor Gill
Councillor Villeneuve

Absent:

Councillor Hunt

Staff Present:

City Manager
City Clerk
General Manager, Planning & Development
Assistant City Solicitor
General Manager, Engineering (Acting)
General Manager, Finance & Technology
General Manager, Parks, Recreation & Culture
General Manager, Investment & Intergovernmental Relations

A. DELEGATIONS

- 1. Deb Jack, Surrey Environmental Partners and Michelle Molnar, Environmental Economist and Policy Analyst, David Suzuki Foundation**
File: 5280-01; 0550-20-10

In attendance before Council to provide a report entitled "Nearshore Natural Capital Valuation, Valuing the Aquatic Benefits of British Columbia's Lower Mainland."

Deb Jack introduced Michelle Molnar.

The following comments were made:

- The City of Surrey has completed the Sustainability Charter, the Ecosystem Management Study and will soon complete the Biodiversity Conservation Strategy. It is our hope that the work we are doing will help guide the implementation of these higher level principals and policies.
- Nature has become a scarce resource and consequently an economic concern. The level of built capital was what limited economic progress, it is now limited by the state of the environment. For example, the fishing industry, a century ago what limited profits was the amount of boats able to fish but today, the health of fish stocks are the limiting factor.
- Natural Capital refers to the planet's stocks of water, land, air, and renewable and non-renewable resources (such as plant and animal species, forests, and minerals). The term natural capital implies an extension of the economic notion of capital.
- Our markets do not recognize many of the vital services of nature. If these services are not tracked, signals of decline are being missed. Natural capital must be measured alongside investments and traditional capital.
- A tool to address this reality is natural capital evaluation. In the fall of 2010, the David Suzuki Foundation released a report titled, "Natural Capital in BC's Lower Mainland". Estimates in that report were based on the cost to replace

natural services with artificial or engineered systems and when that wasn't possible, the cost of restoring ecosystems to the point where they could provide services again were examined.

- The most valuable ecosystem on per hectare per year are:

- Wetlands - \$378,000
- Beaches - \$209,000
- Lakes & Rivers - \$64,000

- Services looked at per hectare per year included:

	Value per hectare (low)	Value per hectare (high)
Disturbance Regulation	\$3000	\$297,000
Aesthetic and Recreation	\$19,000	\$283,000
Waste Treatment	\$1,400	\$115,000

- Cities throughout North America are beginning to question why they are spending money on infrastructure while failing to recognize what nature is able to provide for free. Philadelphia, Seattle, New York, Detroit and Oregon are cities that are supplementing traditional infrastructure (grey infrastructure) with green infrastructure and saving money while seeing environmental wins.
- As one of the fastest growing cities in the Lower Mainland, Surrey could potentially see up to \$1.5 billion dollars in infrastructure needs over the next decade to accommodate the growth.
- Surrey's Biodiversity Conservation Strategy will help identify and prioritize green infrastructure assets to assist in the conservation of biodiversity. The David Suzuki Foundation is a working group member of the Biodiversity Conservation Strategy.
- The City of Surrey has a key opportunity. Metro Vancouver is in the process of developing a regional green infrastructure network as part of their Ecological Health Action Plan. Vancouver will be looking to member municipalities to feed into this process.
- This report provides a framework where you can see more opportunities and we hope that local governments such as Surrey can use the studies to provide practical information on the value of natural assets as strategic land use planning decisions are made.

Council questioned why there is such a wide discrepancy in the evaluation (low value for Disturbance Regulation is \$3000 and high value is \$297,000). The delegation replied that the values vary depending on the location of the study and the actual ecosystem itself and what its level of degradation is. The low bottom price is considered as well as the high end cost with the full range being represented.

Council inquired whether the report had been presented regionally and the delegation responded that the report was completed last month and the municipalities within the report study area and regional districts are being reached out to.

Council questioned in the U.S. examples used, if there was any support for the municipalities from different levels of government or broader initiatives with the resources and finances? The EPA developed a publication that walked through a number of examples that address how these policies were developed and how they were funded.

2. **Don Luymes, Manager, Community Planning**

File: 6520-20 (GH NCP#4)

Note: See Corporate Report Ro18 of Regular Council Public Hearing agenda.

In attendance before Council to provide an update on the preferred Grandview Heights NCP #4 Draft Preferred Land Use Concept.

- A Preferred Land Use Plan is ready for Council's approval. A public meeting is tentatively scheduled for February 6, 2013 pending Council's authorization.
- At the last public meeting in 2011, three land use options were presented and based on the feedback, the Preferred Land Use Plan was a hybrid of two of the options (A and B).
- The planners responded to a number of key planning issues that emerged through discussion with the Citizen's Advisory Committee (CAC) and the background studies. The issues were as follows:
 - Neighbourhood Centre (location and scale)
 - Elementary School (location)
 - Open Space Network (parks, greenways, wildlife, hubs & corridors)
 - Circulation (street networks, pathways, relation to Highway 15)
 - Housing Types and Densities (distribution)
 - Transitions (ALR edge and adjacent neighbourhoods)
 - Stormwater Drainage (pond locations)
- If fully built up, the projections for population and housing estimates are 4,437 units and 11,206 residents.
- Staff developed a Stormwater Concept, Water Distribution Concept and Sanitary Sewer Concept. Sanitary sewers are a key component to this plan. The concept is for a gravity drainage down to a sewer trunk running along the base of the neighbourhood to a proposed pump station and from there sewer will be pumped to a future interceptor and out through the Morgan Creek area into the GVRD system.
- The amount of green space proposed is higher than most other NCP's and there is not sufficient parkland DCC's to cover the purchase of lands outside riparian areas that would be required. There is a need for a special levy to purchase the greenspace for wildlife hub and corridor. A consultant has been hired to recommend the most equitable way to spread the costs of this on all development in the NCP.

A preliminary assessment of the levy is:

- \$11,300 per single-family home
- \$7,848 per townhouse unit
- \$6,594 per apartment unit

- Next steps are as follows:
 - Pubic Meeting tentatively scheduled for February 6, 2013
 - Revisions (Citizen's Advisory Committee) – February, 2013
 - Stage 1 Council approval – April, 2013
 - Stage 2 Initiation – decision of "Owners Group"

Council questioned if the presentation has been before the Development Advisory Committee (DAC) and if the extra levy has been discussed. Staff noted that there is general support among the developers that sit on the CAC, landowners and DAC members. Prudent planning has taken place and Council had stated their interest in making sure the wildlife values were preserved in this area. The mechanism for equitably distributing the costs of that greenspace is to develop a levy rather than load that cost onto certain property owners.

B. ITEMS REFERRED BY COUNCIL

C. CORPORATE REPORTS

D. DELEGATION REQUESTS

E. COUNCILLORS' REPORTS

F. OTHER COMPETENT BUSINESS

G. ADJOURNMENT

It was

Moved by Councillor Hepner

Seconded by Councillor Gill

That the Council-in-Committee meeting do

now adjourn.

Carried

The Council-in-Committee adjourned at 5:38 p.m.

Jane Sullivan, City Clerk

Councillor Hayne, Chairperson