



1. Suburban Pocket Development Applications (the "Suburban Pocket")

The Rosemary Heights Central NCP identified a number of areas proposed for Suburban ½ Acre Residential uses, within an elongated pocket of suburban lands located along 155 Street and 156 Street between 33 Avenue and 37 Avenue. The purpose of this designation in the NCP was to recognize existing suburban residential development rather than provide for future residential development at this density.

Development is proposed on a number of existing properties located in the northern portion of this Suburban Pocket, in the vicinity of 36 Avenue and 156 Street (Development Application Nos. 7914-0338-00, 7915-0002-00, 7915-0085-00, 7916-0005-00, and 7916-0491-00). The applicants for these Development Applications are proposing to amend the Official Community Plan (OCP) land use designation from "Suburban" to "Urban," and the NCP designation from "Suburban ½ Acre Residential" to "Transitional Single Family Residential (5 u.p.a. max.)," and rezoning from RH to CD (based on RF) in order to permit subdivision at a density not to exceed 5 units per acre (u.p.a.).

Development Application Nos. 7914-0338-00, 7915-0002-00, 7915-0085-00, and 7916-0491-00 are at the pre-Council stage in the development process, and have not been presented to Council for consideration.

Development Application No. 7916-0005-00 received First and Second Readings on January 16, 2017. At the Regular Council - Public Hearing meeting on February 6, 2017, a number of neighbourhood residents spoke in opposition to the proposal. Speakers indicated concerns regarding the loss of neighbourhood character, traffic, impact on schools, tree removal, and impact on wildlife. After the Public Hearing portion of the meeting, Council referred this application back to staff to (1) address concerns raised during the Public Hearing, (2) conduct public consultation with residents and stakeholders, and (3) explore how the remaining undeveloped properties can be suitably addressed while maintaining the unique character of the neighbourhood (Resolution R17-385).

In addition, a Development Application in the southern portion of this Suburban Pocket (Development Application No. 7915-0129-00) recently received Third Reading at the Regular Council - Public Hearing meeting on December 19, 2016. Similar to the development applications in the north portion of this Suburban Pocket, this application involves an OCP Amendment from "Suburban" to "Urban," NCP Amendment from "Suburban ½ Acre Residential" to "Transitional Single Family Residential (5 u.p.a. max.)," rezoning to CD and subdivision into larger RF type single family lots.

Development Application No. 7915-0129-00 was part of a comprehensive notification process, including all projects in the Suburban Pocket area. While some overarching concern was raised for development in the area, there were no speakers at the Public Hearing who spoke in opposition to the proposal.

If any of the other applications are approved, it is anticipated that property owners for other properties within the Suburban Pocket will come forward with similar proposals for development.

2. Development Application No. 7915-0401-00 (the "McDonald Lands")

This application is for the property located at 3965 – 156 Street, a 2.26 hectare (5.6 acre) site located at 156 Street and 40 Avenue, at the northern boundary of the NCP area. The entire property is designated "Park/Open Space" in the NCP.

The applicant (Mr. R. Glenn McDonald) proposes an NCP amendment for a portion of the site from "Park/Open Space" to "Suburban ½ Acre Residential," rezoning a portion of the site from "One-Acre Residential Zone (RA)" to "Comprehensive Development Zone (CD)" (based on "Half-Acre Residential Gross Density Zone (RH-G)"), and subdivision to create 11 residential lots and one (1) park lot. This application is in the early stages of review and has yet to be presented to Council for consideration.

3. Development Application No. 7916-0708-00 (the "Retreat Centre Lands")

This application involves two (2) properties comprising approximately 12.3 hectares (30.5 acres), located at the northwest corner of the NCP area (3690 and 3660 – 152 Street). These lands are designated "Institutional" and "Park/Open Space" in the NCP. The site was previously owned by the Archdiocese of Vancouver, who operated the Rosemary Retreat Centre on the site. When the NCP was in the planning stages, the Archdiocese had plans to build a Catholic high school on the site, east of the existing retreat centre.

The Retreat Centre site has since been sold to a developer, Porte Communities, who has applied to the City to amend a portion of the site from "Institutional" to "Townhouses" and "Single Family Small Lots," to amend the location of open space, and to rezone the lands from "General Agricultural Zone (A-1) to "Comprehensive Development Zone (CD)" (based on RM-15) and "Single Family Residential (13) Zone (RF-13)," in order to permit approximately 278 townhouse units and 23 single family small lots. This application is also in the early stages of review and has not yet proceeded to Council for consideration.

## **Policy Context**

The process for amending an approved NCP (i.e., called a "Secondary Plan" in the OCP) is outlined in the Implementation section of the Plan Surrey 2013 OCP (By-law No. 18020), on page 278. It indicates that any application for a major amendment to a Secondary Plan should undertake an analysis of the proposed change to the Secondary Plan, including the impact of the proposed amendment on all aspects of the Secondary Plan including land use, population, densities, impact on schools, parks and amenities, services and utilities, roads and transportation, environmental considerations, funding of services, and local market/economic implications.

## **Public Notification and Consultation to Date**

For each of the three (3) development application areas noted above, there has been public consultation that has already occurred as part of the application review process.

1. Suburban Pocket Development Applications

One combined pre-notification letter for development applications within the Suburban Pocket was mailed out on February 2, 2016. A combined Public Information Meeting (PIM) was subsequently held on March 8, 2016. The comments received as a result of the

pre-notification and March 8, 2016 PIM are summarized in the January 16, 2017 Planning Report for Development Application No. 7916-0005-00 (Appendix "II").

Council heard from neighbourhood residents at the Public Hearing for Development Application No. 7916-0005-00 on February 6, 2017. As mentioned in the Background section of this Planning Report, the application was referred back to staff at the February 6, 2017 to address concerns raised at the Public Hearing and conduct additional public consultation.

Planning and Transportation Engineering staff met with members of the Rosemary Heights Neighbourhood Committee on May 2, 2017, to discuss concerns with the proposed Suburban Pocket development applications and more general concerns about the other proposed amendments to the NCP and potential traffic impacts. Subsequently, a second PIM was held to consult with the neighbourhood on these applications on May 4, 2017, following the direction that had been provided by Council at the Regular Council – Land Use meeting on February 6, 2017.

2. Development Application No. 7915-0401-00 (the "McDonald Lands")

Pre-notification letters for this project were mailed out on November 21, 2016, and a PIM was held for this project on May 15, 2017.

3. Development Application No. 7916-0708-00 (the "Retreat Centre Lands")

Pre-notification letters for this project was mailed out on April 26, 2017, and a PIM was held for this project on May 10, 2017.

Each PIM was well-attended. 59 people signed in at the second Suburban Pocket PIM, 98 at the PIM for the Retreat Centre Lands application, and 15 at the PIM for the McDonald Lands. These numbers are likely under-representative as many attendees may have not signed in. Furthermore, a number of area residents subsequently submitted letters to the City outlining concerns they have with the proposals. The majority of the concerns are coming from the Suburban Pocket and Retreat Centre Lands applications.

### **Issues Raised by Neighbourhood Residents**

There are three broad themes that are dominant in the comments that have been expressed to date for these applications, including (1) land use and density, (2) transportation, and (3) schools. The majority of the concerns are with regard to the Retreat Centre Lands application and the Suburban Pocket applications.

1. Land Use and Density

Neighbourhood residents feel that the community infrastructure – including schools, parkland, and roads; both within and external to the neighbourhood – are already over-capacity and cannot accommodate additional growth. Because of this, many residents feel that the land uses and densities in the NCP should not be amended as this would allow for additional population growth, and the challenges to community infrastructure that may be associated with these.

There was also a concern amongst many residents regarding the character of the neighbourhood, and a feeling that the proposals were not in keeping with the existing neighbourhood character.

Neighbourhood residents also expressed concern regarding the need for additional community amenities, such as parkland; library; community centre; school; and/or child care facility. With regard to the Retreat Centre Lands, there is a desire amongst many neighbourhood residents to retain the institutional designation for the site, and/or for the City to acquire the site for park purposes.

In addition, concerns were also expressed regarding the potential impact on the environment, including a decrease in biodiversity, trees and green space as a consequence of the proposed land use and density changes.

## 2. Transportation

The majority of the comments received through the consultation to date included concerns regarding the impact that the proposed developments would have on traffic both in the neighbourhood and elsewhere, in particular 32 Avenue and 152 Street interchange at Highway 99. Although improvements to the interchange are identified within the Engineering Department's 10 Year Servicing Plan, joint funding with the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure is required which has not been confirmed.

Some respondents adjacent to the proposed developments were concerned about the increased traffic on their individual street while others were concerned about broader neighbourhood traffic changes. In this regard, one of the areas of interest for the neighbourhood has been the status of the opposing cul-de-sacs on 36 Avenue and 156 Street between 34 Avenue and 36 Avenue, and the cul-de-sac at 156 Street and 40 Avenue and whether these would be opened as part of the process of the subject applications. These were implemented as part of the 1996 NCP to try and deter through-traffic from outside the Central Neighbourhood, and to insulate the existing suburban residential properties. At the time, the Suburban Pocket property owners did not want to develop their properties at higher densities and wanted to retain their suburban character. In the 20 years since the NCP was developed there has been a significant change in the approach to transportation provision within neighbourhoods, moving from closed neighbourhoods with limited internal connections to more connected neighbourhoods based around finer-grained grid based road networks where traffic is distributed across the entire road network.

With the current development proposals any additional traffic associated with these would be distributed based on the current network. For some streets this would mean additional traffic while for others no change would be experienced and while there has been no decision to open the cul-de-sacs, given the current and future development proposals it is appropriate that this is assessed as part of the broader transportation review.

## 3. Schools

Many neighbourhood residents also expressed concern regarding school overcrowding and a lack of capacity at neighbourhood schools to accommodate additional growth from the proposed NCP amendments.

## DISCUSSION

Given the number of applications proposing major amendments to the Rosemary Heights Central NCP, and the concerns expressed by neighbourhood residents to date, it is recommended that Council direct staff to conduct a comprehensive review of the NCP in relation to the issues identified by area residents before allowing any individual development application to proceed.

Components of the NCP review would include:

**Transportation Review:** a neighbourhood traffic review will assess traffic patterns and volumes, and anticipated distribution of volume of additional traffic from proposed development applications. This review could be initiated during the remainder of June 2017.

**Consultation with Suburban Pocket Land Owners:** consultation with land owners in the Suburban Pocket of the NCP will help to determine if there is a high level of support to retain the current Suburban Land Use Designation or whether there is large support to change densities to allow Urban Designation. This consultation could begin in July 2017.

**Broader Consultation with Rosemary Heights Residents:** with completion of the traffic review and initial consultation with residents in the Suburban Pocket, an open house format will provide opportunity to receive feedback from residents in the larger neighbourhood area. The timing of this broader consultation could likely be initiated during the Fall season of 2017.

**Consultation with School District No. 36:** to discuss school projections, available school capacity, and the impact that the NCP amendment applications would have on neighbourhood schools.

**Parks and Amenities Review:** a review of the parks and amenities in the neighbourhood with the Parks, Recreation and Culture Department.

### Schedule and Expected Timelines

Subject to Council authorization, the anticipated timeline for the Rosemary Heights Central NCP review are:

- June 2017  
Initiate neighbourhood traffic review.
- July 2017  
Consultation with suburban pocket land owners.
- July and August 2017  
Consultation with School District No. 36 and the Parks, Recreation & Culture Department
- September 2017  
Public Open House to receive feedback from Rosemary Heights residents.
- Late Fall 2017  
Report to Council.

## SUSTAINABILITY CONSIDERATIONS

This Corporate Report applies to the following Desired Outcomes (DO) and Strategic Directions (SD) in the Sustainability Charter 2.0.

### Built Environment and Neighbourhoods

- DO 8: The built environment enhances quality of life, happiness and well-being.
- SD 5: Leverage, incentivize and enhance community benefits through the planning and construction of new development.

### Public Safety

- DO 9: Transportation network supports and provides safe mobility for all ages and abilities.
- DO 10: Surrey is part of a coordinated effort to reduce the risk of harm for all road users, with attention to those who are most vulnerable, including pedestrians and cyclists.
- SD 8: Ensure all public infrastructure is built and maintained to ensure community safety and well-being for all ages and abilities.
- SD 9: Address traffic safety issues in a holistic way, particularly around schools and critical accident locations.

## CONCLUSION

A broader traffic review and small scale consultation is planned to commence immediately with a view to be undertaken through the remainder of June through to August. It is anticipated that a Public Open House could be held in September 2017, followed by a report to Council.

Based on the above discussion, it is recommended that Council:

- Receive this report as information;
- Authorize staff to initiate a land use review process for the areas designated as "Suburban" in the Rosemary Heights Central Neighbourhood Concept Plan (NCP);
- Authorize staff to undertake a transportation review to evaluate the traffic impacts and road network implications associated with all proposed land use amendments in the Rosemary Heights Central NCP; and
- Place all development applications in the Rosemary Heights Central NCP area that are discussed in this report on hold until the comprehensive review is complete.

*Original signed by*  
Jean Lamontagne  
General Manager, Planning & Development

*Original signed by Jeff Arason for*  
Fraser Smith, P.Eng., MBA  
General Manager, Engineering

HK/ss

Appendix "I" - Rosemary Heights Central NCP map, including proposed NCP amendment areas  
Appendix "II" - January 16, 2017 Planning Report for Development Application No. 7916-0005-00




# Appendix "II"

## City of Surrey PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT REPORT

File: 7916-0005-00

Planning Report Date: January 16, 2017




### PROPOSAL:

- **OCP Amendment** from "Suburban" to "Urban"
- **NCP Amendment** from "Suburban ½ Acre Residential" to "Transitional Single Family Residential (5 u.p.a. max.)"
- **Rezoning** from RH to CD (based on RF)

To allow subdivision into three (3) single family residential lots.

**LOCATION:** 3624 - 156 Street  
**OWNER:** PCC Developments Ltd.  
**ZONING:** RH  
**OCP DESIGNATION:** Suburban  
**NCP DESIGNATION:** Suburban ½ Acre Residential



### RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY

- By-law Introduction and set date for Public Hearing for:
  - OCP Amendment; and
  - Rezoning.

### DEVIATION FROM PLANS, POLICIES OR REGULATIONS

- Proposed Official Community Plan (OCP) amendment from "Suburban" to "Urban".
- Proposed amendment to the Rosemary Heights Central Neighbourhood Concept Plan (NCP) from "Suburban ½ Acre Residential" to "Transitional Single Family Residential (5 u.p.a. max.)".

### RATIONALE OF RECOMMENDATION

- The subject property is located within the northern portion of an elongated pocket of suburban lands located along 155 Street and 156 Street between 33 Avenue and 37 Avenue in the Rosemary Heights Central NCP area. The suburban lands are comprised of a mix of one-acre and half-acre zoned lands.
- Under the OCP, the maximum net density permitted in "Suburban" designated areas is 4 units per acre (u.p.a.)/10 units per hectare (u.p.ha.). The applicant is proposing to amend the OCP from "Suburban" to "Urban" in order to permit a net density of 4.76 u.p.a./11.76 u.p.ha. to facilitate subdivision into three (3) single family lots.
- To accommodate the proposal, an amendment to the Rosemary Heights Central NCP is also required to re-designate the site from "Suburban ½ Acre Residential" to "Transitional Single Family Residential (5 u.p.a. max.)".
- The proposal meets the objectives of the OCP policy on "Sensitive Infill", which encourages infill development that is compatible with existing neighbourhoods. Specifically, the proposed development provides for oversized single family lots with areas ranging from 763 square metres (8,213 sq. ft.) to 1,013 square metres (10,904 sq. ft.), which respects the suburban character of the area, while allowing for the gradual densification of this suburban pocket.
- Development is also proposed on a number of other existing properties located in the northern portion of this suburban pocket, in the vicinity of 36 Avenue and 156 Street, (Development Application Nos. 7914-0338-00, 7915-0002-00 and 7915-0085-00). These development applications are Pre-Council. In addition, a development application in the southern portion of this suburban pocket (Development Application No. 7915-0129-00) recently received Third Reading at the Regular Council – Public Hearing meeting on December 19, 2016. All these applications involve a similar OCP Amendment from "Suburban" to "Urban", NCP Amendment from "Suburban ½ Acre Residential" to "Transitional Single Family Residential (5 u.p.a. max.)", rezoning to CD and subdivision into larger RF type single family lots [Appendix VIII].
- The applicant has agreed to provide a community benefit contribution of \$4,500 per lot in support of the proposed OCP Amendment from "Suburban" to "Urban", in accordance with the provisions identified in the OCP.

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning & Development Department recommends that:

1. a By-law be introduced to amend the OCP by re-designating the subject site from Suburban to Urban [Appendix VI] and a date for Public Hearing be set.
2. Council determine the opportunities for consultation with persons, organizations and authorities that are to be affected by the proposed amendment to the Official Community Plan, as described in the Report, to be appropriate to meet the requirement of Section 475 of the Local Government Act.
3. a By-law be introduced to rezone the subject site from "Half-Acre Residential Zone (RH)" to "Comprehensive Development Zone (CD)" and a date be set for Public Hearing.
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 to the satisfaction of the Approving Officer;
  - (c) submission of a finalized tree survey and a statement regarding tree preservation to the satisfaction of the City Landscape Architect;
  - (d) submission of a finalized lot grading plan to the satisfaction of the Planning and Development Department;
  - (e) demolition of existing buildings and structures to the satisfaction of the Planning and Development Department;
  - (f) the applicant satisfy the deficiency in tree replacement on the site, to the satisfaction of the Planning and Development Department;
  - (g) registration of a Section 219 Restrictive Covenant for tree protection; and
  - (h) provision of a community benefit to satisfy the OCP Amendment Policy for Type 2 OCP amendment applications.
5. Council pass a resolution to amend the Rosemary Heights Central Neighbourhood Concept Plan (NCP) to re-designate the subject property from "Suburban ½ Acre Residential" to "Transitional Single Family Residential (5 u.p.a. max.)", as illustrated in Appendix VII, when the project is considered for final adoption.

REFERRALS

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

School District: **Projected number of students from this development:**

2 Elementary students at Rosemary Heights Elementary School  
1 Secondary student at Earl Marriot Secondary School

(Appendix IV)

The applicant has advised that the dwelling units in this project are expected to be constructed and ready for occupancy by Spring, 2019.

SITE CHARACTERISTICS

Existing Land Use: Single family dwelling and accessory structures.

Adjacent Area:

| Direction                    | Existing Use              | OCP/NCP Designation                      | Existing Zone            |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|
| North:                       | Single family residential | Suburban/<br>Suburban ½ Acre Residential | RH                       |
| East:                        | Single family residential | Urban/<br>Single Family Residential      | CD (By-law<br>No. 13615) |
| South<br>(Across 36 Avenue): | Single family residential | Suburban/<br>Suburban ½ Acre Residential | RH                       |
| West<br>(Across 156 Street): | Single family residential | Suburban/<br>Suburban ½ Acre Residential | RA                       |

JUSTIFICATION FOR PLAN AMENDMENT

- The subject property is located within the northern portion of an elongated pocket of suburban lands located along 155 Street and 156 Street between 33 Avenue and 37 Avenue in the Rosemary Heights Central NCP area. These suburban lands are comprised of a mix of one acre and half acre zoned lands.
- Under the OCP, the maximum net density permitted in "Suburban" designated areas is 4 units per acre (u.p.a.)/10 units per hectare (u.p.ha.). The applicant is proposing to amend the OCP from "Suburban" to "Urban" in order to permit a net density of 4.76 u.p.a./11.76 u.p.ha. to facilitate subdivision into three (3) single family lots.

- To accommodate the proposal, an amendment to the Rosemary Heights Central NCP is also required to re-designate the site from "Suburban ½ Acre Residential" to "Transitional Single Family Residential (5 u.p.a. max.)". The "Transitional Single Family Residential (5 u.p.a. max.)" designation was introduced under Development Application No. 7915-0129-00 at the Regular Council – Land Use meeting on December 5, 2016 and is intended to accommodate larger urban lots, similar to that which is being proposed under the current application.
- The proposal meets the objectives of the OCP policy on "Sensitive Infill", which encourages infill development that is compatible with existing neighbourhoods. Specifically, the proposed development provides for oversized single family lots with areas ranging from 763 square metres (8,213 sq. ft.) to 1,013 square metres (10,904 sq. ft.) which respects the suburban character of the area, while allowing for the gradual densification of this suburban pocket.
- Development is also proposed on a number of other existing properties located in the northern portion of this suburban pocket, in the vicinity of 36 Avenue and 156 Street, (Development Application Nos. 7914-0338-00, 7915-0002-00 and 7915-0085-00). These development applications are Pre-Council. In addition, a development application in the southern portion of this suburban pocket (Development Application No. 7915-0129-00) recently received Third Reading at the Regular Council – Public Hearing meeting on December 19, 2016. All these applications involve a similar OCP Amendment from "Suburban" to "Urban", NCP Amendment from "Suburban ½ Acre Residential" to "Transitional Single Family Residential (5 u.p.a. max.)", rezoning to CD and subdivision into larger RF type single family lots [Appendix VIII].
- The applicant has agreed to provide a community benefit contribution of \$4,500 per lot in support of the proposed OCP Amendment from "Suburban" to "Urban", in accordance with the provisions identified in the OCP.

## DEVELOPMENT CONSIDERATIONS

### Background

- The subject property is roughly 0.63 acre (0.255 hectare) in area and located on the east side of 156 Street just north of 36 Avenue. The property is zoned "Half-Acre Residential Zone (RH)" and currently occupied by a single family residential dwelling as well as accessory buildings.
- The property is designated "Suburban" in the Official Community Plan (OCP) and "Suburban ½ Acre Residential" in the Rosemary Heights Central Neighbourhood Concept Plan (NCP).

### Current Proposal

- The applicant proposes an OCP Amendment from "Suburban" to "Urban" [Appendix VI], an amendment to the Rosemary Heights Central NCP from "Suburban ½ Acre Residential" to "Transitional Single Family Residential (5 u.p.a. max.)" [Appendix VII] as well as rezoning from "Half-Acre Residential Zone (RH)" to "Comprehensive Development Zone (CD)" in order to permit subdivision into three single family lots.

- The CD Zone is based upon the "Single Family Residential Zone (RF)" with oversized lots that range in area from 763 square metres (8,213 sq. ft.) to 1,013 square metres (10,904 sq. ft.). The lots will all be a minimum of 20 metres (66 ft.) wide, and 30 metres (98 ft.) deep.
- The existing dwelling and accessory buildings are proposed to be demolished.
- The proposed subdivision has an overall net density of 4.76 u.p.a. (11.76 u.p.ha.).

#### Proposed CD By-law

- The proposed CD By-law [Appendix IX] is based upon the "Single Family Residential Zone (RF)" with modifications to the density, minimum setback and subdivision requirements. The modifications are noted in the table below:

| <b>By-law Comparison</b> | <b>RF Zone</b>  | <b>Proposed CD Zone</b>   |
|--------------------------|---|---|
| Density                  | 14.8 u.p.ha./6 u.p.a. where amenities are provided in accordance with Schedule G of Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000                           | 12.4 u.p.ha./5 u.p.a. where amenities are provided in accordance with Schedule G of Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000                           |
| Setbacks                 | <u>Principal Building</u><br>Side = 1.8 m. (6 ft.)<br>Side (Flanking) = 3.6 m. (12 ft.)   | <u>Principal Building</u><br>Side = 2.4 m. (8 ft.)<br>Side (Flanking) = 4.8 m. (16 ft.)   |
| Subdivision Requirements | Minimum lot width of 15 metres (50 ft.)<br><br>Minimum lot depth of 28 metres (90 ft.)<br><br>Minimum lot size of 560 square metres (6,000 sq. ft.) | Minimum lot width of 20 metres (66 ft.)<br><br>Minimum lot depth of 30 metres (98 ft.)<br><br>Minimum lot size of 760 square metres (8,180 sq. ft.) |

- All other aspects of the proposed CD By-law comply with the provisions of the RF Zone.
- The proposed subdivision into three (3) single family RF-type lots will result in an overall net density of 4.76 u.p.a. (11.76 u.p.ha.) which is within the density range of the proposed "Transitional Single Family Residential (5 u.p.a. max.)" designation in the Rosemary Heights Central NCP.
- The minimum side yard setbacks in the CD Zone are greater than those in the RF Zone to ensure the future single family dwellings constructed on the newly created lots better reflect the transitional nature of the proposed lots.
- The minimum subdivision requirements prescribed in the CD By-law reflect the proposed lot width, depth and area, as shown on the current layout, and ensure that larger RF type lots are created to provide for a transition in lot sizes between the suburban lands and the surrounding urban lands.

### Building Design Guidelines and Lot Grading

- The applicant will retain the Building Design Guidelines previously registered on title for the subject property. These guidelines will subsequently be registered against the newly created lots.
- The Design Consultant (Raymond Bonter of Raymond Bonter Designer Ltd.) has indicated the existing Building Design Guidelines reflect the design standards applied in other phases of the "Morgan Creek" development and, therefore, will ensure greater consistency with the existing single family dwellings in the surrounding neighbourhood.
- The preliminary Lot Grading Plan prepared by Hub Engineering Inc. was reviewed by City staff and considered generally acceptable. The Lot Grading Plan indicates that a minimal amount of fill is proposed in order to achieve in-ground basements.

### TREES

- Glenn Murray, ISA Certified Arborist of Froggers Creek Tree Consultants 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   |
|---|-----------|-----------------|----------|
| <b>Deciduous Trees</b><br>(excluding Alder and Cottonwood Trees)              |           |                 |          |
| Bigleaf Maple   | 1         | 1               | 0        |
| Cherry  | 1         | 1               | 0        |
| Magnolia  | 1         | 1               | 0        |
| Paper Birch   | 9         | 9               | 0        |
| <b>Coniferous Trees</b>   |           |                 |          |
| Blue Spruce   | 2         | 2               | 0        |
| Douglas Fir   | 5         | 2               | 3        |
| Excelsa Cedar   | 15        | 15              | 0        |
| Western Red Cedar   | 1         | 1               | 0        |
| <b>Total</b>  | <b>35</b> | <b>32</b>       | <b>3</b> |
| <b>Total Replacement Trees Proposed</b><br>(excluding Boulevard Street Trees) |           | <b>9</b>        |          |
| <b>Total Retained and Replacement Trees</b>                                   |           | <b>12</b>       |          |
| <b>Contribution to the Green City Fund</b>                                    |           | <b>\$20,800</b> |          |

- The Arborist Assessment states that there are a total of thirty-five (35) protected trees on the site. It was determined that three (3) trees could be retained as part of this development proposal. The proposed tree retention on site was assessed taking into account the location of services, building footprints, road dedication and proposed lot grading.
- For those trees that cannot be retained, the applicant will be required to plant trees on a 1 to 1 replacement ratio for Alder and Cottonwood trees, and a 2 to 1 replacement ratio for all other trees. This will require a total of sixty-four (64) replacement trees on the site. Given that only nine (9) replacement trees can be accommodated on the site (based on an average of three (3) trees per lot), the deficit of fifty-two (52) replacement trees will require a cash-in-lieu payment of \$20,800, representing \$400 per tree, to the Green City Fund, in accordance with the City's Tree Protection By-law.
- In summary, a total of twelve (12) trees are proposed to be retained or replaced on the site with a contribution of \$20,800 to the Green City Fund.

### PRE-NOTIFICATION

One combined pre-notification letter was originally mailed to adjacent property owners on February 2, 2016 for the following development applications:

- File No. 7914-0338-00 (15557 – 36 Avenue)
- File No. 7915-0002-00 (3581 – 156 Street)
- File No. 7915-0085-00 (15558 – 36 Avenue)
- File No. 7915-0129-00 (3415 – 155 Street)
- File No. 7916-0005-00 (3624 – 156 Street)

Each development application proposes to amend the OCP from "Suburban" to "Urban", amend the Rosemary Heights Central NCP from "Suburban ½ Acre Residential" to "Transitional Single Family Residential (5 u.p.a. max.)", to rezone to CD (based on RF) and to subdivide into oversized RF single family lots. With the exception of the subject property and Development Application No. 7915-0129-00, all remaining applications are pre-Council but are expected to proceed to Council shortly.

In response to the original pre-notification letter for the five development applications above, staff received the following responses from adjacent property owners:

- One resident indicated support for the proposed development applications given that they will improve sidewalks and street lights which benefit child safety when walking to/from school as well as the safety of residents walking along 36 Avenue, north of 156 Street.
- Nine residents expressed concerns about increased densification and non-suburban lot types.

*(The applicant proposes to create larger RF-type urban lots that are intended to respect the suburban character of the surrounding neighbourhood. The subject property is located at the eastern edge of the Rosemary Heights Central neighbourhood. While the surrounding area is comprised largely of suburban lots, a number of urban sized lots have been developed including to the east and northeast adjacent 156A Street, 36A Avenue and 37 Avenue as well as to the north and northwest adjacent 156 Street, 37 Avenue and 37A Avenue.)*

- Five residents expressed concerns about potential overcrowding in local schools.

*(The Surrey School District has recently completed new classroom additions at Rosemary Heights Elementary School. At present, enrollment growth is slowing down within this elementary catchment. In addition, a new secondary school is planned for the Grandview area which is expected to open in 2020. Until then, the School District will continue to work with the City and provincial government to adjust capital plans to request additional class space thereby meeting local demand.)*

- Four residents expressed concerns about disruption, greater noise and increased truck traffic in the surrounding neighbourhood during construction.

*(The applicant has indicated that trucks will access the site only to grade and backfill. This work is estimated to commence early in the servicing process and last for two weeks. The contractors must follow City by-laws in terms of hours of operation and noise generated by activities on site.)*

- Five residents expressed concerns about the lack of parkland or green space to accommodate increased densification within the surrounding neighbourhood.

*(The subject property is located in close proximity to many existing parks and within walking distance of Blumsen Park as well as Morgan Creek Park at 3302 – 156A Street.)*

- Seven residents expressed concerns that increased density would result in higher vehicle traffic, replacing cul-de-sacs with through roads and vehicles short cutting through the surrounding neighbourhood.

*(The applicant is proposing to develop three single family lots. Any potential increase in vehicle traffic should be dispersed north and south on 156 Street as well as east and west along 34 Avenue to 152 Street, a full-movement intersection.)*

- Two residents expressed concerns about child safety walking to/from school.

*(The applicant is required to construct or upgrade the sidewalk along all proposed road frontages to municipal standards. This improvement should increase safety for school age children in the surrounding neighbourhood.)*

- Six residents expressed concerns about on-site tree retention.

*(The existing trees located on the site are largely within the future road dedication or building envelope. As such, increased tree retention is extremely challenging. However, the applicant is proposing to relocate several existing trees, plant an additional nine [9] trees on site and provide a contribution to address the shortfall in tree replacement.)*

- Three residents expressed concerns that the increased density would place additional pressure on existing municipal services.

*(The proposal will not impact the functioning of municipal services. Further, as part of the proposal, the applicant will be required to upgrade existing services along all road frontages and provide individual service connections for each lot, in accordance with municipal standards.)*

- Four residents expressed concerns about potential increases in crime rates.

*(The proposed single family dwellings will allow for greater community surveillance by allowing for active rooms and/or active space within the front/rear yard setback area which promote "eyes-on-the-street".)*

#### PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING (MARCH 8, 2016)

- A public information meeting was held on March 8, 2016 in order to obtain input from adjacent residents with regard to the proposed single family development. The applicant estimates that seventy (70) residents attended the meeting and forty-two (42) residents provided feedback in the form of comment sheets. In addition to the concerns previously expressed in response to pre-notification letters and the Development Proposal Sign (see section above), residents who attended the meeting provided the following comments:

##### Support (23 Residents)

- The development will provide sidewalks and street lights which increase safety;
- Smaller lots increase the overall density and contribute to a sense of community;
- The development will increase property values in the surrounding neighbourhood;
- The development provides more housing choice for younger families; and
- The development encourages greater affordability by providing more housing options.

##### Opposition (14 Residents)

- The applicant proposes a higher density than permitted in the approved OCP/NCP;
- The proposed higher density does not reflect the character of the neighbourhood;
- The proposal could result in removal of cul-de-sacs and traffic calming measures;
- The proposal will increase vehicle traffic, create on-street parking issues, allow cars to short-cut through residential areas and creates public safety concerns;
- The proposal will negatively impact quality of life and neighbourhood character;
- Additional single family properties will increase overall noise levels;
- The proposal will result in secondary suites and/or rental suites;
- The proposal further contributes to overcrowding in local schools;
- The proposal removes additional green space and contributes to loss of wildlife habitat;
- The proposal will remove existing trees on site; and
- The proposal will contribute to higher crime rates.

Additional comments that were received included concerns about higher taxes, increased property values, quality of life and the loss of a quiet neighbourhood.

##### Neutral with Concerns (5 Residents)

- Increased vehicle traffic and congestion resulting from school pick-up/drop-off;

- The proposed higher density will result in additional pressure on the intersection at 32 Avenue and 152 Street;
- The proposal should retain existing cul-de-sacs;
- The proposal should include traffic calming measures;
- The proposal will result in increased pressure on existing municipal infrastructure;
- The proposal should maximize tree preservation;
- The proposal further contributes to overcrowding in local schools;

*(The comments that were received from the Public Information Meeting are consistent with the previous comments that were provided by adjacent property owners in response to pre-notification. Refer to the previous section for staff responses to these comments.)*

### PUBLIC CONSULTATION PROCESS FOR OCP AMENDMENT

Pursuant to Section 879 of the Local Government Act, it was determined that it was not necessary to consult with any persons, organizations or authorities with respect to the proposed OCP amendment, other than those contacted as part of the pre-notification process.

### SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT CHECKLIST

The applicant prepared and submitted a sustainable development checklist for the subject site on September 22, 2016. The table below summarizes the applicable development features of the proposal based on the seven (7) criteria listed in the Surrey Sustainable Development Checklist.

| <b>Sustainability Criteria</b>                 | <b>Sustainable Development Features Summary</b>   |
|--|---|
| 1. Site Context & Location<br>(A1-A2)          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The subject property is located within the Rosemary Heights Central Neighbourhood Concept Plan (NCP).</li> </ul>   |
| 2. Density & Diversity<br>(B1-B7)              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The future single family dwellings may include secondary suites which provide for greater housing choice within the Rosemary Heights Central NCP.</li> <li>• The backyards are available for private gardens or green space.</li> </ul>  |
| 3. Ecology & Stewardship<br>(C1-C4)            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal includes low-impact development standards (LIDS) in the form of perforated pipe systems.</li> <li>• The applicant is proposing to retain three shared trees and retain or relocate several existing undersized trees on-site.</li> <li>• The proposed dwellings have access to recycling and organic waste disposal.</li> </ul> |
| 4. Sustainable Transport & Mobility<br>(D1-D2) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>   |
| 5. Accessibility & Safety<br>(E1-E3)           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community surveillance is promoted through single family dwellings that provide more active space in the front yard and "eyes-on-the-street".</li> </ul>   |
| 6. Green Certification<br>(F1)                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>   |

| Sustainability Criteria          | Sustainable Development Features Summary  |
|----------------------------------|---|
| 7. Education & Awareness (G1-G4) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The applicant conducted a Public Information Meeting on March 8, 2016 in order to engage adjacent property owners and community stakeholders in the planning process.</li> </ul> |

INFORMATION ATTACHED TO THIS REPORT

The following information is attached to this Report:

|                |   |
|----------------|---|
| Appendix I.    | Lot Owners, Action Summary and Project Data Sheets          |
| Appendix II.   | Proposed Subdivision Layout                                 |
| Appendix III.  | Engineering Summary   |
| Appendix IV.   | School District Comments                                    |
| Appendix V.    | Summary of Tree Survey and Tree Preservation                |
| Appendix VI.   | OCP Re-designation Map                                      |
| Appendix VII.  | NCP Re-designation Map                                      |
| Appendix VIII. | Map of In-stream Development Applications in the Local Area |
| Appendix IX.   | Proposed CD By-law  |

*original signed by Ron Hintsche*

Jean Lamontagne  
General Manager  
Planning and Development

MRJ/dk




## SUBDIVISION DATA SHEET

Proposed Zoning: CD (based on RF)

| Requires Project Data                              | Proposed                   |
|--|----------------------------|
| <b>GROSS SITE AREA</b>                             |                            |
| Acres  | 0.63 ac.                   |
| Hectares   | 0.255 ha.                  |
| <b>NUMBER OF LOTS</b>                              |                            |
| Existing   | 1                          |
| Proposed   | 3                          |
| <b>SIZE OF LOTS</b>                                |                            |
| Range of lot widths (metres)                       | 20 metres to 25.4 metres   |
| Range of lot areas (square metres)                 | 763 sq. m. to 1,013 sq. m. |
| <b>DENSITY</b>                                     |                            |
| Lots/Hectare & Lots/Acre (Gross)                   | N/A                        |
| Lots/Hectare & Lots/Acre (Net)                     | 4.76 u.p.a./11.76 u.p.ha.  |
| <b>SITE COVERAGE (in % of gross site area)</b>     |                            |
| Maximum Coverage of Principal & Accessory Building | 34%                        |
| Estimated Road, Lane & Driveway Coverage           | N/A                        |
| Total Site Coverage                                | N/A                        |
| <b>PARKLAND</b>                                    |                            |
| Area (square metres)                               | N/A                        |
| % of Gross Site                                    | N/A                        |
| <b>Required</b>                                    |                            |
| <b>PARKLAND</b>                                    |                            |
| 5% money in lieu                                   | NO                         |
| <b>TREE SURVEY/ASSESSMENT</b>                      |                            |
|  | YES                        |
| <b>MODEL BUILDING SCHEME</b>                       |                            |
|  | YES                        |
| <b>HERITAGE SITE Retention</b>                     |                            |
|  | NO                         |
| <b>FRASER HEALTH Approval</b>                      |                            |
|  | NO                         |
| <b>DEV. VARIANCE PERMIT required</b>               |                            |
| Road Length/Standards                              | NO                         |
| Works and Services                                 | NO                         |
| Building Retention                                 | NO                         |
| Others   | NO                         |



36 AVE



**Hub Engineering Inc.**  
Engineering and Development Consultants



Suite 212, 12992 - 76 Avenue, Surrey, B.C. V3W 2V6  
tel: 604-572-4328 | fax: 604-501-1625 | mail@hub-inc.com | www.hub-inc.com

|  |                |                                  |              |
|--|----------------|----------------------------------|--------------|
| CLIENT:  |                | PROJECT: 3624 156 STREET, SURREY |              |
| DRAWING TITLE: RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION   |                |                                  |              |
| PROJECT No. 15087  | DATE: JUN 2015 | LEGAL:                           | SCALE: 1:500 |
|  |                | MUNICIPAL PROJECT No: 16-0005-00 |              |
| PRELIMINARY PLAN - SUBJECT TO APPROVAL(S) FROM FEDERAL, PROVINCIAL AND LOCAL AUTHORITIES |                |                                  |              |

G:\Projects\15087\15087.dwg - Op. 3 - Jun 2017.dwg [Lot Portrait 11x17] 1/06/2017 1:53PM

---

TO: **Manager, Area Planning & Development  
- South Surrey Division  
Planning and Development Department**

FROM: **Development Services Manager, Engineering Department**

DATE: **January 11, 2017** PROJECT FILE: **7816-0005-00**

---

RE: **Engineering Requirements  
Location: 3624 - 156 Street**

**REZONE/SUBDIVISION**

***Property and Right-of-Way Requirements***

- dedicate 3.0m x 3.0m corner cut at the intersection of 156 Street and 36 Avenue.
- provide 0.5 metre ROWs fronting 156 Street and 36 Avenue.

***Works and Services***

- construct the north side of 36 Avenue to a local standard road complete with 8.5 metre pavement asphalt and 1.5 m sidewalk.
- construct the east half of 156 Street to a local standard road complete with 8.5 metre pavement asphalt and 1.5 m sidewalk.
- provide service connections.

A Servicing Agreement is required prior to Rezone/Subdivision.

**OCP AMENDMENT/NCP AMENDMENT**

The following issue is to be addressed as a condition of the OCP Amendment/NCP Amendment:

The change to RF for this area of the NCP will result in a significant increase in runoff from the RH land use that is approved. A stormwater management plan must be completed to the satisfaction of Surrey Drainage Engineering to assess the 5 year post development flows (minor system) and 100 year post development flows (major system) within the catchment. SWCP is required to confirm downstream capacity to the nearest trunk storm sewer (>20 ha catchment area).



Rémi Dubé, P.Eng.  
Development Services Manager

LR<sub>1</sub>



Thursday, December 22, 2016  
Planning

## THE IMPACT ON SCHOOLS

APPLICATION #: 16 0005 0

### SUMMARY

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

#### Projected # of students for this development:

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

#### September 2016 Enrolment/School Capacity

| Rosemary Heights Elementary |             |
|-----------------------------|-------------|
| Enrolment (K/1-7):          | 50 K + 496  |
| Capacity (K/1-7):           | 160 K + 350 |
| Earl Marriott Secondary     |             |
| Enrolment (8-12):           | 1856        |
| Nominal Capacity (8-12):    | 1500        |
| Functional Capacity*(8-12): | 1620        |

### 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.


Rosemary Heights opened in September 2008, relieving overcrowding at Morgan Elementary. The school reached capacity in 2010 and there are four modular classrooms on-site. The school district recently completed 2 classroom addition to Rosemary and 4 classrooms at Morgan. Enrolment growth recently started to taper in this catchment however, with the infill occurring to the east and south of the school site and the potential for other large development applications in the catchment, enrolment pressures will grow in the coming years and may require additional capital investments. The District has purchased land for a new secondary school in the Grandview area, adjoining the City's aquatic centre property, and capital project approval has been granted for the construction of a new 1,500 student secondary school on this site (likely opening 2020).

Surrey is a rapidly growing urban centre and as NCPs build out and densities increase the school district is concerned that capital investment approvals will not be available in a timely manner to support this local growth. Approved NCP densities are the basis on which school sites and capital projects are requested and higher than projected densities create a capital planning challenge and increase enrolment pressures. As required, the school district will continue to work with the City and Province to adjust our capital plans to request additional school spaces and land to meet local demands.

#### Rosemary Heights Elementary



#### Earl Marriott Secondary



\*Functional Capacity at secondary schools is based on space utilization estimate of 27 students per instructional space. The number of instructional spaces is estimated by dividing nominal facility capacity (Ministry capacity) by 25.

## Tree Preservation Summary

**Surrey Project No:**

**Address:** 3624 156th Avenue, Surrey BC

**Registered Arborist:** Glenn Murray

| On-Site Trees   | Number of Trees |
|---|-----------------|
| <b>Protected Trees Identified</b><br>(on-site and shared trees, including trees within boulevards and proposed streets and lanes, but excluding trees in proposed open space or riparian areas)   | <b>35</b>       |
| <b>Protected Trees to be Removed</b>  | <b>32</b>       |
| <b>Protected Trees to be Retained</b><br>(excluding trees within proposed open space or riparian areas)   | <b>3</b>        |
| <b>Total Replacement Trees Required:</b><br><br>- Alder & Cottonwood Trees Requiring 1 to 1 Replacement Ratio<br>$\underline{\quad 0 \quad} \times \text{one (1)} = 0$<br><br>- All other Trees Requiring 2 to 1 Replacement Ratio<br>$\underline{\quad 32 \quad} \times \text{two (2)} = 64$ | <b>64</b>       |
| <b>Replacement Trees Proposed</b>   | <b>12</b>       |
| <b>Replacement Trees in Deficit</b>   | <b>52</b>       |
| <b>Protected Trees to be Retained in Proposed [Open Space / Riparian Areas]</b>   |                 |

| Off-Site Trees  | Number of Trees |
|---|-----------------|
| <b>Protected Off-Site Trees to be Removed</b>   | <b>0</b>        |
| <b>Total Replacement Trees Required:</b><br><br>- Alder & Cottonwood Trees Requiring 1 to 1 Replacement Ratio<br>$\underline{\quad 0 \quad} \times \text{one (1)} = 0$<br><br>- All other Trees Requiring 2 to 1 Replacement Ratio<br>$\underline{\quad 0 \quad} \times \text{two (2)} = 0$ | <b>0</b>        |
| <b>Replacement Trees Proposed</b>   | <b>0</b>        |
| <b>Replacement Trees in Deficit</b>   | <b>0</b>        |


Summary, report and plan prepared and submitted by:



\_\_\_\_\_  
(Signature of Arborist)


3-Aug-16

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date



OCP Amendment 7916-0005-00  
Proposed amendment from Suburban to Urban






NCP Amendment from Suburban 1/2 Acre Residential to Transitional Single Family Residential (5 up max)


- Suburban 1 Acre Residential
- Suburban 1/2 Acre Residential
- Single Family Residential
- Compact Single Family Residential
- Clustering at Single Family Density
- Compact Single Family/Cluster
- Single Family Small Lot
- Townhouses
- Garden Apartments (3-Storeys)
- Neighbourhood Commercial
- Institutional (Religious, College, Library, Fire Hall, etc.)
- Institutional Residential
- Buffer/Park / Open Space
- Elementary School
- Pond
- Golf Course

**ROSEMARY HEIGHTS CENTRAL LAND USE PLAN**  
CITY OF SURREY - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Approved by Council: May 6, 1999 Amended 15 Oct. 2013



This map is provided as general reference only. The City of Surrey makes no warranties, express or implied, as to the fitness of the information for any purpose, or to the results obtained by individuals using the information and is not responsible for any action taken in reliance on the information contained herein.



**File No. 7914-0338-00**  
 OCP Amendment to "Urban", NCP Amendment to "Transitional Single Family Residential (5 u.p.a. max.)", rezoning to CD (based on RF) and subdivision into 4 single family lots

**File No. 7915-0085-00**  
 OCP Amendment to "Urban", NCP Amendment to "Transitional Single Family Residential (5 u.p.a. max.)", rezoning to CD (based on RF) and subdivision into 8 single family lots

**File No. 7916-0005-00**  
 OCP Amendment to "Urban", NCP Amendment to "Transitional Single Family Residential (5 u.p.a. max.)", rezoning to RH and CD (based on RF) and subdivision into 4 single family lots


**File No. 7915-0002-00**  
 OCP Amendment to "Urban", NCP Amendment to "Transitional Single Family Residential (5 u.p.a. max.)", rezoning to CD (based on RF) and subdivision into 3 single family lots

**File No. 7915-0129-00**  
 OCP Amendment to "Urban", NCP Amendment to "Transitional Single Family Residential (5 u.p.a. max.)", rezoning to CD (based on RF) and subdivision into 4 single family lots

Map of In-Stream Development Applications in the Local Area

Scale: 1:3,750

The data provided is compiled from various sources and is NOT warranted as to its accuracy or sufficiency by the City of Surrey. This information is provided for information and convenience purposes only. Lot sizes, legal descriptions and encumbrances must be confirmed at the Land Title Office. Use and distribution of this map is subject to all copyright and disclaimer notices at cosmos.surrey.ca



CITY OF SURREY

BYLAW NO. \_\_\_\_\_

A by-law to amend Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000, as amended  
.....

THE CITY COUNCIL of the City of Surrey ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

- 1. Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000, as amended, is hereby further amended, pursuant to the provisions of Section 479 of the Local Government Act, R.S.B.C. 2015 c. 1, as amended by changing the classification of the following parcels of land, presently shown upon the maps designated as the Zoning Maps and marked as Schedule "A" of Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000, as amended as follows:

FROM: HALF-ACRE RESIDENTIAL ZONE (RH)

TO: COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT ZONE (CD)

Parcel Identifier: 024-533-980  
Lot 67 Section 26 Township 1 New Westminster District Plan LMP42210

3624 - 156 Street

(hereinafter referred to as the "*Lands*")

- 2. The following regulations shall apply to the *Lands*:

**A. Intent**

This Comprehensive Development Zone is intended to accommodate and regulate the development of *single family dwellings* on large *urban lots*.

**B. Permitted Uses**

The *Lands* and *structures* shall be used for the following uses only, or for a combination of such uses:

- 1. One *single family dwelling* which may contain 1 *secondary suite*.
- 2. *Accessory uses* including the following:
  - (a) *Bed and breakfast* use in accordance with Section B.2 of Part 4 General Provisions, of Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000, as amended; and

- (b) The keeping of *boarders* or *lodgers* in accordance with Section B.2 of Part 4 General Provisions, of Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000, as amended.

**C. Lot Area**

Not applicable to this Zone.

**D. Density**

1. For the purpose of subdivision, the maximum *unit density* shall be 2.5 *dwelling units* per hectare [1 u.p.a.]. The maximum *unit density* may be increased to 11.76 *dwelling units* per hectare [4.76 u.p.a.] if amenities are provided in accordance with Schedule G of Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000, as amended.
2. For *building* construction within a lot:
  - (a) The *floor area ratio* shall not exceed 0.51 provided that of the resulting allowable floor area, 39 square metres [420 sq. ft.] shall be reserved for use only as a garage or carport;
  - (b) The maximum permitted floor area of a second storey for a *principal building* shall not exceed 80% of the floor area of the first storey including attached garage and that portion of any porch or veranda at the front that is covered by a sloped roof, but not including any portion of the *structure* located within 7.5 metres [25 ft.] of the *front lot line*. The reduced floor area of the second storey shall be accomplished by an offset at the second storey level from the wall at the main floor level from either the front or side walls at the main floor level or a combination thereof; and
  - (c) For the purpose of this Section and notwithstanding the definition of *floor area ratio* in Part 1 Definitions of Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000, as amended, the following must be included in the calculation of *floor area ratio*:
    - i. Covered area used for parking unless the parking is located within the *basement*;
    - ii. The area of an *accessory building* in excess of 10 square metres [108 sq. ft.];
    - iii. Covered outdoor space with a height of 1.8 metres [6 ft.] or greater, except for a maximum of 10% of the maximum allowable floor area of which 15 square metres [160 sq. ft.] must be reserved for a front porch or veranda; and

- iv. Floor area with extended height including staircases, garages and covered parking, must be multiplied by 2, where the extended height exceeds 3.7 metres [12 ft.], except for a maximum of 19 square metres [200 sq. ft.] on the *lot*.

**E. Lot Coverage**

The *lot coverage* shall not exceed 34%.

**F. Yards and Setbacks**

*Buildings* and *structures* shall be sited in accordance with the following minimum *setbacks*:

| <b>Use</b>  | <b>Setback</b> | <i>Front Yard</i> <sup>1,2</sup> | <i>Rear Yard</i> <sup>3</sup> | <i>Side Yard</i>  | <i>Side Yard on Flanking Street</i> <sup>4</sup> |
|---|----------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| <i>Principal Building</i>   |                | 7.5 m.<br>[25 ft.]               | 7.5 m.<br>[25 ft.]            | 2.4 m.<br>[8 ft.] | 4.8 m.<br>[16 ft.]                               |
| <i>Accessory Buildings and Structures Greater Than 10 square metres [108 sq. ft.] in Size</i> |                | 18 m.<br>[60 ft.]                | 1.8 m.<br>[6 ft.]             | 1.0 m.<br>[3 ft.] | 7.5 m.<br>[25 ft.]                               |
| <i>Other Accessory Buildings and Structures</i>   |                | 18.0 m.<br>[60 ft.]              | 0.0 m.                        | 0.0 m.            | 7.5 m.<br>[25 ft.]                               |

Measurements to be determined as per Part 1 Definitions of Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000, as amended.

<sup>1</sup> Except for a garage, the *front yard setback* may be relaxed at the lower floor level to 5.5 metres [18 ft.] for a maximum of 50% of the width of the *principal building*. If a minimum of 50% of the width of the *principal building* is set back 9 metres [30 ft.], the setback to an attached garage may be relaxed to 6.7 metres [22 ft.].

<sup>2</sup> With the exception of a garage with its main access doors facing a *side yard*, an attached garage to the *principal building* must not extend towards the *highway* for more than half the depth of the said garage, measured from the front face of the *principal building*, excluding any front face of the exterior wall above the said garage. If an attached garage with its main access doors facing a *highway* contains more than 2 parallel parking bays, the additional parking bay(s) and the garage entrance leading to the additional parking bay(s) must be set back at least 0.9 metre [3 ft.] from the front of the said garage.

<sup>3</sup> 50% of the length of the rear *building* face may be *setback* a distance of 6.0 metres [20 ft.] from the *rear lot line* provided the remainder of the *building* face is *setback* at least 8.5 metres [28 ft.] from the *rear lot line*.

- <sup>4</sup> The *side yard setback* on a *flanking street* measured to the face of an attached garage or carport must be a minimum of 6.0 metres [20 ft.].

## G. Height of Buildings

Measurements to be determined as per Part 1 Definitions of Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000, as amended.

1. Principal building:
  - (a) The *building height* shall not exceed 9 metres [30 ft.]; and
  - (b) The *building height* of any portion of a *principal building* with a roof slope of less than 1:4 shall not exceed 7.3 metres [24 ft.].
2. Accessory buildings and structures: The *building height* shall not exceed 4 metres [13 ft.] except that where the roof slope and construction materials of an *accessory building* are the same as that of the *principal building*, the *building height* of the *accessory building* may be increased to 5 metres [16.5 ft.]

## H. Off-Street Parking

1. Resident and visitor *parking spaces* shall be provided in accordance with Part 5 Off-Street Parking and Loading/Unloading of Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000, as amended.
2. Outside parking or storage of *campers*, boats and *vehicles* including cars, trucks and *house trailers* ancillary to a residential use shall be limited as follows:
  - (a) A maximum of 3 cars or trucks, which may be increased to a maximum of 4 cars or trucks on *lots* where the front face of an attached garage is set back a minimum of 11.0 metres [36 ft.] from the *front lot line*;
  - (b) *House trailer, camper* or boat, provided that the combined total shall not exceed 1; and
  - (c) The total amount permitted under (a) and (b) shall not exceed 3, which may be increased to 4 where the front face of an attached garage is set back a minimum of 11.0 metres [36 ft.] from the *front lot line*.

3. *Vehicle* parking may be permitted in either the *front yard* or *side yard* subject to the following:
  - (a) No off-street *parking space* shall be permitted within the required *front yard* or *side yard setback* except on a *driveway*. *Driveways* may be constructed off either the *frontage* or *flanking street*;
  - (b) *Parking spaces* shall be located only on a *driveway* leading to a garage, carport or parking pad, in a garage, in a carport, or on a parking pad; and
  - (c) The total area surfaced or paved for a *driveway* shall be as follows:
    - i. Every *lot* may have one *driveway* with a uniform maximum width of 8.0 metres [26 ft.] extending from the *lot line* to the garage, carport, or parking pad on the *lot*;
    - ii. Notwithstanding Sub-section H.3.(c)i. additional *driveway* width may also be allowed to provide access to additional *parking spaces* in a garage, carport or parking pad, where the garage, carport or parking pad has more than 2 side by side *parking spaces*, provided that such width is no more than 3 metres [10 ft.] times the number of adjacent side by side *parking spaces* measured at the required *front yard setback* and is uniformly tapered over the required *front yard* to a width of 8 m [26 ft.] at the *front lot line*;
    - iii. Notwithstanding Sub-sections H.3.(c)i. and ii. the *driveway* width may be expanded provided that the total area of the *driveway* shall not exceed 53% of the total area of the *front yard* or required *side yard* within which the *driveway* is located; and
    - iv. Where the *driveway* is constructed in a *side yard* off a *flanking street* all references to *front yard* within this Section shall be read as *side yard*.
4. No outside parking or storage of a *house trailer* or boat is permitted within the *front yard setback*, or within the required *side yards* adjacent the *principal building*, or within 1 metre [3 ft.] of the *side lot line*, except as follows:
  - (a) On *lots* which have no vehicular access to the *rear yard* or where access is not feasible through modification of *landscaping* or fencing or both, either 1 *house trailer* or 1 boat may be parked in the front *driveway* or to the side of the front *driveway* or in the *side yard*, but no closer than 1 metre [3 ft.] to a *side lot line* nor within 1 metre [3 ft.] of the *front lot line* subject to the residential parking requirements stated in Part 5 Off-Street Parking and Loading/Unloading of Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000, as amended;

- (b) Notwithstanding Sub-section H.4(a), no outside parking or storage of a *house trailer* or boat is permitted on *corner lots* in an area bounded by the intersecting *lot lines* at a street corner and a straight line joining points 9 metres [30 ft.] along the said *lot lines* from the point of intersection of the two *lot lines*; and
- (c) Adequate screening, as described in Section I.2 of this Zone is provided.

## I. Landscaping

- 1. All developed portions of the *lot* not covered by *buildings, structures* or paved areas shall be landscaped including the retention of mature trees. This *landscaping* shall be maintained.
- 2. A minimum of 30% of the *lot* must be covered by porous surfaces.
- 3. The parking or storage of *house trailers* or boats shall be adequately screened by compact evergreen trees or shrubs at least 1.8 metres [6 ft.] in height and located between the said *house trailer* or boat and any point on the *lot line* within 7.5 metres [25 ft.] of the said *house trailer* or boat, in order to obscure the view from the abutting *lot* or street, except:
  - (a) On a *corner lot*, this required landscape screening shall not be located in an area bounded by the intersecting *lot lines* at a street corner and a straight line joining points 9 metres [30 ft.] along the said *lot lines* from the point of intersection of the 2 *lot lines*;
  - (b) Where the *driveway* or the parking area is used for parking or storage of a *house trailer* or boat, the landscape screen is not required within the said *driveway*; and
  - (c) In the case of *rear yards*, this screening requirement may be provided by a 1.8 metre [6 ft.] high solid fence.

## J. Special Regulations

- 1. Basement access and basement wells are permitted only between the *principal building* and the *rear lot line* and must not exceed a maximum area of 28 square metres [300 sq. ft.], including the stairs.
- 2. A *secondary suite* shall:
  - (a) Not exceed 90 square metres [968 sq. ft.] in floor area; and
  - (b) Occupy less than 40% of the habitable floor area of the *building*.

**K. Subdivision**

*Lots* created through subdivision in this Zone shall conform to the following minimum standards:

| <i>Lot Size</i>               | <i>Lot Width</i>      | <i>Lot Depth</i>      |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 760 metres<br>[8,180 sq. ft.] | 20 metres<br>[66 ft.] | 30 metres<br>[98 ft.] |

Dimensions shall be measured in accordance with Section E.21 of Part 4 General Provisions of Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000, as amended.

**L. Other Regulations**

In addition to all statutes, bylaws, orders, regulations or agreements, the following are applicable, however, in the event that there is a conflict with the provisions in this Comprehensive Development Zone and other provisions in Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000, as amended, the provisions in this Comprehensive Development Zone shall take precedence:

1. Definitions are as set out in Part 1 Definitions of Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000, as amended.
2. Prior to any use, the *Lands* must be serviced as set out in Part 2 Uses Limited, of Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000, as amended and in accordance with the servicing requirements for the RF Zone as set forth in the Surrey Subdivision and Development By-law, 1986, No. 8830, as amended.
3. General provisions are as set out in Part 4 General Provisions of Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000, as amended.
4. Additional off-street parking requirements are as set out in Part 5 Off-Street Parking and Loading/Unloading of Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000, as amended.
5. Sign regulations are as set out in Surrey Sign By-law, 1999, No. 13656, as amended.
6. Special *building setbacks* are as set out in Part 7 Special Building Setbacks, of Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000, as amended.
7. *Building* permits shall be subject to the Surrey Building Bylaw, 2012, No. 17850, as amended.
8. Subdivisions shall be subject to the applicable Surrey Development Cost Charge Bylaw, 2014, No. 18148, as may be amended or replaced from time to time, and the development cost charges shall be based on the RF Zone.

- 9. Tree regulations are set out in Surrey Tree Protection Bylaw, 2006, No. 16100, as amended.
- 10. Provincial licensing of *child care centres* is regulated by the Community Care and Assisted Living Act S.B.C. 2002, c. 75, as amended, and the Regulations pursuant thereto including without limitation B.C. Reg 319/89/213.

3. This By-law shall be cited for all purposes as "Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000, Amendment By-law, \_\_\_\_\_, No. \_\_\_\_\_."

PASSED FIRST READING on the \_\_\_\_\_ th day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_ .

PASSED SECOND READING on the \_\_\_\_\_ th day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_ .

PUBLIC HEARING HELD thereon on the \_\_\_\_\_ th day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_ .

PASSED THIRD READING on the \_\_\_\_\_ th day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_ .

RECONSIDERED AND FINALLY ADOPTED, signed by the Mayor and Clerk, and sealed with the Corporate Seal on the \_\_\_\_\_ th day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_ .

\_\_\_\_\_ MAYOR

\_\_\_\_\_ CLERK