



Corporate Report

NO: C010

COUNCIL DATE: October 27/03

COUNCIL-IN-COMMITTEE

TO: Mayor & Council DATE: October 22,
2003

FROM: General Manager,
Planning & Development FILE: 6520-20
General Manager, (Highway 99
Engineering Corridor)

SUBJECT: Highway 99 Corridor Plan – Summary Report on
Additional Public Consultation and Recommended
Next Steps

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning and Development recommends that Council:

1. Receive this report as information; and
2. Authorize staff to proceed to public open houses in November to present the modified land use concept plan for the Highway 99 Corridor (Appendix "A"), incorporating the recommendations contained within this report, as follows:
 - (a) Amend the plan to incorporate the recommendations of the proposed habitat management strategy, described in this report, by focussing land retention and compensation for environmental purposes in and around Fergus Creek and the southern portion of the study area, south of 16 Avenue;
 - (b) Develop a strategy to implement the habitat management strategy, including a compensation strategy to provide for the elimination of yellow-coded creeks, north of 16 Avenue, in exchange for focussing environmental preservation in and around Fergus Creek, south of 16 Avenue and the possible acquisition of land, by the City, as part of the overall parks and open space needs for the larger Grandview Heights area;
 - (c) Amend the plan to reflect a minor expansion of the 24 Avenue commercial node;
 - (d) Amend the plan to reflect minor adjustments to the boundaries of the proposed Business Park/Light Impact Industrial and Commercial designations at the 16 Avenue commercial node;
 - (e) Amend the plan to delete the 16 Avenue crossing as an optional location for a new highway interchange on Highway 99;

- (f) Develop additional design guidelines to integrate sustainable development principles and to achieve high quality urban design, architecture and landscaping for development within the Corridor;
 - (g) Finalize funding mechanisms for the proposed 24 Avenue/Highway 99 interchange; and
 - (h) Finalize the servicing plan and financing strategy based on the development pay principle.
3. Direct staff to forward, for Council's consideration, a final land use plan and servicing plan and financing strategy for the Highway 99 Corridor, subsequent to the public open houses.

INTENT

The purpose of this report is to provide Council with a summary of the results of the additional public consultation undertaken since the last report to Council on the status of the preparation of a land use plan for the Highway 99 Corridor (the "Corridor"), the adjustments to the plan and related strategies that have been developed to address concerns that have been identified through this process and to obtain Council approval to proceed to open houses with a final draft land use plan for the Corridor lands.

BACKGROUND

At its Regular Land Use meeting on June 9, 2003, Council considered Corporate Report No. L007 entitled "Grandview Heights/Highway 99 Corridor Status Report" (Appendix "B") and approved the recommendations of the report, that included authorization for staff to undertake additional public consultation. The intent of the consultation was to address issues and concerns that had been brought to staff's attention with the Preferred Land Use Option Plan and related development policies that were presented at an April 23, 2003 open house (Appendix "C"). The Corporate Report recommended that a series of meetings be arranged with various stakeholders/community groups to exchange information and seek input on alternative solutions to attempt to address specific concerns of each of these stakeholders/community groups. The report also recommended that a community workshop be held after the meetings with each of the individual groups. The workshop was to be chaired by an experienced facilitator.

Staff has now completed the consultation process, as generally described in the previous paragraph, the results of which are summarized in the remainder of this report. This report also includes recommended courses of action to address most of the issues identified through this public consultation process.

DISCUSSION

A. Stakeholder Group Meetings

A meeting was held with each of six different stakeholder groups in late August and September. A list of the groups, the geographic location of the lands represented by each of the groups and the minutes of each of the individual group meetings are attached as Appendices "D", "E" and "F", respectively. The interests of these various stakeholder groups are outlined in the following sections of this report.

(1) 24 Avenue Developer Group

This group is comprised of a number of developers who have optioned land within and around the 24 Avenue commercial node (Appendix "E") in the Preferred Land Use Option Plan which was presented at the April 24 Open House. The main issues of this group are as follows:

(a) *Land Use*

The commercial developer component of the group would like to see an expansion of the proposed commercial node to approximately 94 acres from the currently proposed 70 acre area, to accommodate up to four potential large anchor tenants. They argue that the commercially designated lands are significantly constrained by the B.C. Hydro easement running diagonally across these lands and that, while the easement area can be used for parking, a larger area outside the easement area needs to be designated for commercial purposes. They argue that shifting the commercial land use boundary will improve vehicular access to future developments by placing driveways in safer locations along the public roads.

The residential developer component of the group (i.e. Morgan Heights group) advised that they fully support the Corridor plan. They have optioned approximately 80 acres of land immediately to the east of the Corridor study area as illustrated in Appendix "E". This group would like Council support to undertake a planning process on the optioned lands and neighbouring properties to the south for future urban residential development, immediately upon completion of the Corridor plan. They advise that they have significant community support for the proposed planning process and that the development of these lands for urban residential development will provide an appropriate and effective land use transition and buffer between the commercial node to the west and the larger Grandview Heights community to the east. They advise that they are prepared to pay their fair share towards the required infrastructure needed to service the Corridor lands and that development cost charge revenues generated by their development will help to accelerate other planned development in the area.

(b) *Interchange Levy*

Council has previously endorsed an area levy to be collected from development on the Corridor lands as a means of equitably sharing the costs of constructing a new interchange on Highway 99. A levy of up to \$180,000 per acre, for lands within the proposed 24 Avenue commercial node (based on a construction cost of \$15 million for a new interchange at Highway 99 at 24 Avenue), was presented at the April 24, 2003 open house. While the commercial developer group has indicated that they are willing to pay their fair share towards any new interchange, they have expressed concerns over the significant cost of the proposed interchange and the associated levy and have suggested three ways to address these concerns as follows:

- (i) redistribute the levy between primary commercial and secondary land to more closely match the difference in land value;
- (ii) spread the cost of the interchange over a larger area to include all benefiting land owners;
and
- (iii) reduce the cost of the interchange by looking at alternative interchange designs.

(2) Fergus Creek Pocket Taxpayers

The Fergus Creek Pocket Taxpayers represents owners of property comprising approximately 44 acres of land located on the east side of 164 Street between 20 Avenue and 16 Avenue, from the east boundary of the B.C. Hydro right-of-way to 164 Street (Appendix "E"). This area is outside the Corridor Study area, but is at the same elevation as the Corridor lands to the west. The lands located to the east of the Fergus Creek pocket are at a higher elevation on top of a ridge. This group supports the Corridor plan, but would like to be included as part of the Corridor plan due to the natural topography of the area and the potential negative impacts on their lands that may be caused by the development on the Corridor lands. They argue that they will be impacted, with none of the benefits of development accruing to their properties if they are not included as part of the Corridor plan. They suggest that the Corridor plan area boundary can be logically extended to the east to include the lowlands of the "Pocket". They argue that the natural topographic break is a much more appropriate boundary than the arbitrary boundary provided by the B.C. Hydro right-of-way. With regard to land use, this group would like to see urban residential development on their lands. They argue that such a land use would provide an appropriate interface between the commercial-business park uses proposed for the Corridor and the suburban residential land uses at the top of the ridge to the east. This group also wants to have access to the utility services being extended to the Corridor lands.

(3) Grandview Heights Community Connection

While some members of this group reside in Grandview Heights, this group is not geographically based, but "issue-oriented". They consider themselves as stewards of the land. This group is not opposed to the business development focus of the Corridor plan, but want to ensure that development within the Corridor is environmentally sustainable and want to see "first class quality development".

The main concern of this group is that sensitive fish and wildlife habitat and significant natural areas within the Corridor, are protected in a sustainable manner. This group also has a concern about the potential for low quality development and urge that development not result in large, unattractive buildings, surrounded by even larger asphalt parking lots. In a similar vein, this group has serious concerns over the type of employment land uses that could occur within the Corridor and, in particular, the land uses which could occur within the proposed Business Park/Light Industrial designation. They would like to see a refinement of land uses allowed in these designations to avoid unsightly and polluting businesses and promote sustainable development principles and practices. They would also like LEEDS standards to apply to all development in the Corridor.

This group also urges that any new highway interchanges, highway and road upgrades, and access roads, be constructed prior to implementation of any new building projects.

(4) West Grandview Heights Residents' Association

This group represents approximately 117 properties within a triangle of land bounded by the B.C. Hydro right-of-way to the east, 28 Avenue to the north, 24 Avenue to the south and 164 Street to the east (Appendix "E"). This group unanimously supports the Corridor plan and urges that the plan be approved by Council as soon as possible, and that a Neighbourhood Concept Plan for the West Grandview Heights area be undertaken as the first phase of development for the larger Grandview Heights area. They argue that they have a "critical mass" of residents/property owners in support of an NCP for this area and that the planning and development of this area will help address the shortage of urban residential land in South Surrey. This group is working with the Morgan Heights developer

group to accelerate planning for this area.

(5) Grandview Heights Residents' Association

This group represents property owners within the larger Grandview Heights area located south of 32 Avenue to 16 Avenue and east of Highway 99 to 176 Street (Appendix "E").

This group supports Council's decision to develop an area structure plan (General Land Use Plan) for all of Grandview Heights and urges that this plan be completed before any development takes place east of the Corridor boundaries. In this regard, they have concerns over the expansion of the 24 Avenue commercial node, east of the Hydro right-of-way, as presented in the Preferred Land Use Option at the April 24, 2003 open house.

Secondly, this group does not support the possible truck route along 24 Avenue. They suggest that this community is already surrounded by truck routes which are far more suitable for truck traffic and that an overall traffic plan is needed to address concerns respecting Corridor traffic and truck route designations.

Thirdly, this group does not support an interchange at 24 Avenue and Highway 99, but if one is built it should be funded by development of lands within the Corridor. They will strongly object to any suggestion that a portion of the interchange be funded by Surrey taxpayers.

Fourthly, this group supports the vision contained within the Future Surrey Vision and would like to see development plans for the Corridor that respect and are responsive to the Surrey Future Vision. They noted that "big box" stores with large surface parking areas are not consistent with the Future Surrey Vision.

(6) Cranley Village Property Owners

This group represents property owners who reside in a newer subdivision on the west side of Highway 99 at 24 Avenue (Appendix "E"). This group's key concern is the proposed 24 Avenue/Highway 99 interchange and the impacts of such an interchange on their subdivision such as noise, dust, pollution, etc., as well as the impacts and inconveniences they may face during construction of the interchange. They suggest that their subdivision should never have been built if a major interchange was being contemplated. They question the need for a new interchange at this location, especially when the existing interchange at 32 Avenue is not fully completed. The possibility of 24 Avenue as a truck route which, would further increase noise and impacts in their subdivision, was also identified as a key concern.

This group strongly urges that the existing transportation infrastructure in this area be improved, particularly in light of the significant costs of a new interchange at this location.

B. Community Workshop

As a follow-up to stakeholder group meetings, the Planning and Development Department hosted a community workshop on October 7, 2003. An experienced professional facilitator was engaged to lead the workshop. The purpose of the workshop was to provide an opportunity for representatives of the groups participating in the stakeholder group process to share their thoughts and ideas with the other groups and to work towards developing consensus-based solutions on the various issues and concerns identified through the small group meetings. Following a brief presentation by staff on the planning process and the work completed, to date, on the plan, each of the of the participant stakeholder groups introduced themselves and outlined their views and comments about the proposed land use plan for the Corridor, generally reflecting the above-noted comments. Following these presentations, a facilitated discussion ensued on the various concerns identified by the stakeholder groups. The concerns and comments expressed through the presentation component of the workshop were grouped by the facilitator into three main issues – (1) Environment (2) Land Use, Planning and Urban Design and (3) Transportation and Traffic. Through the facilitated discussion, workshop participants were able to reach a reasonable level of consensus on various components of these main issues. The detailed proceedings of the workshop are attached as Appendix "G".

The issues and concerns raised by workshop participants and the outcomes of the facilitated discussion are summarized below.

1. Environmental Issues

A key concern shared by all the stakeholder groups is that future development within the Corridor should not negatively impact the significant habitat values (both fish and wildlife) and natural environmental features currently present within the Corridor area. Development should be undertaken in an environmentally sustainable manner that integrates and enhances the natural environmental values of the area. Also, the stormwater management strategy must be integrated with any environmental strategies, particularly with respect to base flows and water quality. There was general consensus amongst the workshop participants that the final land use plan for the Corridor should incorporate the recommendations of the habitat management strategy to focus preservation and enhancement efforts in and around Fergus Creek.

Staff Comments

Extensive environmental studies have been undertaken in preparing the plan for the Corridor. Watercourses have been ground-truthed for the presence of fish and/or containing fish nutrients. In accordance with Department of Fisheries and Oceans requirements, the Preferred Land Use Option plan, presented at the April 24, 2003 open house, proposed 30-metre riparian (i.e. waters' edge) setbacks from top of bank for all red and yellow-coded creeks. In response to concerns raised at the open house that the preferred land use option does not provide sufficient attention to the wildlife values in the study area and that new development needs to be better integrated with the environmental and natural heritage values of the area, a wildlife assessment study was undertaken to assess the wildlife potential of various habitat units within the Corridor. Envirowest Consulting was retained to assess the wildlife attributes of the study area. Based upon the findings of the fish and wildlife studies, a habitat management strategy has been developed for the Corridor.

The proposed habitat management strategy includes the following main components:

- (a) All red-coded watercourses shall be protected with a minimum 30 metre riparian setback area from top of bank;
- (b) Yellow-coded creeks, particularly those located north of 16 Avenue, are proposed to be either eliminated or retained with land retention and compensation focussed in and around Fergus Creek to the south of 16 Avenue. Yellow-coded creeks proposed for elimination must be compensated at a ratio of two to one in land or productivity, to enhance the Fergus Creek corridor south of 16 Avenue;
- (c) Protection and preservation of wildlife habitats shall maximize habitat diversity;
- (d) Linkages should be preserved to connect areas of high habitat values, both within and beyond the boundaries of the study area; and
- (e) High value fish habitat features of Fergus Creek are a key element of the wildlife management plan.

The proposed habitat management strategy is illustrated in Appendix "H". It is recommended that the final land use plan for the Corridor incorporate the proposed habitat management strategy and that Council authorize staff to study various measures to implement this strategy, including the development of a compensation plan and the acquisition of land by the City, as part of the overall open space requirements for the larger Grandview Heights community.

2. Land Use, Planning and Urban Design

The range of land uses envisioned for the Corridor and the quality of development within the Corridor are key concerns shared by all the workshop stakeholder groups. There is consensus amongst the groups that noisy and polluting, "low end" light industrial uses, with extensive outside storage areas, are inappropriate uses for the Corridor. Similarly, there is consensus that highway strip commercial development should not be permitted along the Corridor. Landscape buffers along the Highway 99 frontage of the Corridor; appropriate land use transitions between various land uses within and beyond the Corridor boundaries to the east; and high quality, visually attractive and environmentally sensitive development with a high quality of urban design are the main characteristics of new development strongly urged and expected by the stakeholders.

One major land use issue not fully resolved at the community workshop, is the size and scale of the proposed commercial node at 24 Avenue and Highway 99. While all workshop participants generally agree that conventional "big box" buildings surrounded by large asphalt parking lots is not the development model envisioned for this commercial node, there is disagreement over the boundaries of this commercial node. The initial land use options for the Corridor, presented at the open house held in March 2002, showed the easterly edge of the node at the Hydro right-of-way. This option is supported by one of the stakeholder groups. The Preferred Land Use Option, presented at the April, 2003 open house, showed a larger node extending to the east of the B.C. Hydro right-of-way. The majority of the stakeholder groups support this option. More recently, the commercial developer group has requested that the commercial node extend further to the north and east to encompass a larger area of land.

Planning for the lands along the east edge of the Corridor is another issue that was not fully resolved at the community workshop. Whereas a number of the stakeholder groups want to see a planning process initiated for lands immediately east of the Corridor simultaneously with, or immediately following, the completion of the plan for the Corridor, one group strongly urges that the area structure plan for the larger Grandview Heights area be completed prior to any detailed planning for individual neighbourhoods in this community.

Staff Comments

The Preferred Land Use Option presented at the April 24, 2003 open house includes a Business Park/Light Impact Industrial land use designation. The Business Park designation is intended to accommodate industrial business parks consisting of corporate office and service uses, warehouse and distribution uses that are comprehensively designed with extensive landscaping and open space and high quality urban design. A business park development may be a multi-building complex, or a freestanding building for a single tenant established in an attractive, clean and quiet corporate setting. The Light Impact Industrial designation is intended to accommodate clean, "high-end" light industrial uses, including office and service uses, wholesale, warehousing and light manufacturing uses that are completely contained within a building, with no outside storage. To address concerns over undesirable, "lower end" industrial uses, it is recommended that the final plan for the Corridor include policies and zoning that clearly articulate the type of "high-end" light impact industrial uses that may be considered within the Corridor plan area, including specific performance criteria.

With respect to concerns over the quality of future development within the Corridor, the plan includes design guidelines. Draft design guidelines were presented at the April 24, 2003 open house with the following design objectives:

- To ensure high quality development in the Corridor;
- To integrate urban design and environmental protection into the development process;
- To encourage comprehensively designed and well integrated business/commercial development;
- To provide appropriate landscaped interfaces and/or land use buffers between the Corridor uses and the residential area to the east; and
- To facilitate coordinated architectural expression among buildings, landscaping and site features within the Corridor.

The draft design guidelines, presented at the April 24, 2003 open house, are attached as Appendix "I" to this report. Additional guidelines will be included in the next draft of the guidelines to better achieve objectives to integrate urban design, environmental preservation and stormwater management; to ensure the development of a continuous landscape buffer ("green edge") along the Highway 99 frontage of the plan area; to include sustainable development principles in the planning and design of new development; to create developments which respect the natural topography of the area; to articulate buildings to disguise the large format nature of "big box" stores; and other guidelines to achieve high quality urban design, architecture and landscaping. Development permit applications will be evaluated against these design guidelines, as well as the general development permit guidelines already contained in the Official Community Plan.

With respect to the unresolved issues regarding the 24 Avenue commercial node, the size and scale of this node needs to strike an appropriate balance between the City's business development objectives and policies, market needs, the physical constraints and opportunities of the area such as the Hydro right-of-way and the concerns of the various community stakeholder groups. Fundamental to properly managing this node are elements related to design, traffic and transportation, buffers and other transitional elements. In particular, the boundaries of this commercial node need to be evaluated and established within the larger context of future land uses and planning of the lands, both within and on the easterly edge of the Corridor.

A Terms of Reference for the preparation of an area structure plan or general land use plan for the larger Grandview Heights is being presented to Council for its consideration. In anticipation of neighbourhood boundaries being established to identify feasible planning units for the preparation of individual Neighbourhood Concept Plans in the early stages of the area structure plan process, and in anticipation of an NCP with a range of urban residential land uses being prepared for the lands along the easterly edge of the Corridor in the near future, the Planning and Development Department recommends that a further minor expansion to the 24 Avenue commercial node be presented for community input and discussion at open houses later this Fall. The expanded 24 Avenue commercial node is illustrated in Appendix "A". The northeast quadrant of this commercial node is envisioned for neighbourhood-oriented commercial uses as opposed to large format retail uses. Neighbourhood commercial uses would not only serve the day to day needs of the future neighbourhood, but would also provide an appropriate land use transition to any future residential neighbourhood to the east. Policies will be included in the final plan for the Corridor, which clearly specifies the type of commercial uses, which could be permitted within this quadrant.

While not specifically discussed at the workshop, the consolidation of land for environmental preservation around Fergus Creek has resulted in a minor increase in the amount of developable land fronting 16 Avenue. This developable area provides an opportunity to increase the size of the designated Commercial area at this location (Appendix "A"). To offset the increase in the size of this commercial node and the decrease in the Business Park designation south of 16 Avenue, related to the consolidation of environmental preservation efforts around Fergus Creek, it is recommended that the lands designated Commercial/Business Park on the north side of 16 Avenue be modified to Business Park.

3. Transportation and Traffic

The main transportation and traffic issues in the Corridor are the proposed new Highway 99 interchange at 24 Avenue and the possibility of 24 Avenue becoming a designated truck route. In a round table discussion by the workshop stakeholder groups, an interchange was not supported at this location. Reasons cited were traffic, noise, pollution, visual and other impacts on the overall quality of life of residents and property owners close to such an interchange, as key concerns. Instead, the majority of the stakeholders indicated that the 152 Street interchange should be completed to make it a full interchange. With respect to 24 Avenue as truck route, there was consensus amongst the stakeholder groups that 24 Avenue should not be a truck route. The workshop participants indicated that a truck route should be on the edge of communities and not cut through communities. It was expressed that the truck route should be on 32 Avenue. Stakeholders cited the fact that 32 Avenue had been classified as a truck route prior to the development in that area and that most of the housing along 32 Avenue was developed with a buffer.

Discussion also took place on the possibility of a right-in/right-out access from Highway 99 at 20 Avenue to provide access to the commercial/industrial properties only.

Staff Comments

(a) Proposed 24 Avenue/Highway 99 Interchange Options

Traffic modelling undertaken for this Land Use Plan has identified the need for an additional interchange on Highway 99 at some point in time, as South Surrey continues to build out to urban densities even if the 152 Street interchange is in place. Without the 152 Street interchange, which is the second phase of the current 32 Avenue interchange, an interchange at 24 Avenue would be needed by 2006. There are a number of advantages to constructing the 24 Avenue interchange in the short term rather than waiting. The interchange would:

- Defer City expenditures for 4-laning of the 152 Street bridge over Highway 99 and the associated interchange expansion by approximately 10 years. Note: There is no further significant commercial development potential in the area of this second phase of the interchange to contribute towards it (other than basic development cost charges) in conjunction with development;
- Improve the economic viability and rate of absorption of the commercial and light industrial businesses planned for the Corridor;
- Improve freeway access for South Surrey generally;
- Given the ultimate need for the 24 Avenue interchange, committing to this now ensures that all benefiting development will cost share in its implementation. If the interchange is not constructed at this time, it would, when needed, have to be funded at a higher rate, by the remaining development, even though the first phase of development would benefit from the interchange without having paid.

In response to concerns raised through the recent stakeholder group and community workshop process, as well as concerns raised at previous open houses on the Corridor plan, the Engineering Department has evaluated additional options for the 24 Avenue interchange that reduce the community impacts, particularly, for the Cranley Village residents and also reduce the interchange cost.

Although the stakeholder groups indicated that they did not support an interchange at 24 Avenue, there is a need for the interchange, given the longer term development of South Surrey, and a number of advantages to constructing it, possibly in phases, in the short term.

The group most affected by the proposed interchange is the Cranley Village development, immediately west of Highway 99 and south of 24 Avenue. Their prime concerns are related to noise, light, safety and pollution impacts, particularly, from the southwest leg ramp of the interchange. If an interchange were to be constructed, they stressed that these impacts must be mitigated.

Given that 24 Avenue must be widened to 4 lanes to accommodate development east of Highway 99, there are five options to incrementally add to the bridge for interchange capability.

These options were developed based on community input, together with consideration of the potential funding through development (Options 1 and 2 are illustrated in Appendices J and K). All of the options include the cost to provide alternate access from the Cranley Village neighbourhood. For all options, there are methods to mitigate most of the concerns of the Cranley Village residents. Mitigation could include measures such as concrete fencing, as was used along sections of the Fraser Highway in Fleetwood.

1. A phased single point interchange (SPI).

This option has the highest cost at \$16.5 million, but provides the best mobility. Although phasing its construction increases the total cost, it would make it possible for the initial commercial developments to up-front the costs of the first phase of the interchange (\$9 million, based on a new Highway 99 overpass; southbound off-ramp to 24 Avenue; and westbound to northbound ramp to Highway 99) with the potential for the City to fund the critical eastbound to northbound movement (additional \$2.5 million). The south ramps of the interchange could be constructed at a future date, if/when needed.

2. Elimination of the westbound to southbound movements and utilizing a phased tight diamond interchange.

This reduces the overall costs of the interchange to \$13 million, but does eliminate the one turning movement. Although elimination of this movement would typically result in motorists driving up to an additional 5 kilometres along City roads, the demand for this movement would be relatively low and, thus, would only impact approximately 100 vehicles per hour in the PM peak (2021).

The initial commercial developments would be able to up-front the costs of the first phase of the interchange (\$8.5 million, based on a new Highway 99 overpass; southbound off-ramp to 24 Avenue; and westbound to northbound ramp to Highway 99) with the potential for the City to fund the critical eastbound to northbound movement (additional \$1.5 million). Similar to Option 1, the south ramps of the interchange could be constructed at a future date, if/when needed.

3. Elimination of the southwest leg (ramp) of the interchange, which provides for eastbound to southbound traffic movement.

This would reduce the impact to the Cranley Village residents and would reduce the interchange cost to \$11 million for a tight diamond or \$14.5 million for a Single Point Interchange. However, this increases the impact to the City road network by rerouting approximately 300 vehicles per hour in the PM peak (2021) destined south on Highway 99.

4. Elimination of the south leg ramps of the interchange, which eliminates all southbound movements.

This does not reduce the impact to the Cranley Village residents any further than Option 3, but does reduce the cost to \$9.5 million for a tight diamond or \$11.5 million for a Single Point Interchange. Impacts to the City's road network would be even higher, with approximately 500 vehicles per hour in the PM peak (2021) rerouted onto other roads.

5. **Elimination of the 24 Ave interchange in favour of right-on/right-off ramps to Hwy 99 from the commercial/light industrial spine road in the vicinity of 20 Avenue or 160 Street.**

This option would have the lowest cost at approximately \$9 million (including 4-laning of the 24 Ave overpass, which is necessary in any case and included in all other options) and the least impact to the Cranley Village residents. However, it does not adequately address the long-term freeway access needs of motorists generated by future development in the area and could lead to the utilization of 20 Avenue for access to the freeway and may overload the spine road (160 Street at this location). Increased usage of 20 Avenue was identified as a concern by residents during the April 24, 2003 open house and its use for freeway access would be inappropriate from a transportation engineering perspective.

Based on the results of the evaluation, Option 2 (i.e. the staged tight-diamond interchange) best balances the short term and long term freeway access needs of South Surrey with overall cost.

It should be noted that the Cranley Village neighbourhood is already very close to both Highway 99 and 24 Avenue and has access difficulties under current circumstances. By utilizing mitigative measures in conjunction with the initial phase of the interchange construction, and a new access to 156 Street, liveability of and accessibility for the Cranley Village neighbourhood may actually improve.

(b) Proposed 24 Avenue/Highway 99 Interchange Funding

Related to the ultimate design of an interchange at 24 Avenue, is the available mechanisms to fund the construction of such an interchange. While Council has previously endorsed an area levy to be collected from development on the Corridor lands, as a means to address equitably sharing the costs of the interchange, there is little community support for the levy as proposed.

By reducing the interchange cost and developing an alternative funding mechanism, it is believed that an acceptable solution is possible. The initial commercial developments may be able to up-front the costs of the first phase of the interchange. However, some form of levy/cost recovery mechanism would still be required. A precise formula to distribute the costs has not yet been established, staff has been moving forward on the basis of a rate for each land use type (trip generation on an annual basis) and relative proximity to the interchange. Rather than limiting it to just the commercial and light industrial development immediately surrounding the interchange, a sliding scale could be utilized for the commercial/light industrial development for the entire Corridor and for the potential future residential development in West Grandview Heights.

(c) Overall Financing Strategy

In addition to the interchange, there is the issue of proportionate share of the costs of arterial road needs within and connecting to the Corridor exceeding development cost charge revenues generated (\$6.5 million costs, \$4.7 million development cost charge revenues). Options to resolve this shortfall include:

- Adding the shortfall to the interchange levy;
- Having a new levy with a different distribution/sharing formula;
- Having an area specific development cost charge rate; and
- Including the shortfall in the overall development cost charge program which would increase the citywide arterial development cost charge rate.

(d) Possible Designation of 24 Avenue as a Truck Route

Through the Corridor study, the idea of spreading the impact of trucks onto three routes (32 Avenue, 24 Avenue and 16 Avenue), rather than concentrating trucks on one or two routes, was investigated.

The issue of the status of the interim truck traffic prohibition on 32 Avenue is currently with Trans Link.

(e) Engineering Services

Road, sewer, water and drainage plans, as presented through the consultation process, appear to be generally acceptable. In the area of road development cost charges, as discussed in the previous section, there appears to be a development cost charge shortage that will have to be addressed through an area levy for road services.

It should be noted that there are no development cost charge shortfalls for the other Engineering services.

However, for both roads and other services, there is a timing issue whereby facilities need to be constructed ahead of development cost charge funding generation. Consequently, mechanisms for cost recover for the front-ender must be put into place. Staff will develop a financial strategy as part of the plan, to be presented to Council as part of the final plan.

C. Recommended Courses of Action

The following is a summary of the recommendations contained in the earlier sections of this report.

- (1) Modify the land use plan for the Corridor to incorporate the recommendations of the proposed habitat management strategy, described in this report, by focussing land retention and compensation for environmental purposes and to achieve the greatest biodiversity impact, in and around Fergus Creek and the southern portion of the study area, south of 16 Avenue;
- (2) Develop a strategy to implement the habitat management strategy, including a compensation strategy to provide for the elimination of yellow-coded creeks north of 16 Avenue, in exchange for focussing environmental preservation in and around Fergus Creek, south of 16 Avenue and the possible acquisition of land by the City as part of the overall parks and open space needs for the larger Grandview Heights area;
- (3) Modify the land use plan for the Corridor to reflect a minor expansion of the 24 Avenue commercial node in anticipation of a Neighbourhood Concept Plan being undertaken for the lands immediately to the east of the Corridor;
- (4) Modify the land use plan to reflect minor adjustments to the boundaries of the proposed Business Park/Light Impact Industrial and Commercial designations at the 16 Avenue commercial node;
- (5) Amend the plan to delete the 16 Avenue crossing as an optional location for a new highway interchange on Highway 99;
- (6) Develop additional design guidelines to integrate sustainable development principles and to achieve high quality urban design, architecture and landscaping for development within the Corridor;
- (7) Finalize funding mechanisms for the proposed 24 Avenue/Highway 99 interchange; and
- (8) Finalize servicing plan and financing strategy based on a development pay principle

A land use concept plan illustrating the proposed modifications to the Preferred Land Use Option plan is attached as Appendix "A".

NEXT STEPS

Subject to Council's endorsement of the recommendations in this report, staff will move forward on the following elements of work to complete the Planning component of the Corridor Plan:

- Undertake revisions to the Preferred Land Use Plan presented at the April 24, 2003 open house, as outlined in this report;

- Modify the preliminary Highway 99 Corridor Design Guidelines to include additional guidelines and policies related to sustainability, quality of development, etc.;
- Further develop and finalize related development policies;
- Present the revised Preferred Land Use Plan, design guidelines and development policies at open houses in November, to receive input from the public;
- Present a proposed land use plan, design guidelines and development policies for Council's consideration and approval in December.

The following items of work are required to complete the engineering servicing and financial strategy components of the Plan:

- Finalize the major road network (arterial and major collector roads) improvements for the proposed land use plan and integrate these with the City's transportation and ten year servicing plan as well as complete technical and financial analyses associated with the transportation issues noted previously in this report;
- Complete the recommended stormwater management plan for the proposed land use plan, including integration of environmental protection objectives highlighted in recent public consultation;
- Finalize modelling, conceptual layout and report for water distribution network;
- Finalize modelling, conceptual layout and report for sanitary sewer servicing. More details will be provided related to constraints and opportunities through the Corridor and the long-term impact of the plan on proposed servicing in the area. Specific information will highlight the interim servicing constraints and catchment boundaries along the Corridor; and
- Finalize a financing strategy for the engineering services for the area including triggers for infrastructure improvements and financial impacts with respect to long term servicing of the Corridor and surrounding area.

It is estimated that open houses will be scheduled for mid-November, 2003, with a proposed land use plan for the Corridor being presented to Council for its consideration and approval in December, 2003.

CONCLUSION

In response to various issues and concerns raised by the public over different aspects of the Preferred Land Use Plan for the Highway 99 Corridor, presented at an open house held April 24, 2003, staff has undertaken additional public consultation through a series of stakeholder group meetings in late August and September and a community workshop held on October 7, 2003. This consultation process provided opportunities for the various stakeholder groups to articulate and discuss their key outstanding issues and concerns, both with City staff and the other participating stakeholder groups. Through the community workshop, participants were able to group the outstanding concerns into three main issues – (1) Environment (2) Land use, Planning, and Urban Design and (3) Transportation and Traffic. Workshop participants were able to achieve consensus on many of the concerns in the various issue areas and, where consensus was not achieved, to better understand the differing perspectives.

Through community input received at the workshop, together with the preparation of additional environmental studies, this report outlines a series of recommendations and policy directions intended to address the outstanding community concerns. This report recommends that a modified land use plan, design guidelines and engineering servicing and financing strategy be presented for public input at open houses to be held in November, 2003.

Original signed by

Murray Dinwoodie
General Manager
Planning and Development

Original signed by

Paul Ham
General Manager
Engineering

GF/kms/saw

Attachments

- Appendix A Proposed Modifications to the Preferred Land Use Option Plan
- Appendix B Corporate Report L007
- Appendix C Preferred Land Use Option Plan, April 24, 2003
- Appendix E Map Showing Location of Stakeholder Groups
- Appendix D Participating Stakeholder Groups
- Appendix F Minutes Stakeholder Group Meetings
- Appendix G Proceedings Report – Highway 99 Corridor Plan Workshop, October 7, 2003
- Appendix H Proposed Habitat Management Strategy
- Appendix I Draft Design Guidelines, April 23, 2003
- Appendix J Single Point Interchange Conceptual Design
- Appendix K Tight Diamond Interchange Conceptual Design

v:\wp-docs\planning\03data\oct-dec\10210912.gf.doc
SAW 10/27/03 10:17 AM

Appendix "A"



Corporate Report

Appendix "B"

NO: L007

COUNCIL DATE: June 9, 2003

REGULAR COUNCIL – LAND USE

TO: **Mayor & Council** DATE: **June 3,
2003**

FROM: **General Manager,
Planning and
Development** FILE: **6520-20
(Grandview/Hwy
99)**

SUBJECT: **Grandview
Heights/Highway 99
Corridor Status Report**

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning and Development Department recommends that Council:

1. Receive this report as information; and
2. Authorize staff to undertake additional public consultation, as documented in this report.

INTENT

The purpose of this report is to provide Council with a synopsis of input received from the public in relation to the Grandview Heights/Highway 99 Corridor Plan (the "Plan") as a result of the Public Open House held on April 24, 2003. This report also seeks Council authorization to expand the public consultation component of the Plan preparation process.

BACKGROUND

At the Council-in-Committee meeting on March 3, 2003, Council considered Corporate Report No. C008 entitled "Grandview Heights/Highway 99 Corridor – Status Report" (copy attached as Appendix I) and adopted the recommendations of that report, including authorization for staff to hold a Public Open House to present a final draft land use plan for the Corridor lands and other information and endorsement of a revised work program and schedule to complete the Plan.

The Public Open House, at which the preferred land use option for the Grandview Heights/Highway 99 Corridor (the "Corridor") was presented to the public, was held on April 24, 2003. This Open House was the third in a series of Open Houses related to the preparation of the Plan and was attended by approximately 420 people. Draft design guidelines as well as schematic engineering servicing strategies were also presented at this Open House. The preferred land use option was developed taking into consideration public input received at a previous Open House on May 2, 2002, at which three alternative land use plan options were presented. This report summarizes the public input received as a result of the April 24, 2003 Open House and documents a number of issues which require further analysis and resolution.

DISCUSSION

Description of the Preferred Land Use Option

The preferred land use option features a variety of Commercial, Business Park, and Light Industrial Uses as illustrated in Appendix II. A major commercial node is proposed at 24 Avenue with smaller commercial nodes proposed at 16 Avenue and 8 Avenue. The area between the 24 Avenue and 16 Avenue commercial nodes is proposed for Business Park/Light Industrial uses.

The preferred land use option proposes a new Highway 99 interchange at 24 Avenue. The Plan also illustrates a possible alternative Highway 99 interchange location at 16 Avenue.

A key element of the preferred land use option is the proposal to reserve the east half of the B.C. Hydro right-of-way [±40 metres (130 ft.)] as a transition buffer between the business development in the Corridor and the existing residential area to the east. In addition, a proposed multi-use pathway system (Millennium Trail) that runs from 32 Avenue to 8 Avenue will provide an additional buffer for the residential area to the east.

All existing fish-bearing watercourses (red coded creeks) and watercourses providing fish nutrients (yellow-coded creeks) are proposed to be protected by a 30 metre (100 ft.) riparian setback, in accordance with Department of Fisheries and Oceans and Ministry of Water, Land and Air Protection guidelines. In addition, the preferred land use option proposes to protect three existing raptor nests located south of 16 Avenue, each with a 50 metre (165 ft.) radius no disturbance boundary, in accordance with Ministry of Water, Land and Air Protection guidelines.

Summary of Comments

Property owners and residents within and adjacent to the Plan area and from the business community attended the April 24, 2003 Open House with over 400 individuals in attendance.

Each of those attending the Open House was asked to complete a comment sheet that would be used by City staff to assist in gauging public opinion on different aspects of the information presented at the Open House. The comment sheet (attached as Appendix III) included a series of statements related to the Plan with a series of optional responses after each statement ranging from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree". The respondents were asked to indicate which response best described their position in relation to each respective statement. In addition, the comment sheet included a number of open-ended questions.

As of May 23, 2003 the Planning and Development Department had received comment sheets from 180 individuals. The information gathered through the comment sheets provides a good indication of the community's view on the preferred land use option as well as other information presented at the Open House. The Planning and Development Department has also received a number of letters on various aspects of the planning process and material displayed at the Open House and has met with a number of groups and individuals. As recently as June 4, 2003, the Planning and Development Department received a petition containing 97 signatures that expressed concern with the planning process.

The following is a summary of the results of the information gathered from the Open House comment sheets. The map attached as Appendix VII illustrates the properties from which comment sheets have been received.

Issue	Strongly	Disagree/Strongly	Neutral
-------	----------	-------------------	---------

	Agree/Agree	Disagree	
Support for preferred land use option as presented (175 responses)	134 (76%)	37 (22%)	4 (2%)
Support for the flexibility provided in the land uses (174 responses)	129 (74%)	31 (18%)	14 (8%)
Support for proposed road network as presented (172 responses)	114 (66%)	47 (28%)	11 (6%)
Levy for Interchange Construction (175 responses)	54 (31%)	105 (60%)	16 (9%)
Plan sufficiently protects and preserves environment (175 responses)	115 (65%)	47 (26%)	13 (7%)
Support for Development Moratorium (173 responses)	41 (24%)	116 (67%)	16 (9%)

The following is a synopsis of the information gathered by way of the comment sheets.

Degree of Support for the Preferred Land Use Option

There is a strong level of support for the preferred land use option. The statement on the comment sheet: "The preferred land use option as presented is generally supportable" resulted in a response of either "Strongly Agree" or "Agree" from 76% of the respondents (i.e., 134 out of 175 total responses). Only 22% of the respondents (i.e., 37 out of 175 responses) indicated that they either "Strongly Disagree" or "Disagree" with the preferred land use plan as presented. An additional four respondents or 2%, indicated that they were "Neutral" to this statement.

The Preferred Land Use Option Balances an Overall Policy and Land Use Framework with Sufficient Flexibility

In response to the statement: "The preferred land use option provides a good balance between an overall policy and land use framework for the Corridor with sufficient flexibility so that the Plan can respond to market opportunities", 129 responses out of a total of 174 responses or 74% indicated that they either "Strongly Agree" or "Agree" with this statement. Conversely, only 31 responses or 18%, indicated that they either "Strongly Disagree" or "Disagree" with this statement. There were 14 responses or 8% of the

respondents that indicated that they were "Neutral" with respect to this statement.

Degree of Support for the Road Network

There is a relatively strong level of support for the proposed road network shown in the preferred land use option. Out of a total of 172 responses, 114 or 66% of respondents indicated that they either "Strongly Agree" or "Agree" with the proposed road network. There were 47 respondents or 28% who either "Strongly Disagree" or "Disagree" with the road network. There were 11 or 6% of responses that are "Neutral".

Degree of Support for Interchange Construction Funding

In adopting the recommendations of the March 3, 2004 Corporate Report, Council authorized staff to solicit public input on the idea of the City charging a levy from development in the Corridor to finance an interchange on Highway 99 at either 24 Avenue or 16 Avenue. In response, a proposed interchange funding formula was presented at the Open House. This funding formula proposed that new development be charged a levy that would vary based on the land use proposed and the proximity of the proposed development to the interchange. Two areas were defined. Commercial-Business Park designated lands close to the interchange would be expected to receive the most significant benefit from a new interchange so, consequently, should pay a higher levy than the remaining lands in the Corridor. The Primary and Secondary Benefiting

Areas were identified for an interchange at 24 Avenue and for an interchange at 16 Avenue (Appendix IV). Only one interchange would be constructed at one of these two locations. The proposed levies for each alternative are presented below:

24 Avenue	Proposed Levy
Primary Area (Commercial/Business Park)	\$180,000/acre
Secondary Area (Business Park/Light Industrial)	\$60,000/acre

16 Avenue	Proposed Levy
Primary Area (Commercial/Business Park)	\$270,000/acre
Secondary Area (Business Park/Light Industrial)	\$90,000/acre

There is significant opposition to the levys, as proposed. In response to the statement: "The approach for funding the construction of a new highway interchange, at either 24 Avenue or 16 Avenue, is generally

supportable", 105 responses out of a total of 175 responses or 60%, indicated that they either "Strongly Disagree" or "Disagree" with the levy approach. Conversely, 54 responses or 31% either "Strongly Agree" or "Agree" with the levy approach. The remaining 16 responses (9%) indicated that they are "Neutral".

Degree of Support for Environmental Preservation and Protection

The majority of respondents agree that environmental features of the Plan area are adequately preserved and protected. In response to the statement: "The significant environmental features of the Plan area are adequately preserved and protected by the preferred land use option plan", 115 responses out of a total of 175 responses or 65% of responses, indicated that they either "Strongly Agree" or "Agree" with the level of environmental preservation and protection. On the other hand, 47 respondents or 26%, indicated that they either "Strongly Disagree" or "Disagree", while 13 respondents or 7%, indicated that they are "Neutral".

Degree of Support for Development Moratorium

There is little support for a development moratorium for the lands located in Grandview Heights immediately east of the Corridor lands. In response to the statement: "A moratorium should be placed on the subdivision of existing suburban properties east of the Plan area in Grandview Heights to protect the future development potential of these lands", 116 responses out of a total of 173 respondents or 67%, indicated that they either "Strongly Disagree" or "Disagree" with this statement. On the other hand, 41 respondents or 24%, either "Strongly Agree" or "Agree" with a development moratorium, while 16 respondents or 9% indicated that they are "Neutral".

Other Comments

The Public Open House comment sheet also included a number of open-ended questions to seek community input on the preferred land use plan, the proposed design guidelines and any other aspects of the material displayed at the Open House. The following provides a summary of comments (paraphrased) that were noted by more than five respondents. These responses, where they overlapped with the above statements, were included in the statistical summaries provided above.

Most Liked Aspects of the Preferred Land Use Option

1. Creation of a major commercial node at 24 Avenue (57 responses);
2. Millennium Trail interface between the Plan area and residential area to the east (37 responses);
3. Complementary future urban development for West Grandview Heights area (35 responses);
4. None (15 responses);

5. Interchange at 24 Avenue (14 responses);
6. Creation of jobs and the generation of new property taxes (9 responses);
7. Effective use of land/well thought out plan (8 responses); and
8. More commercial/local shopping (7 responses).

Most Disliked Aspects of the Preferred Land Use Option

1. Development moratorium on the lands to the east of the Corridor (40 responses);
2. Creation of unnecessary commercial/industrial land and impact on suburban properties in Grandview Heights (20 responses);
3. New interchange at 24 Avenue (9 responses);
4. None (8 responses);
5. Insufficient attention given to fish and wildlife values and too much impact on the environment (7 responses);
6. Everything (5 responses);
7. Areas east of the Plan area not adequately addressed in the information presented to date (5 responses); and
8. Proposed interchange levy (5 responses).

Most Liked Aspects of the Proposed Design Guidelines

1. Guidelines well stated (34 responses);

2. Protection/preservation of trees and buffer zones of green space (11 responses);
3. None (11 responses); and
4. More commercial development, but not too much (5 responses).

Most Disliked Aspects of the Proposed Design Guidelines

1. Proposed 24 Avenue interchange levy (38 responses);\
2. None (11 responses); and
3. Incorporation of natural environment characteristics may not be possible (6 responses).

Other General Comments

1. Developer-driven OCP amendment must take precedence over proposed Grandview Heights Area Structure Plan (37 responses);
2. The development resulting from the plan will destroy Grandview Heights/maintain existing suburban character of South Surrey (17 responses);
3. The plan is a developer-driven plan for the benefit of a few individuals (12 responses);
4. Do not like/require further details on proposed development moratorium east of the Plan Area (10 responses);
5. More details are required on the need for a new interchange at 24 Avenue when the full interchange at 32 Avenue is yet to be completed and neighbourhood impacts of any new interchange (8 responses)
6. Have a second look at 24 Avenue interchange levy and redistribute costs more evenly (7 responses)
7. Better environmental protection needed (7 responses); and

8. Leave 24 Avenue as is/24 Avenue should not be a truck route (6 responses).

Primary Outstanding Issues and Concerns

While the great majority of comment sheet responses indicate that the preferred land use option as presented at the April 24 Open House is generally supportable, a number of issues and concerns have also been identified. In addition, staff has received a number of letters and met with a number of groups and individuals who have voiced some strong concerns. The following is a list of the issues and concerns that appear to require additional work:

1. **Mechanism for funding the construction of a new interchange on Highway 99 (interchange levy issue);**
2. **Timing of development of lands immediately to the east of the Corridor lands (moratorium issue);**
3. **Protection and preservation of the natural environment within and adjacent to the Corridor;**
4. **Concerns with the planning process and opportunities to provide meaningful input;**
5. **Impact of Corridor development on suburban character of Grandview Heights;**
6. **Scale and extent of commercial node at 24 Avenue;**
7. **Interface between the Corridor lands and Highway 99 (City image and character);**
8. **Truck routing through Grandview Heights; and**
9. **Impacts of an interchange at 24 Avenue on existing development to the west of Highway 99.**

The following paragraphs summarize these issues and concerns in more detail.

Proposed Interchange Levy

There is little community support for the levy, as proposed, to fund the construction of a new interchange. Staff has received strong feedback that if the City introduces a levy, it must be more equitably distributed over a larger area including Grandview Heights and Campbell Heights, as the benefits accruing from a new interchange would extend to a much wider area than that area currently identified as the Primary and Secondary Benefiting Areas.

It has also been suggested that the City look at alternative, less costly interchange designs.

Development Moratorium and Planning for Lands Beyond the Corridor Plan Area

There appears to be strong support for proceeding with development in the Corridor, but owners of the property to the east of the Corridor are concerned that they will be impacted by the Corridor development and yet will not have the opportunity to develop their lands. The idea of a moratorium on the subdivision of existing suburban properties east of the Plan area to protect the future development potential of these lands has raised strong concerns, particularly with respect to its scope and purpose; the area of lands affected by any such moratorium; and the timing of the moratorium. The owners of the properties to the east of the Corridor appear to be interested in proceeding with urban development on their lands "sooner rather than later".

Concerns have been expressed that the future planning process related to the preparation of an area structure plan for Grandview Heights should not take precedence over the preparation of a Neighbourhood Concept Plan for the properties immediately east of the Highway 99 Plan Area, south of 28 Avenue, north of 24 Avenue and west of 164 Street. There is a strong opinion from the owners of these properties that a developer-driven Neighbourhood Concept Plan for the area immediately east of the Corridor should take precedence over the development of an overall Structure Plan for the larger Grandview Heights area.

Environmental Protection and Preservation

Although the majority of comment sheet respondents indicated that the significant environmental features of the Plan area are adequately preserved and protected by the preferred land use option, staff has also received strong concerns that the preferred land use option does not provide sufficient attention to the fish and wildlife values in the Plan area and that new development needs to be better integrated with the environmental and natural heritage values of the Corridor. In particular, concerns have been expressed that the proposed riparian (water edge) setbacks abutting Fergus Creek are not sufficient to sustain fish and wildlife habitat. A more specific concern focuses around the existence of riparian habitat used by Pacific Water Shrew, a "red-listed" species in British Columbia, categorized as "threatened" by the Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada.

Planning Process

A number of individuals and groups have expressed concerns that the public consultation process, to date, has been a "top-down" process and that the Open House format of seeking public input has not allowed sufficient opportunity for meaningful public input. They argue that the process should provide more opportunities for interactive dialogue, such as a workshop that would permit and encourage two-way dialogue and where ideas can be openly exchanged and examined.

In a similar vein, staff continues to receive comments and concerns that the planning process for the Corridor is developer-driven benefiting a few property owners and developers at the expense of those not in the Corridor.

Impact of Development On Existing Suburban Character of Grandview Heights

Staff has received strong concerns that the development of the Highway 99 Corridor for commercial and business park-type uses will negatively impact the existing suburban character of the larger Grandview Heights area east of the Corridor.

Scale and Extent of 24 Avenue Commercial Node

The expansion of the 24 Avenue commercial node to include land to the east of the Hydro right-of-way that was not originally identified as being in the Plan area has raised some concerns. On the other hand, there are other concerns that this commercial node should be further expanded to accommodate additional commercial development.

Community Image and Character

Concerns have been raised in relation to the treatment of the interface between the Corridor development and Highway 99, with particular reference to the aesthetics of this important gateway to the City from the USA.

Truck Routing Through Grandview Heights

Concerns were received over the possibility of 24 Avenue becoming a truck route. Alternatively, other comments were received supporting 24 Avenue as a truck route, as truck traffic could be more evenly distributed between 24 Avenue, 32 Avenue and 16 Avenue.

Impact of a 24 Avenue Interchange on Existing Development On the West Side of Highway 99

A number of concerns were voiced over the traffic, noise, visual and other impacts of a new interchange at 24 Avenue on existing residential developments on the west side of Highway 99.

Recommended Approach to Address Outstanding Issues and Concerns

The issues and concerns noted in the preceding sections deal with specific aspects of the preferred land

use option, proposed development policies and the planning process. To address these concerns, the Planning and Development Department recommends that the Plan preparation process provide additional opportunities for public consultation.

Meetings with Groups/Organizations

It is recommended that a series of meetings be arranged with various stakeholders/community groups to exchange information and seek input on alternative solutions to address specific concerns of each of these stakeholders. These meetings would be coordinated by staff of the Planning and Development Department, together with support from the Engineering Department. A list of groups with whom staff would attempt to arrange meetings is attached as Appendix V. These meetings could likely be held over the next month.

Workshop

Following the above-referenced meetings, it is recommended that a workshop, chaired by an experienced facilitator, be arranged. This workshop would be attended by representatives of the various interest groups as well as appropriate City staff and would provide an opportunity for representatives to share their thoughts and ideas to assist in resolving the various issues and concerns. This facilitated workshop could probably take place in late June/early July.

Plan Completion Timeline

While the recommended additional public consultation will better engage the public in the planning process for the Corridor and allow opportunities for additional review and analysis, it will extend the timeline for the completion of a final land use plan from the end of July, 2003 to the early Fall of 2003. However, the consultation process that is recommended will assist in ensuring that the final plan is effective from all perspectives. The revised work program/schedule is illustrated in Appendix VI.

CONCLUSION

Although many aspects of the preferred Corridor plan appear to be acceptable to the public, the public input received to date has identified a number of issues and concerns that need to be addressed to ensure an effective final plan. To address these issues and concerns, some additional public consultation opportunities are recommended. This additional public consultation, which will be coordinated by the Planning and Development Department staff, includes meetings between City staff and several identified groups and organizations and a subsequent facilitated workshop involving representatives of these groups and organizations. This additional public consultation will require additional time, but the extra time spent in preparing the plan will assist in ensuring the effectiveness of the final product.

Original Signed By

Murray Dinwoodie
General Manager
Planning and Development

GF:saw

Attachments

- Appendix I Corporate Report No. C008 – Grandview Heights/Highway 99 Corridor – Status Report (without attachments)
- Appendix II Preferred Land Use Option
- Appendix III Comment Sheet
- Appendix IV Interchange Primary and Secondary Benefiting Areas
- Appendix V Community Groups/Organizations
- Appendix VI Revised Work Program/Schedule
- Appendix VII Map Illustrating Properties from which Comment Sheets have been received.

v:\wp-docs\planning\03data\april-june\06031550.gf.doc
SAW 10/27/03 10:17 AM



Corporate Report

NO: C008

COUNCIL DATE: Mar. 3/03

APPENDIX I

COUNCIL-IN-COMMITTEE

TO: **Mayor &
Council** DATE: **February 25, 2003**

FROM: **General Manager,
Planning &
Development** FILE: **6520-20
(Grandview/Hwy
99)**

SUBJECT: **Grandview Heights/Highway 99 Corridor -
Status Report**

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning and Development Department recommends that Council:

1. Receive this report as information;
2. Authorize staff to proceed to a Public Open House to present a draft final Land Use Plan for the Grandview Heights/Highway 99 Corridor incorporating recommendations contained within the text of this report; and

3. Endorse the revised work program/schedule to complete the Plan preparation process for the Grandview Heights/Highway 99 Corridor (the "Corridor"), as documented in Appendix VII.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to provide Council with a status report on the Grandview Heights/Highway 99 Corridor Study (the "Study"), on the results of the public consultation process undertaken to date, on the opportunities and issues that need to be addressed in the final plan for the Corridor and to seek Council endorsement regarding a proposed process and timeline to complete the Study.

BACKGROUND

Economic Development Context

The Official Community Plan ("OCP") was amended in early 2001 to include a strong business development focus and policies to create a strong and sustainable local economy. This was done in response to a general recognition that the City had some significant imbalances that would need to be corrected to ensure an economically sustainable future.

Firstly, the City is significantly deficient relative to the number of jobs located within the City's boundaries in comparison to the number of Surrey residents in the workforce. The ratio between jobs and workforce currently stands at approximately 5.5 jobs for every 10 residents in the workforce. Most of Surrey's residents in the workforce must travel outside of Surrey to their place of employment. This places significant demands on transportation infrastructure, which is the most costly infrastructure to construct and maintain.

Secondly, the City's assessment base is predominantly residential with 72% of the City's property tax revenues generated from residential development and 28% from business development. Residential development generates a relatively high demand for services in comparison to the property tax revenues it generates. Business development generates a comparably low demand for services and generates three times the tax revenue per \$1000 of assessment in comparison to residential development. As such, business property tax revenues are necessary to assist in meeting the on-going service demands of residential properties in the City. Based on research, it has been established that, for the long term health of the City, the ratio of property tax revenues generated from business development should be at least 40% of total property tax revenues of the City to meet the needs of the residential component of the City.

Council has determined that the means by which the City's property tax ratio will be adjusted is to encourage and accelerate business development within the City (i.e., Council's economic development thrust). As new businesses locate in the City, the net affect will be more local jobs and increased business property assessments that will yield greater property tax revenues for the delivery of services to the City's residents.

It is estimated that the City needs to attract approximately \$200 million to \$250 million in economic development per year on average in each of the next 20 years (\$4.5 billion in total economic development over the next 20 years) to achieve a balance between the number of jobs in the City and the workforce residing in Surrey. If this amount of business development is achieved it will also result in approximately 40% of the total property tax revenues of the City being generated from business development. Given that the City has typically generated only about \$100 million worth of new business development annually,

these new targets clearly represent a significant challenge.

It was also determined, during the most recent OCP major review process, that to achieve the above economic development targets, some additional lands within the City will need to be designated for industrial and commercial development. Policies were included in the OCP to assist in expanding the supply of industrial and commercial land at appropriate locations to facilitate business growth in the City.

The Corridor area has been identified as an attractive area for business development. A conversion of this Corridor from a Suburban designation to a Business designation (Industrial and Commercial designations) is supportable, based on OCP policies.

The Corridor has an area of approximately 158 hectares (390 acres) of land. If it is developed to its full potential with a mix of industrial and commercial development, it will generate approximately \$300 to \$350 million in new business property assessments (i.e., new property tax revenues of approximately \$3 million to \$3.5 million per year) and will be home to over 6,000 new jobs.

Plan Objectives

On January 21, 2002, Council considered Corporate Report R015 and, subsequently, adopted the Terms of Reference attached to that report as the basis for preparing a Local Area Plan for the Corridor. Based on those Terms of Reference, the objectives for the Grandview Heights/Highway 99 Corridor Local Area Plan are as follows:

1. To develop and formulate land use, economic and other development policies, with a business development focus, to guide business development proposals for the Corridor;
2. To prepare a parallel servicing strategy that provides for the location, staging and standards of services, including sanitary sewer, water, drainage, roads and other utilities and methods of implementation by rezoning, subdivision, or other mechanisms;
3. To undertake a financial analysis that will demonstrate adequate funding for the implementation of the servicing plan;
4. To identify environmentally sensitive areas for protection;
5. To ensure that the development of this corridor is economically sustainable and does not negatively impact existing and planned businesses in the larger South Surrey area; and
6. To ensure that the lands immediately adjacent to the Corridor are planned so as to provide appropriate land use interfaces and transitions between the business development corridor to the west and the suburban acreages further to the east in Grandview Heights.

On June 24, 2002, Council received Corporate Report No. R137 from the Planning and Development Department on the status of the preparation of a Local Area Plan for the Grandview Heights/Highway 99 Corridor in South Surrey (Appendix I). This report advised, based on public input received to that date, that there was community support for the preparation of a Local Area Plan with a business development focus for the Corridor lands. The report also discussed a number of issues that were identified through the planning and public consultation processes to that date, which warranted more careful consideration by staff and further deliberation by Council as the final plan is being developed. The remainder of this report will be focussed on discussing the identified issues and recommending a direction for resolution of each issue.

It was clearly recognized at the outset of the planning process that the reason for undertaking the plan preparation process in advance of formulating a land use plan for the larger Grandview Heights area, is to help fulfil the City's economic development objectives by taking advantage of a strong market demand for commercial and business development in this area, and that development of the Corridor lands would not necessarily be popular from all perspectives. It was also clear that, to be successful, the planning exercise needs to result in a plan that is attractive to prospective industrial and commercial developers and address, in a balanced manner, the impacts that development in the Corridor will create on the surrounding areas. However, no matter how effective the plan is at addressing the impacts, if the final plan fails in meeting the needs of business development in the Corridor, the work expended in developing the plan will be an exercise in futility.

DISCUSSION

The June 24, 2002 Corporate Report (attached as Appendix I) provides a summary of the public input that had been received to that date and discusses the major issues that need to be addressed and resolved as part of the process of finalizing the Local Area Plan for the Corridor lands. In addition to the issues identified in that previous report, more recently, development industry representatives have indicated the following:

1. The plan needs to provide as much flexibility as possible both respect to the allowable uses on each site as well as with respect to when each site within the Corridor may be developed. In general terms, it is the development industry's view that if a phasing strategy is included in the plan that dictates the timing of development of different sectors within the Corridor, such action will extend the timeframe over which development in the Corridor will occur and will defer the potential benefits that development of the Corridor will deliver to the City.
2. The lands located in the vicinity of the intersection of 24 Avenue and 160 Street are attractive in relation to commercial development, based on their central location within the South Surrey area, their location on a major east-west arterial street (24 Avenue) that crosses Highway 99 and their location relative to a potential future interchange on Highway 99 (Appendix II). Given the narrower width of the Corridor, the Plan area should be expanded to the east, beyond the Hydro Transmission Line, to allow a larger area for commercial development at this location and, thereby, take full advantage of the commercial development potential of this location.

Staff is currently proceeding with the preparation of a final draft land use plan for presentation to the public at a Public Open House meeting. The following sections of this report address a recommended course of action in relation to addressing each of the issues identified through the public input, to date

Proposed Phasing Plan for Development within the Corridor

Based on the responses from the public at and after the previous Open House, there is no clear community consensus on the question of phasing. Council chose to proceed with a study on the Corridor lands with a view to providing new opportunities for business development in the City. The opportunities for business development in the Corridor will be more limited if flexibility is removed through the introduction of a phasing plan. Therefore, **it is recommended that, in the interests of encouraging early and on-going business development within the Corridor, that the Local Area Plan for the Corridor not include a "phasing plan" beyond what may be necessary due to engineering servicing considerations.**

Transportation Considerations

Development within the Corridor will result in an increase in traffic and the need for additional roadway/transportation capacity. These needed increases in capacity are covered in the following sections:

1. **New Interchange on Highway 99**

(a) Location of Interchange

Traffic projections resulting from the transportation and traffic impact study for the Corridor indicate that the two existing Highway 99 interchanges at 32 Avenue/152 Street and 8 Avenue are adequate to accommodate projected traffic volumes in the short term, assuming the second phase of the Highway 99/32 Avenue interchange is constructed. In the longer term, a new interchange will be warranted and a new interchange on Highway 99, between 8 Avenue and 32 Avenue would provide improved accessibility and resultant benefits to the area. Similarly, the Market Assessment and Impact Study prepared for the Corridor indicates that a new highway interchange could be a key element in the success of the Plan Area toward securing market share and achieving sufficiently high rates of land absorption for business uses.

The Land Use Plan Options presented at the May 2, 2002 Open House showed a possible new interchange on Highway 99 at either 16 Avenue or 24 Avenue (Appendix III). A high level overview of the relative merits of each of these two locations is listed below:

(i) 24 Avenue Interchange on Highway 99

Pros:

- Based on traffic modelling, the preferred location for a new interchange is 24 Avenue as traffic volumes on 24 Avenue are significantly higher than on 16 Avenue when the Grandview Heights area is fully developed;
- 24 Avenue provides a key link to the Campbell Heights industrial area to the east, the development of which is important to the long term financial health of the City;
- There are commercial and other business developers who appear willing to help finance the construction of a new interchange at 24 Avenue in the near term; and
- 24 Avenue is a designated arterial road (but not a truck route), which provides a key link to the Industrial designated lands in Campbell Heights and, in the future, into Langley Township.

Cons:

- There are potential property constraints at 24 Avenue on the west side of Highway 99, due to existing residential developments at this location. However, these property constraints can be addressed through interchange design considerations.

(ii) 16 Avenue Interchange

Pros:

- 16 Avenue is an arterial and truck route; it has regional significance as it extends through Surrey and Langley as far east as Abbotsford.

Cons:

- There are environmental constraints on much of the land immediately to the south of 16 Avenue and, therefore, there is less development potential in the vicinity of 16 Avenue; and
- 16 Avenue is not as central to the overall Grandview Heights area, or to South Surrey generally, as 24 Avenue and, therefore, would not provide the same level of benefit.

Based on preliminary estimates, the cost to construct an interchange at either 16 Avenue or

24 Avenue would be approximately the same.

As any new interchange would require Provincial Ministry of Transportation support, Planning and Development and Engineering staff met with Ministry of Transportation staff earlier this year. At this meeting, Ministry staff agreed that either of 24 Avenue and 16 Avenue would be an acceptable location for a new interchange on Highway 99, but advised that only one additional interchange would be permitted between 8 Avenue and 32 Avenue. Ministry staff also advised that **no Provincial funding would be available for any aspect of a new interchange at either location.**

Based on the analysis undertaken, to date, the preferred location for a new Highway 99 interchange is 24 Avenue. The intersection of 24 Avenue and Highway 99 is near the geographic centre of the South Surrey area. Such a central location lends itself to the development of community-wide uses such as community commercial uses (Appendix II). The Corridor market analysis completed by Urbanics indicates that the South Surrey area is under-developed from the perspective of community commercial development. Such commercial development tends to draw patrons from a broader catchment area and should be more centrally located within the community. The South Pointe Exchange development is an example of this type of commercial development and its success is indicative of the potential demand in the South Surrey area. City staff is aware of a number of other large format retailers who are interested in locating in South Surrey and, in particular, on 24 Avenue to the east of Highway 99.

The Plan, in the vicinity of the interchange, should be designed to recognize the maximum advantage from the interchange investment. On this basis, **it is recommended that the final draft land use plan illustrate a future interchange at the 24 Avenue crossing of Highway 99, that the land along both sides of 24 Avenue east of Highway 99 be designated for commercial development and that consideration be given to extending this commercial designation to the east of the Hydro Transmission Line to accommodate a significant node of commercial development at this location (see Appendix IV).**

(b) **Funding for a new interchange at 24 Avenue and Highway 99**

Unlike the 32 Avenue interchange that was funded by the Ministry of Transportation to address regional transportation needs and, de facto, also created commercial opportunities in its immediate vicinity, the Ministry of Transportation has advised that although they are prepared to allow an interchange on Highway 99 between 8 Avenue and 32 Avenue on Highway 99 they are not prepared to provide any funding for such an interchange. It is estimated that a new interchange on Highway 99 at 24 Avenue would cost approximately \$10 million to construct. **It is recommended that the final servicing strategy for the Corridor lands provide for an area levy to be collected from development on the Corridor lands toward an equitable sharing of the costs of the proposed interchange at 24 Avenue and that such a funding concept be presented to the public at the next Public Open House.**

2. **Transportation and Traffic Impacts on the Existing Grandview Heights Road System**

As is the case with any new development in the City, new business development on the Corridor

lands will generate a significant volume of new traffic to and within the area that will require the construction of significant street system improvements, both to and within the Corridor. Preliminary analysis indicates the need for a widened and somewhat realigned Croydon Drive to function as a spine road for the Corridor. Additionally, 24 Avenue from King George Highway to 164 Street and 16 Avenue from King George Highway to 176 Street, will need widening to four lanes. Subject to a final land use plan for the Corridor lands being adopted by Council, the Engineering Department will complete a detailed traffic impact analysis and accurately determine what street system improvements will be necessary to support development in the Corridor and, subsequently, to establish a financing strategy to review Development Cost Charges generated compared to costs and demonstrate how such improvements will be funded. This will include consideration of the funding requirements for the 24 Avenue interchange through the use of a special area levy.

Allocation of Land Uses

There was criticism from a number of owners of properties within the Corridor and representatives of the development industry that the land use plan options presented at the previous Public Open House were too prescriptive and that the land use plan should be more flexible as to the locations of the different business uses that are proposed within the plan area. These individuals argue that the identification of specific land uses can actually hinder development because lands identified for specific uses may be undevelopable for various reasons, including uncooperative land owners, poor soils, access, environmental consideration, etc. and that without a detailed analysis, the ultimate viability of a location designated for a specific use cannot be determined at this level of land use planning.

The Market Assessment and Impact Study indicates that, in general, those uses having a more regional orientation will benefit strongly from close proximity to a new interchange on Highway 99. Such uses include new and large format retail shopping, service commercial and related uses. While this study notes that the success of light industrial or business park uses is somewhat less tied to a new highway access, a single developer seeking a large research park/campus development might desire the increased access characteristics provided by a new highway access to accommodate both local and regional employees, visitors and clients.

This study also indicates that greater overall synergy is likely to be achieved by bracketing the large format retail and service commercial and related uses with employment generating, light industrial and business park uses. An increased employment base will result in greater demand for retail and related establishments.

The land use plan options presented to the public, to date, illustrate a level of detail, which provides an overall framework for the orderly and efficient development of the Corridor. These plan options support the policies within the OCP for the preparation of Local Area and Neighbourhood Concept Plans ("NCPs"). The level of detail contained within the plan options also provides property owners, whose properties fall within the Plan Area, as well as adjacent property owners who may be affected by the plan, a degree of certainty as to future land uses and potential impacts. As well, the land use plan forms the basis for detailed servicing and financing plans and, without some degree of certainty with respect to specific land uses, it is difficult to develop detailed servicing and financing plans.

The land use plan for the Corridor must, therefore, balance the need for an overall policy and land use framework for the future development of this area with sufficient flexibility so that the plan can respond to the realities of the market place. However, it is critical that the plan satisfy some fundamental principles. These principles include:

- preservation of watercourses and protection of riparian setback areas;

- land use compatibility;
- provision of an effective and appropriate interface so that business uses do not adversely impact adjacent land uses;
- provision of adequate servicing infrastructure; and
- provision of a road network to effectively handle the new traffic generated by development and separates business traffic from residential traffic.

It is recommended that the final draft land use plan for the Corridor concentrate the majority of the Corridor's commercial development at 24 Avenue since 24 Avenue is more central to the South Surrey area and is a suitable location for a future interchange on Highway 99. It is also recommended that a commercial development be designated at 16 Avenue and at 8 Avenue within the Corridor, but at a smaller scale than at 24 Avenue. It is further recommended that the remainder of the lands in the Corridor be designated for either business park or light impact industrial uses and that the plan be developed so as to promote land use flexibility.

Planning Approaches for and Interface Issues with Lands to the East of the Plan Area

As mentioned earlier in this report, one of the key elements in the final plan for the Corridor will be an effective interface strategy between the Plan Area and adjacent lands to the immediate east.

The information presented at the previous Public Open House suggested that a moratorium be placed on the subdivision of existing suburban properties east of the Plan Area in Grandview Heights to protect the future development potential of these lands. While such a moratorium appeared to have general community support, there are divergent views on the length of such a moratorium.

The Grandview Heights Residents Association ("GHRA") would like to maintain the current Suburban designation of Grandview Heights (See the attached Appendix V) well into the future. This organization includes some of the property owners and residents residing in the area bounded by 32 Avenue on the north, 176 Street to the east, 16 Avenue to the south and Highway 99 to the west (Appendix VI). On the other hand, the West Grandview Heights Residents' Association ("WGHRA") does not support any initiatives which would delay the preparation of an area plan for the larger Grandview Heights area (the WGHRA is a group of landowners that are dedicated to the urbanization of the area bounded by Highway 99 on the west, 164 Street on the east, 20 Avenue on the south and 28 Avenue on the north). Similarly, there are other property owners abutting the Highway 99 Corridor who would like to see urban development in the short term such as the Fergus Creek Taxpayers. This is a small group of property owners on the east side of 164 Street, generally between 16 and 24 Avenue, who have expressed concerns that the land use plan options for the Corridor do not effectively address interface issues respecting their properties and that their small triangular pocket of lowland should be considered for commercial/industrial development as part of the Corridor Study.

It is appropriate that, as part of the final draft local area plan for the Corridor, a moratorium be placed on any further subdivision of properties in Grandview Heights, adjacent to the Corridor, until a detailed Neighbourhood Concept Plan is prepared for this area.

With respect to interface concerns between the business developments in the Corridor and the existing

large lot rural residential development to the east of the Corridor, **it is recommended that staff prepare a set of design guidelines for dealing with ensuring effective interface design between the Corridor lands and lands to the east of the Corridor, as part of the final draft land use plan**, for presentation at the next Public Open House. These guidelines will be focussed on mitigating impacts on existing development created by the development proposed within the Corridor.

Planning for Future Growth in South Surrey

The existing urban residential NCPs in the South Surrey area are rapidly being built out, as the residential housing market in South Surrey remains very active. Similarly, infill areas in Elgin and Ocean Park are also being rapidly absorbed. The Planning and Development Department is preparing the annual OCP review report that will be forwarded to Council in the next few weeks. It will provide an update on the status of each of the City's currently approved NCPs. It will also make recommendations to Council on actions that are considered necessary to ensure that planning is completed in a timely manner to ensure an on-going supply of urban residential land in South Surrey, to satisfy on-going market demands. The report will include specific discussion and recommendations regarding the timing of further planning for the South Grandview Heights area east of the current Corridor study area. It is anticipated that the development of an overall area structure plan for the entire Grandview Heights area will be recommended to Council and that will be followed with the preparation of a Neighbourhood Concept Plan for an area within Grandview Heights, based on the completed area structure plan. This is consistent with the Clayton process where an overall structure plan was prepared for the entire Clayton area followed by a Neighbourhood Concept Plan for East Clayton. The report on the OCP annual review will be forwarded to Council prior to the next Public Open House for the Corridor study. Any recommendations related to Grandview, that are adopted by Council as a result of the annual review of the OCP, will be presented to the public at the next Open House meeting for the Corridor study.

NEXT STEPS

Subject to Council's endorsement of the recommendations in this report, staff will move forward on the following elements of work to complete the Planning component of the Highway 99 Corridor Plan:

- Finalize a preferred land use plan for the Corridor;
- Present the preferred land use plan at a Public Open House to receive input from the public;
- Finalize design guidelines for the Corridor;
- Finalize the land use plan and related development policies; and
- Present the proposed land use plan, development policies and design guidelines for Council's consideration and approval.

The following items of work are required to complete the engineering servicing and financial strategy components of the Plan:

- Finalize major road network (arterial and major collector roads) improvements for the proposed land use plan and integrate these with the City's transportation and ten year servicing plans;

- Finalize the recommended storm water management plan for the proposed land use plan;
- Complete the modelling and conceptual layout of the water distribution network;
- Complete the conceptual layout of all sewer facilities including catchment boundaries and equivalent populations for each sewer; and
- Prepare a financing plan for the area including triggers for infrastructure improvements and financial impacts in five year intervals,

It is estimated that the balance of the plan preparation process for the Corridor will take approximately four months to complete, including one Open House to receive public input on the proposed final draft land use plan (Appendix VII).

CONCLUSION

Staff has, over the last several months, reviewed the main issues related to the preparation of a land use plan and servicing concept for the Corridor, as identified through the planning process and public consultation, to date. This report recommends an approach for addressing each issue and advises Council of the intended course of action to complete the planning process in a timely manner.

Original signed by

Murray Dinwoodie

General Manager,
Planning and Development

GF:saw

Attachments:

Appendix I - Corporate Report No. R137
Appendix II - 24 Avenue/160 Street Node
Appendix III - Land Use Plan Option Presented at May 2, 2002 Open House
Appendix IV - 24 Avenue Commercial Node
Appendix V - Grandview Heights OCP Land Use Designations
Appendix VI - Grandview Heights Community Groups
Appendix VII - Revised Timelines

APPENDIX II



APPENDIX III





APPENDIX IV



APPENDIX V

COMMUNITY GROUPS/ORGANIZATIONS FOR SMALL GROUP MEETINGS

- Fergus Creek Pocket Property Owners

- West Grandview Heights Residents' Association
- Grandview Heights Residents' Association
- Environmental Groups/Naturalists
- 24 Avenue West of Highway 99 Residents
- Developer/Business Representatives/Corridor Property Owners
- Other stakeholders, as required

APPENDIX VI



APPENDIX VII



Appendix "C"



Appendix "D"

Participating Stakeholder Groups

- Cranley Village Property Owners
- West Grandview Heights Residents' Association

- Fergus Creek Pocket Taxpayers' Association
- Grandview Heights Community Connection
- Grandview Heights Residents' Association
- 24 Avenue Developer Group

Appendix "E"

Appendix "F"

City of Surrey

***Grandview Heights/Hwy 99 Corridor
Stakeholder Group Meeting
24 Avenue Developers***

Planning & Development
Meeting Room #1
City Hall
14245 - 56 Avenue
Surrey, B.C.
THURSDAY, AUGUST 28, 2003
Time: 10:00 a.m.

Present:

Staff Present:

Darren Kwiatkowski – First Pro
 Michael Nygren – First Pro
 Glen Carlberg – Westfair
 Ken Anderson – Morgan Heights
 Marten Van Huizen – Field & Marten
 (Morgan Heights)
 Mike Jorden – Davidson Yuen Simpson Architects
 (Morgan Heights)

George Fujii – Planning & Development Department
 Megan James – Planning & Development Department
 Judy McLeod – Planning & Development Department
 Ken Zondervan – Engineering Department
 Robert Lee – Engineering Department

Introduction:

This group represents developers who have optioned land within the 24 Avenue commercial node and those who have optioned land adjacent to the 24 Avenue Highway 99 Corridor lands for the purposes of residential development. The focus of this meeting was to review and discuss the 24 Avenue commercial node and its proposed expansion by the commercial developers as well as the proposal to undertake a planning process for the lands generally between the Hydro right-of-way and 164 Street and between 28 Avenue and 20 Avenue, and how this process relates to the overall area structure plan process for Grandview Heights. The main issues discussed include:

- The servicing plan;
- Interchange levy;
- Land use plan; and
- Process.

Discussion of Issues:

Servicing of the additional lands:

- The Morgan Heights group presented an overview as to how they propose to service the additional lands as follows:
 - Their consulting engineer, Aplin & Martin has submitted servicing modeling to the City that proposes an interim sanitary solution for the additional lands.
 - The proposed interim solution makes a number of assumptions including:
 - All of the proposed commercial around 24 Avenue and all residential north of 24 Avenue will tie-in to the interim solution;
 - North Grandview Heights has been assumed as half-acre (RH) lots;
 - Morgan Heights proposal assumes 10 upa;
 - Commercial approximately .25 FAR.
 - Aplin & Martin has begun modeling the area south of 24 Avenue to determine if the 16 Avenue pump will have problems at build-out.
 - According to the developer, one of the community benefits of proceeding with a plan for the additional lands is that the DCC's generated through these projects, by permitting the interim, will contribute to the permanent sanitary solution for the area. It is understood that the interim solution would be a developer cost.
 - The Aplin & Martin solution is consistent with the Highway 99 solution for sanitary sewers.
 - The report is based on Surrey City criteria on real and proposed usage.
 - To service the larger Grandview Heights area, the interceptor would be needed and would be costly.
- Engineering staff noted that the interceptor would most likely have to be financed by a specified charge, as the DCC's will not cover the entire cost.
- Engineering staff will review the servicing report and get back to Aplin & Martin.
- The Morgan Heights group further noted that the size and topography of their proposed site lends itself well to on-site storm water detention that can also be turned into an amenity.

Interchange Levy:

- The commercial developer group provided commentary on the proposed interchange levy as follows:
 - The levy for primary beneficiaries, as presented at the April 24, 2003 Highway 99 Corridor Public Open House, of \$180,000/acre is a very “pricey” item.
 - They have determined that the interchange is not fundamental to them from a retail perspective and that the benefits of the ramps would actually be minimal as they see their main customer base coming west from the Semiahmoo Peninsula and not from neighbourhoods to the north and south.
 - They do require the doubling of 24 Avenue west to King George Highway.
 - Their transportation consultant, Trevor Ward, is completing a study analyzing how much traffic will be generated by the proposed commercial versus how much from the rest of the area with the addition of the interchange ramps. This is to determine how much traffic would be development driven and therefore how much they should be contributing towards the interchange.
 - Trevor Ward's study should be available shortly and will include impacts, phasing, and a financial model.
- Engineering staff explained that the costing of the interchange is just to the end of the ramps and does not include the twinning of 24 Avenue to King George Highway.
- Planning staff noted that the Trevor Ward study should also look at costing.
- The developer group stated there is a need for further discussion of the design and necessity of the ramps and feels that:
 - Using 160 Street as northbound on and off ramps could decrease costing by using the existing road network.
 - Having turning lanes at the 24 Avenue overpass with the ramps at that location would be more costly. 160 Street could also be an interim solution.
 - The land area is constrained around 24 Avenue and other options are under consideration.
 - The southbound on-ramp is most costly and the least important for them.
- Planning staff explained that the current interchange design is accommodated within the existing Highway 99 right-of-way.
- Engineering staff said that phasing possibilities and any rationale for City contribution for the interchange is being looked at.
- The developer group further noted that the current cost (\$180,000/acre) provides no benefit for the current owners to sell at this time.
 - If the cost is too high, the developer will pay less for the land.
 - This would result in a land cost similar or even less than what the property owners would get for their land right now.
 - To keep profit consistent, it is the land cost that will decrease.
 - Morgan Heights is a benefiting area and is willing to contribute.
 - The developer group as a whole is willing to pay their fair share to the cost of the interchange.
 - The developer group questioned whether DCC's could be used for the road portion of the interchange so that they are not hit twice.
 - Engineering staff stated that the DCC's don't cover basic roadwork for this project irrespective of the interchange.
 - None of this was anticipated even in the 10-year plan and as a result, there are no provisions for this within the DCC by-law.
 - The 24 Avenue upgrades could be added, most likely as a credit.
 - Costs will be shared on the interchange designs.

Land Use:

- First Pro noted the following issues with land use:
 - They would like to extend 1 lot width further north from the City's commercial designation.
 - Propose parking under the power lines.
 - If the commercial is extended 1 lot north, three large retailers can be accommodated. If drawn

where it is, the biggest building they could place in the surplus area is 60,000 sq. ft. with an area of undevelopable land.

- Other issues arise if commercial is not extended further north:
 - Access from 160 Street will result in access being in front of store entrance. This will result in traffic backing up onto 160 Street.
 - Other access option would re-route traffic next to residential to the north.
- With the commercial extended further north, there would be sufficient room for access off of 160 Street.
- Planning staff noted that it appears that by pushing the commercial north by one lot, a double fronting situation could exist with the remaining portion of land.
- Some concepts have been developed by the Morgan Heights group to create a suitable interface at this location of concern. The concept assumes ground-oriented housing here.
- First Pro is willing to show a concept for this portion in order to justify the extension of commercial further north.
- Planning staff advised that the pushing of the envelope for the commercial should be compared with the Urbanics study.
- First Pro is to provide a plan showing the expansion.
- The Westfair holdings have been extended further east:
 - This could be used to move the building further east or as a buffer.
- The Morgan Heights group explained that the interface can be planned by them working with the commercial developers now resulting in the residential being planned appropriately.
 - The commercial interface may include smaller neighbourhood commercial uses and possibly 2-sided buildings.
- With regards to the remaining commercial lands within the 24 Avenue centre currently not optioned, the developer group noted that they consist of a rising topography with a lot of small parcels with older houses. Possibly could be more service oriented commercial. Will have benefit of Highway 99 frontage.
 - Planning staff reminded the group of the importance of maintaining the green buffer along the highway.
- The developer group presented some pros and cons of locating commercial at 8 Avenue.
 - Pro is the existing interchange.
 - Cons include location is at the wrong end of the corridor and therefore takes the population south and away from where most of them live.
 - 24 Avenue is most central to the plan area and the population. Growth will occur in the north and east rather than in the south.

Process:

- The Highway 99 Corridor plan is intended to be taken to Council for approval later this year.
- The City will be meeting with various stakeholder groups over the next few weeks.

- October 7, 2003 will be a stakeholder workshop with all small stakeholder groups.
- Will likely meet with the public for one final open house before the plan is brought to Council.
- The Morgan Heights group suggested that by doing a comprehensive commercial and residential plan, the interfaces can be created effectively. They noted the following benefits:
 - Also allows for efficient project implementation in terms of infrastructure.
 - Makes sense from an economics point of view to place the big-ticket items together.
 - Ideal timeline for Morgan Heights to develop alongside the commercial development is to have a plan by spring of next year without compromising the implementation of the commercial developments.
- Staff noted the importance of undertaking a Grandview Heights overall structure plan prior to beginning further residential development in this area.



**City of
Surrey**

***Grandview
Heights/Hwy
99 Corridor
Stakeholder
Group
Meeting
Fergus Creek
Pocket
Taxpayers'
Association***

Planning &
Development
Meeting Room
#1
City Hall
14245 - 56
Avenue
Surrey, B.C.
**THURSDAY,
SEPTEMBER
4, 2003**
Time: 6:30
p.m.

Present:

Fred Hubbick
Joyce Gordon
Sharlene Lazin
Bob Arnason
Stan Bird
Wayne Dombroski

Staff Present:

George Fujii - Planning & Development Department
Megan James – Planning & Development Department
Judy McLeod – Planning & Development Department
Rémi Dubé – Engineering Department

Introduction:

The Fergus Creek Pocket Taxpayers' Association represents an area consisting of 44 properties generally located between Highway 99 and 160 Street to the west and the slope change to the east and between 24 Avenue to the north and 16 Avenue to the south. They describe their history as follows:

- This group has always been an entity (often called South Grandview Heights Residents' Association).
- The group mobilized after Council denied the 2001 'Cheema Application'. In November of 2001 the group asked

Council that they be involved in the planning process for the corridor. This was one of the factors that resulted in the Terms of Reference being created for the Grandview Heights/Highway 99 Corridor Local Area Plan.

- The Association members feel that although they were the catalyst, they have been left out of the plan area when the hydro lines became the barrier without consideration for topography. They feel that the topography of the pocket and surrounding areas creates a more logical and natural boundary for the Corridor.
- By being left out of the plan area, property owners have been left in limbo, as they are unsure as to how this will affect their land.

The main issues that were discussed include:

- Inclusion of Pocket East of Hydro ROW
- Availability of Services to the Pocket
- Watercourses South of 20 Avenue

Discussion of Issues:

Inclusion of Pocket East of Hydro ROW:

- The Association writes, “The properties on the east side of 164 Street, between 20 Avenue and 16 Avenue, and on both sides of 20 Avenue from the east boundary of the Hydro Right-of-Way to 164 Street, be given an ‘Urban’ designation as part of the Local Area Plan, and not delayed through the previously-noted moratorium on such designation for these properties.”
- The group feels that because of the natural topography this 44-acre area should be included in the Highway 99 Corridor Plan and that the boundary can be logically extended east to include these low lands. This would serve as a natural buffer rather than the arbitrary one of the Hydro lines.
- They stated that Council told them that there would be a plan for them within two years after the ‘Cheema Application’ was denied. The two years are almost up and not only is the plan not finished yet, they have also been excluded from the Corridor plan area.
- Planning staff explained that the Planning & Development Department is looking at an Area Structure Plan for the larger Grandview Heights area that they will be a part of.
- The Association members described that there are second growth trees along the high slope behind the pocket that continue down the slope into the backs of their properties that can serve as a buffer for the homes on the higher lands behind them.
- The group envisions that south of 20 Avenue the pocket be designated urban to provide a more realistic/meaningful buffer and transition area with an appropriate low-density multi-family residential use.
- The group would like to see an urban versus commercial designation due to their perception that upland residents would oppose commercial development so close to them.
- The group explained that the 164 Street pocket should be a transition area within the plan and not be left within the moratorium. If they are left out, they feel that they will be directly affected by the plan area and will face the construction and commercial. They fear that it will be very difficult for them to sell their properties to homebuyers, as this will become a very undesirable location.
- In response to an inquiry as to why the pocket has been excluded from the plan, Planning staff noted that the focus of the Corridor is on employment land uses and the inclusion of the pocket could be problematic with this focus.
- Commercial realtors have indicated to the Fergus Creek Pocket Taxpayers' Association that the only area of value within the Corridor for employment land uses is between 16 and 24 Avenues.
- Planning staff indicated that from the previous stakeholder meeting with the 24 Avenue developer groups, it was possible that this area could be included within the first NCP area in the Grandview Heights area, once the structure plan is underway.
- The group advised that they had not been included in any Morgan Heights plan shown to them to date.
- Planning staff noted that the Terms of Reference for the Grandview Heights structure plan is currently being drafted and will be forwarded to Council soon. An overview of the larger Grandview Heights area should be

gained first.

- The residential will not proceed immediately as it is Council's priority to get the employment generating development within the Corridor started first.

Availability of Services to the Pocket:

- The Association writes, "That properties on 20 Avenue (from the freeway to 164 Street) and on 164 Street (from 20 Avenue to 16 Avenue) have access to the same services as any developer in the area."
- The group members explained that because the entire pocket drains in a southwest direction they are the most affected by groundwater. The ground becomes water-logged, especially in the winter. Their septic tank systems are also failing. They would like to have this problem rectified now as a part of this plan otherwise they are afraid they will be left in limbo. They also expressed concern for further groundwater runoff and contamination.
- Engineering staff noted that large commercial developments usually pipe their own drainage and are required to have on-site treatment for pollutants. This would be the case for any industrial or commercial developments that may be approved.
- The group would not be satisfied being a part of the area structure plan since the pocket is within a different drainage system than the Morgan Heights properties. They explained that the pocket is also unique in that if not part of the Corridor plan they will become trapped between the Corridor and the uplands.
 - They feel that it all comes down to the sanitary sewer and whether there is capacity.
 - They would agree to phase their pocket within the corridor plan.
 - The question was raised, if they are not included within the corridor, can the pocket be included in the capacity of services so that it is available when they do develop?
- Planning staff indicated that the sanitary servicing of the corridor may be an interim solution and that the ultimate system could allow them to hook-in to the sanitary and the interim be abandoned.
- Engineering staff explained that it is not possible to do a clean swap of undeveloped commercial industrial with their residential development, should it happen first, as the residential demand on sanitary services is much higher than that of commercial/industrial.
- It is not anticipated that the area between 24 and 16 Avenues to be built-out before the ultimate system is built.

Watercourses South of 20 Avenue:

- The Association writes, "That the Planning & Development Department re-investigate the designation of certain 'watercourses' south of 20 Avenue (and some other sections), to recognize that they are man-made features (often dry), with little benefit to nutrient- or fish bearing creeks much further away."
- The group indicated that there are yellow-coded watercourses shown on some properties south of 20 Avenue that are actually ditches and described the following:
 - The Envirowest report indicates that they do not carry any value.
 - The ditch largely carries run-off from failing septic tanks in the winter.
 - They stated that having this area protected on the plan could be a concern to potential developers and should not be shown if it is of no value.
 - This artificial impediment to the marketability of these properties should be reinvestigated.
 - The ditches along 20 Avenue rarely carry any water, even in winters.

- Staff indicated that there may be options for watercourses of lower value to be traded-off with appropriate compensation during the development process. A very conservative approach has been taken with regards to the Preferred Land Use Option and that all red- and yellow-coded streams are shown with a 30-metre riparian setback. Staff is to check with Envirowest specifically on this watercourse discussed by the group.

Wrap-Up:

- There is some merit on developing the pocket.
- The main issue however, relates to the timing of this development.
- The group feels that they must be included now for fears of being left out in the end.
- Detailed minutes will be circulated for review and feedback.
- A package of all of the minutes from the series of stakeholder group meetings will be presented to each group prior to the community workshop.
- The community workshop is scheduled for October 7, 2003.
 - An outside facilitator will conduct the workshop.
 - Will include 2 or 3 members from each of the stakeholder groups.
 - Objective is to synthesize the materials together.
- After the workshop there will most likely be a final public open house to present the final plan to the public.
- It is anticipated that the final plan will be presented to Council before the end of this year.

City of Surrey

Grandview Heights/Hwy 99 Corridor Stakeholder Group Meeting Grandview Heights Area Community Connection

Planning &
Development
Meeting Room
#1
City Hall
14245 - 56
Avenue
Surrey, B.C.
**TUESDAY,
SEPTEMBER
9, 2003**
Time: 6:30
p.m.



Present:

David Riley
 Flemming Petersen
 Allen Aubert
 Janice Melody
 Anne Murray
 Caroline McCue-Davies
 Richard Bury

Staff Present:

George Fujii – Planning & Development Department
 Megan James – Planning & Development Department
 Judy McLeod – Planning & Development Department
 Carrie Baron – Engineering Department
 Jaime Boan – Engineering Department
 Ian Whyte – Envirowest Consultants Ltd.
 Libor Michalak – Envirowest Consultants Ltd.

Introduction:

Members of the Grandview Heights Community Connection are not geographically bound and consider themselves stewards of the land. They are looking at the bigger picture from a sustainable perspective. They are not against development but want to see first class development occur and make the City accountable for what is approved. The main issues that were discussed include:

- Planning Process
- Environmental Protection
- Land Use Classifications
- Traffic/Roads

Discussion of Issues:

Planning Process:

- The group outlined the key items that are critical to them for the planning process regardless of the ultimate configuration of the Corridor:
 - Natural Character
 - Refers to identity of place and natural heritage including air, land, and water resources.
 - As a result of this plan, the natural heritage is now being threatened and as a result residents are anxious about the outcome.
 - Community Use Values
 - The current level of land utilization within the area is low.
 - An increase in use will have its pros and cons.
 - Development should not disrupt the current accesses, uses, and ultimately the character of the area.
 - Transportation
 - Consideration needs to be given to accesses and egresses, circulation in and around the corridor, modes of transportation, and services and roads.
 - Noise & Pollution
 - The area is currently very quiet with little pollution.
 - The proposed development will result in noise, air, water, and light pollution.
 - Configuration of the Corridor
 - The current Hydro right-of-way is an illogical artificial boundary.
 - Logical rationale is needed to create a footprint for the area. This should be done through means of an area inventory.
 - These key issues, which they feel are presently absent, should serve as a measuring stick for whatever proposal is put forward for consideration. They stated that the plan should balance and use an environmental sustainability approach.
- The group is looking at the overall picture for something they can all be proud of. It should consist of first class developments with focus on the community wants and needs rather than those of the developers.
 - They stated the process has become controlled by the developers. If it is developer controlled, the result will be of low value and quality with nothing to be proud of. The City should call the shots and do it right from the start by starting development in the most environmentally sensitive area first in order to prove that it can be done right. A group member gave the example of Woodlands in Houston, Texas as an

example of a first class development they would like to see here.

- The group urged that the portion of developable land at 8 Avenue be developed right. Especially with the Olympics coming to Vancouver, this will serve as the gateway to not only Surrey but also to B.C. and Canada.
- Members expressed that what is missing from the process are criteria under which community interaction could be looked at for each application that will be submitted once the plan is completed.
 - They noted that there should be sustainability objectives for all resources that exist in the community.
- The group indicated that it is known that Council's agenda is focused on economic development and that this does not have to be the focus at the expense of other aspects of our community as follows:
 - Traditionally economy, environment and social aspects are measured separately without consideration for the others.
 - A sustainable approach looks at all three aspects and how the boundaries of the three are respected and how they integrate. In order for this plan to result in a first class development this must be done.
- Planning staff explained that the plan options to date have balanced these three aspects as much as possible.
 - The challenge lies in balancing environmental and social aspects with economic objectives.
- The group responded that by determining the study area first and then discovering that half of it is not developable, the approach is backwards.
 - They feel that the equation should begin by stating how much land is needed for development rather than by taking on an arbitrary strip and noted that if this was done and the current boundary erased, it would probably take on a different shape.
- Planning staff noted that the City did have an economic study done to determine how much land could be allocated for different land uses.

Environment Protection:

- Envirowest Consultants Ltd. has looked at fisheries and wildlife habitat to identify lands within the Corridor that should be preserved to protect environmental values.
- Group members are very concerned with the area's wildlife and expressed the following:
 - They explained that there are few natural areas left within the watershed and that there is tremendous bio-diversity within the area.
 - Boundary Bay has been designated the most valuable area in Canada for bird habitat and is recognized internationally.
 - They want habitat corridors to be viewed as an asset and be protected as other areas are protected for their architectural or historical values.
 - Protecting the habitat, they feel, will make it an attractive place to live and visit with resulting economic benefits as well.
 - The group stated that more open space is needed and that Surrey should be gutsier with open space requirements. The example of Denmark requiring developments to dedicate 25% green space within the most environmentally valuable lands was given. This is required for all developments, not just residential.
 - They are not demanding that the entire area be made park.
- Planning staff explained that there are many ways to show green space preservation on the plan and that a key consideration is protecting private property rights. The watercourses on the current plan have been protected using the Ministry of Water Land and Air Protection's standards of 30-metre riparian setbacks from the top of bank of all red- and yellow-coded creeks.
- The group expressed the need for a storm water management plan with a set of over-arching storm water management principles and stated that Fergus Creek will have problems if any water is directed there.
- Engineering staff indicated that a more detailed plan is currently under review. As the land use decisions are revised, the storm water management plan also has to be revised.

- Envirowest Consultants Ltd. gave a brief synopsis of the work they have done to date:
 - The environmental protection areas shown on the current plan are based on fish habitat
 - The Department of Fisheries and Oceans is on board to support a habitat strategy. The red-coded creeks will be protected and the yellow-coded creeks are proposed to be either retained or eliminated with compensation given elsewhere. This compensation could be utilized to enhance the Fergus Creek corridor.
 - The Envirowest report within the packages sent out for this meeting were draft form and included only principles, not hard and fast recommendations.
 - The next step is to produce a plan for wildlife habitat corridors.
 - In order to discuss this new information before the community workshop, a follow-up session can be arranged.
 - In order to come to an agreement on wildlife habitat, it must be decided what should be protected. The most logical means of protection is to focus on biodiversity and threatened and endangered species protection.
 - The red-coded streams along Highway 99 and the required setbacks, will mean that the tree buffer will remain.
- The group expressed that in order for the undevelopable land owners to benefit from development, the developable areas need to be densified with a density transfer to the owners of undevelopable land. The successes of the densification of Tsawwassen centre to preserve agricultural land was given as an example.

Land Use Classifications:

- The group indicated some concern with various land use issues including:
 - The sample photos shown at the open houses did not include representative images of large format retail or light industry.
 - There is also a fear that the design review process will be streamlined similar to that proposed for Campbell Heights.
 - The Light Industrial designation is inappropriate for the most environmentally sensitive lands south of 16 Avenue.
 - The light industrial uses permitted under the IL Zone are not suitable within this sensitive area. Business Park or even large format retail could be done in this area.
- Planning staff explained that the rationale behind the Business Park/Light Industrial designation was to provide flexibility within the land uses. The intent of this designation within the environmentally sensitive areas was to develop higher tech/business park uses. The labeling of the designation will be revisited.

Traffic/Roads:

- The group noted concerns with the traffic that will be generated by the proposed commercial development and noted the following:
 - The traffic on King George Highway and 24 Avenue is already causing bottlenecks.
 - There does not appear to be any place to put an interchange at 24 Avenue.

- The City will be meeting with the Cranley Village property owners group to discuss their concerns with the proposed interchange as a part of this stakeholder group process.
- Engineering staff explained that the interchange design is to be accommodated entirely within the existing road right-of-way.
 - The interchange is a special single-point design.
 - 24 Avenue will also be upgraded to 5 lanes from King George Highway.
- A concern was also raised by the group as to how much traffic will actually increase.
- Engineering staff explained that to date, general numbers can be given based on land use.
 - For example, (numbers subject to change as information changes) 24 Avenue at 160 Street traffic levels are currently at 1,000 – 1,200 vehicles per hour in peak hours. With corridor build-out and development of Campbell Heights, year 2021, it is estimated that there will be approximately 4,400 vehicles per hour in peak hours at that same intersection. This assumes growth within the larger Grandview Heights area as well. The Highway 99 Corridor will contribute to approximately 30 – 40% of the traffic at that time.
- The City is also currently evaluating the merits of completing the 32 Avenue/152 Street improvements versus the interchange at 24 Avenue at Highway 99.
- The group stated that the community is concerned that the interchange location is dependent upon where developers want it.
 - Engineering staff noted that the City evaluated the potential of locating the interchange at 24 Avenue or 16 Avenue as well as the developer levy for the interchange. This information was used at the last public open house to generate feedback on these options from the public.
- A group member questioned the need for a new interchange and the effects it will have on existing roads when the existing highways can handle the proposed volumes and stated that the interchange is not needed to direct people to the commercial as they will find a way to get there without it.
- Engineering staff noted that the interchange is not required until beyond 2021 for background traffic. The primary purpose of it for the shorter term is to provide access to the commercial node. However, the economic study prepared for the City indicated that the absorption rate for the Corridor lands would be accelerated with a new interchange.
- Engineering staff explained that Highway 99 traffic will also increase in volume and plans are also in works to eventually add more lanes to it in the future. 24 Avenue has always been planned as a 5-lane arterial.
- The group noted that the mayor had said large parking lots as at Guildford would not be constructed. They are concerned that this proposal is exactly the same concept.

Summary/What's Next:

- Following the stakeholder meetings there will be a facilitated community workshop on October 7, 2003 with 2 or 3 representatives from each of the stakeholder groups.
- The group has requested that a number of materials are available at the next meeting including:
 - An aerial photo of the area is needed.
 - An overlay of the Envirowest materials on the corridor plan showing the environmental values of the area.

- A land use review should be conducted to determine what uses are most appropriate in each area and whether or not the footprint should change.
- Planning staff explained that additional footprint changes are constrained by a couple of issues including:
 - i. The servicing capacity is limited.
 - The group noted that this should not be a factor as engineering solutions can always be solved. This should not dictate where development occurs.
 - ii. The servicing constraints cannot be ignored though. The other issue is that the objective is to bring the plan to Council for final consideration by the end of this year.
 - The group feels that their concerns cannot be addressed in this short time.
- To summarize the meeting, the key issues are to identify the natural heritage aspects of the area and work them into the final plan by:
 - Identifying areas to be set aside;
 - Looking at a finer grain of land use for the environmentally sensitive areas south of 16 Avenue;
 - Get away from supporting the traditional shopping centre mold;
 - Research density increases in exchange for environmental protection;
 - Prohibit the creation of a highway commercial strip and rather create a gateway into Surrey and Canada;
 - For the workshop, materials should be synthesized to facilitate better discussion.

City of Surrey

Grandview Heights/Hwy 99 Corridor Stakeholder Group Meeting Grandview Heights Residents' Association

Planning &
Development
Meeting Room
#1
City Hall
14245 - 56
Avenue
Surrey, B.C.
**WEDNESDAY,
SEPTEMBER
10, 2003**
Time: 6:30
p.m.

Present:

David Sellars
Wendy Sellars
Ken Hall
Doug Field

Staff Present:

George Fujii - Planning & Development Department
Megan James - Planning & Development Department
Judy McLeod - Planning & Development Department
Rémi Dubé - Engineering Department

Introduction:

The Grandview Heights Residents' Association represents property owners within the larger Grandview Heights area south of 32 Avenue to 16 Avenue and east of Highway 99 to 176 Street. The main issues that were discussed include:

- Planning Process
- Buffer Concerns
- Structure Plan
- Interchange
- Truck Route/Campbell Heights
- Facilitated Meeting

Discussion of Issues:

Planning Process:

- The group began by explaining their concerns with the planning process to date as follows:
- After the plan options were presented at the second open house, they expected the preferred plan option from the third open house to reflect the previous options. They felt that the preferred option presented did not resemble the options presented at the second open house.
- They questioned how the preferred plan option came about as it does not seem to be the result of public input.
- Planning staff noted that a lot of feedback was received from the three options and that the current preferred plan option is a hybrid of the three options and input.
- As a result of the input received on the three options, a report was written to Council.
- A number of issues were identified at the last open house where the preferred plan option was presented, and as a result Council has asked for additional community input into the process. These stakeholder meetings are being held in response to that concern.
- With regards to the phasing issue, many comments were received. It was determined that the most environmentally significant portion of the corridor should not be the focus of development. Developer interest around 24 Avenue was also an influence.
- Input from various stakeholders resulted in the current preferred plan option.
- The group expressed their frustrations with the eastern encroachment of the commercial node past the Hydro right-of-way.
- They noted that in the first two open houses the importance of the Hydro right-of-way as a buffer was always discussed and that the extent of the commercial area shown on the preferred plan option was never discussed with the public prior to the preferred option being developed.
- They questioned why the commercial area was being expanded when there is a moratorium on subdivisions required for all lands outside of the Corridor Plan.
- The group feels that because the expansion of the commercial node was never discussed with the public, and the Hydro right-of-way is no longer a buffer in this area, their trust in the process has been breached. They fear sprawl with this encroachment of the commercial node at 24 Avenue.
- Planning staff explained that:
- Council has not approved the commercial expansion but it has become part of the preferred plan option for community input and discussion at this point.
- There are a number of interests that need to be balanced as other area residents are in support of the expanded commercial area.
- Throughout the planning process the Hydro right-of-way has been the major focus as a buffer.

Buffer Concerns:

- Within the preferred plan option there is concern within the group as to how the buffer will now work around the expanded commercial node at 24 Avenue.
- Planning staff explained that within the Official Community Plan (OCP) Council has identified Grandview Heights as a future Urban area. The node at 24 Avenue picks up on this. Around the commercial node there will be consideration of how the transition to residential uses will be made, possibly with higher densities around the node, that transitions to larger lots to the east.
- Roads may serve as additional buffers.
- The design guidelines being developed will include appropriate landscape buffers. The Development Permit guidelines within the OCP currently require a minimum 6 metres of landscape buffering adjacent to residential uses.
- There will be an opportunity to provide residential transitions with the first Neighbourhood Concept Plan (NCP) after the area structure plan is completed.
- One additional solution could be a broader green edge around the commercial node regardless of whether it encroaches over the Hydro right-of-way or not.
- The group expressed that many of their buffer concerns would be addressed if the commercial node was not to extend past the Hydro right-of-way. They would prefer it if the buffer could remain at the Hydro right-of-way and that the transition be left for the structure plan that they would be a part of.

Structure Plan:

- Planning staff explained that the area structure plan for Grandview Heights was introduced earlier this year by Council with the OCP Annual Review. Council now wishes to look at the larger area plan in order to determine what should happen to the lands east of the Corridor Plan.
- The group questioned whether the structure plan would proceed before any further planning is done east of the Corridor Plan.
- Staff indicated that the current direction is to proceed with the structure plan first and that the area around the commercial to the east will be the boundary subject to the structure plan. It was also noted that there is still interest from the developer group in proceeding with the NCP.
- The group expressed that they feel it is essential for the structure plan to proceed prior to any NCPs proceeding in order to avoid urban sprawl.
- When asked as to the sanitary sewer availability within the timeline, Engineering staff indicated that the ultimate servicing for the area would be via the interceptor sewer. This interceptor is not required for the commercial node as it can be piped west or south. There is also a potential interim tie-in to the Morgan Creek system at developer cost being proposed by developers to the east of the Corridor that the commercial node could also potentially use.

Interchange:

- With regards to the interchange design, the group asked how the geometry would work with the newly constructed Cranley Village right next to it just west of Highway 99 and how it would be paid for.
- Staff indicated that the interchange is being designed as a full single-point design to be accommodated entirely within the existing road right-of-way.
 - The design could include noise attenuation walls to lessen the impact on Cranley Village west of Highway 99.
 - The interchange construction is still based on user-pay as presented at the last public open house.

- There has also been some discussion on phasing of the interchange as well as who is benefiting and who should pay.
- It has never been discussed that the City would pay for the interchange.

Truck Route/Campbell Heights:

- The group expressed concerns that 24 Avenue was indicated as a potential truck route as part of the Corridor Plan.
- With the interchange at 24 Avenue, the group feels that the truck route is more likely to be located on 24 Avenue as it connects directly to Campbell Heights. The group expressed its strong opposition to 24 Avenue being used as a truck route.
- Staff explained that 32 Avenue still has its merits as a truck route. The Campbell Heights plan is also significantly more accelerated than the interchange at 24 Avenue. As a result the Campbell Heights Group is looking to have the 32 Avenue truck route reinstated after this year. That group is not relying on this 24 Avenue proposal to make their development viable.

Facilitated Meeting:

- The group questioned the value of the facilitated community workshop on October 7 due to the following reasons:
 - There will be too many different agendas for anything to be resolved.
 - They are already well aware of the other groups' points of view.
 - The agenda of those wanting to sell their land and leave is totally different than their agenda as they are planning to stay.
- Staff noted that the intent is to have the different groups hear various views and the objective will be to achieve consensus wherever possible.
- An information package, including minutes from all of the stakeholder meetings, will be sent to each group a week prior to the workshop.

**City of
Surrey**

***Grandview
Heights/Hwy
99 Corridor
Stakeholder
Group
Meeting***

Planning &
Development
Meeting Room
#1
City Hall
14245 - 56
Avenue
Surrey, B.C.
**THURSDAY,
SEPTEMBER
11, 2003**
Time: 6:30
p.m.



West Grandview Heights Residents' Association

Present:

Gary Scott
Paul Kim
Roy Stack
Rita Krause
Gerhard Krause
David McCue
Gordon Cameron
Albert Svab
Tak Yamaura
Len Sigurdson

Staff Present:

George Fujii - Planning & Development Department
Megan James - Planning & Development Department
Wendy Whelen - Planning & Development Department
Carrie Baron - Engineering Department

Introduction:

The West Grandview Heights Residents' Association represents properties extending from 20 Avenue north to 28 Avenue and from Highway 99 east to 164 Street including several associate members within the larger Grandview Heights area. This group supports the Highway 99 Corridor Plan. The group advised that over the last seven years it has began organizing support from area residents who are interested in bringing sewer to the area. Over the past six months the group has been working with the Morgan Heights developer group to develop a concept plan for their properties. The following issues were discussed:

- Interface for the Commercial Node
- Grandview Heights Area Structure Plan
- Fergus Creek Pocket
- Timing of the Corridor Plan
- Truck Routes
- 24 Avenue Interchange
- Environment
- Community Workshop.

Discussion of Issues:

An Urban Residential Interface for the 24 Avenue Commercial Node:

- The group described how the development of their properties as proposed by the Morgan Heights developer group could provide as an effective interface to the commercial node at 24 Avenue as follows:
 - A preliminary concept plan has been prepared to illustrate how their properties can become the interface between the proposed commercial and existing suburban lots to the east. This plan includes the Fergus Creek Pocket.
 - Their plan is to buffer the commercial node with medium density housing (townhousing) followed by small lots, conventional urban lots and larger lots adjacent to existing one-acre lots. The intent is to create important housing options that the developer group believes are needed in the area.
 - They feel that this urban development will provide the population to support the commercial node.
- The group explained that they support the expansion of the commercial node beyond the Hydro right-of-way, within limitations, so as to provide sufficient land to make it economically viable for the commercial developers.

They feel that the Morgan Heights group has come up with a plan, with their Association's input, that would serve as an effective and attractive buffering solution.

- If the group does not develop their land to become the buffer and transition, they will be the most directly affected by the commercial development.

Grandview Heights Area Structure Plan:

- It was noted by Planning staff that the Grandview Heights Residents' Association (GHRA) has indicated that they want the structure plan done before any neighbourhood concept plans (NCP) are begun.
- The group responded by stating that they are the area in between the Corridor plan and the larger Grandview Heights area to the east. They reiterated that they can serve as the buffer and land use transition for the Corridor and as such, planning for their neighbourhood should come before or alongside the area structure plan.
- The group explained that it would like the GHRA to be a part of the planning process for their NCP with the understanding that the GHRA would be far less affected, while the WGHRA are immediately impacted, especially with properties bordering the commercial node.
- The group does not want to wait 2-3 years before their NCP process begins, as they indicated that their properties are most affected by development of the Corridor around 24 Avenue. They do not want to be placed on hold and be adversely affected by the commercial development. They stated that with verifiable support coming from the vast majority of property owners within their boundaries, owning over 90% of the land area, they feel their properties would be the most logical area for the first NCP.
- Group members indicated that many of them intend to stay in the area either by leaving remnant parcels on their properties to live on or by buying urban lots once they are developed. They indicated that they, and their voting age children, intend to stay in the community and that they do have a long term commitment to it. Many older people in the community would stay if more housing options were available to them. The group feels that urban development of the land can provide more housing options.
- The group requested that the planning process for lands immediately east of the Corridor should be accelerated as they have many properties in support of the NCP process. They would ideally like to see an NCP completed within a year.
- Planning staff indicated that typically NCP areas (elementary school catchment areas) have a population of approximately 6,000 residents.
- Planning staff asked the group to respond to the idea that planning for the NCP would pre-empt the larger structure plan.
 - Group members responded that it is not a pre-emption but that it is providing an immediate buffer and transition area to the existing suburban lands. They feel that the NCP would ensure servicing, parks, linear pathways and other amenities for the area and would facilitate future planning in other areas of Grandview Heights. They also feel that options are not being taken away from the structure plan by proceeding with the NCP but rather it is making future land uses possible.
- Planning staff noted further concerns that planning for the NCP before the structure plan would eliminate other options for the area around the commercial node.
 - The group feels that this should not be a problem because their members are both inside the Corridor and immediately surrounding the commercial node from all directions. However they welcome the dialogue from others to determine what the most appropriate land uses would be. The group expressed a fear of the process being delayed by groups living outside of their West Grandview Heights boundaries who want to keep the area as it is.
- Planning staff explained that the Terms of Reference for the Grandview Heights Structure Plan will be presented to Council later this month or in early October. It was again noted by staff that the initial intent was to do the general structure plan first. Planning agreed to consider the WGHRA's proposal in developing the area structure plan Terms of Reference report.

Fergus Creek Pocket:

- Staff summarized the Fergus Creek Pocket Taxpayers' Association's (FCPTA) concerns with not being a part of the Corridor Plan and their fears of being left behind if not included now.

- The group indicated that they realize that this is the FCPTA's position and their inability to get servicing immediately. They feel there is still a benefit in that by being part of the NCP process the FCPTA will influence the future.
- In response to a question as to how the location of pump stations are decided, Engineering staff explained that approximate locations have been identified and that more detailed analysis will be undertaken to determine specific locations.

Timing of the Corridor Plan:

- The group stated that they came to this meeting to show support for the Corridor Plan going forward and being approved by Council before the end of this year.

Truck Routes:

- With regards to 24 Avenue being a potential truck route, the group feels that in order to be fair, 16, 24, and 32 Avenues should all be designated truck routes for the whole area to provide choices.

24 Avenue Interchange:

- The group feels that the two critical movements for the interchange are the southbound off-ramp and the northbound on-ramp and that the least important movement is the southbound on-ramp.
- Staff indicated that the City is looking into phasing and financing options for the interchange. Fundamentally however, it was explained by staff that the new interchange will be developer funded. It is hopeful that there will be more definitive answers by the October 7 workshop.
- The group indicated that in their opinion, the interchange should be contributed to proportionally by jurisdiction (City and Province) and by those developments that generate traffic.
- In terms of jurisdiction, Staff indicated that there is no money available from the City or Province to fund this interchange.

Environment:

- A concern was brought forward by the group regarding the creeks shown on the plan. They noted that the creeks on the driving range are actually ditches with grass and little or no water in them. It was suggested by the group that compensation should be given in and around Fergus Creek where protection really matters.
- Planning staff explained that in protecting watercourses a very conservative approach was taken for this plan. All yellow- and red-coded creeks were given a 30-metre riparian setback as per Provincial policy. There will be opportunities to discuss compensation elsewhere, such as Fergus Creek, with the appropriate agencies.

Community Workshop:

- The group offered to meeting with the GHRA prior to the community workshop in hopes of discussing issues outside of the Corridor Plan in order to keep the focus of the workshop on the Corridor Plan.
- Planning staff indicated that they would contact members of the GHRA to determine if they would be

willing to do so. It was stated that the GHRA is prepared to go through a planning process for the Grandview Heights area but that they are struggling with the timing of the group's West Grandview Heights NCP proposal versus the timing for the larger structure planning process.

- Planning staff will request the workshop facilitator to keep the focus of discussions on the Corridor Plan.

Wrap-up:

- To summarize, the group is in support of the Corridor Plan initiatives and are willing to pay their fair share of the interchange at 24 Avenue.
- Detailed minutes will be circulated for review and feedback.
- A package of all of the minutes from the series of stakeholder group meetings will be presented to each group prior to the community workshop.
- The community workshop is scheduled for October 7, 2003.
 - A professional facilitator will conduct the workshop.
 - Will include 2 or 3 members from each of the stakeholder groups.
 - Objective is to synthesize the materials and address concerns.
- After the workshop there will most likely be a final public open house to present the final plan to the public.
- It is anticipated that the final plan will be presented to Council before the end of this year.

City of Surrey

Grandview Heights/Hwy 99 Corridor Stakeholder Group Meeting Cranley Village Property Owners

Planning &
Development
Meeting Room
#1
City Hall
14245 - 56
Avenue
Surrey, B.C.
**TUESDAY,
SEPTEMBER
16, 2003**
Time: 6:30
p.m.

Present:

Darryl Wong

Staff Present:

George Fujii – Planning & Development Department

Evelyn Wong
Linda Prevost
Anne Denness
Garry Mandau
Sally Keasler
Dave Keasler

Megan James – Planning & Development Department
Jaime Boan – Engineering Department

Introduction:

This group represents the 18 homes located within the Cranley Village development south of 24 Avenue to Cranley Drive and east of 157A Street to Highway 99. The group's major issues/concerns discussed at the meeting include:

- Proposed interchange and upgrading of 24 Avenue
- Buffering of the Corridor from the Highway
- Truck Route on 24 Avenue

Discussion of Issues:

Proposed 24 Avenue Interchange and Upgrades:

- Engineering staff gave a quick overview of the interchange design
 - The interchange is a special design called a single-point interchange.
 - 24 Avenue is an arterial road that will also be upgraded to a 5-lane divided road from King George Highway to 160 Street.
 - It is currently proposed that 157 Street at 24 Avenue will then become right-in and right-out only. The City is currently discussing the construction of a road through to 156 Street and then signaling 156 Street at 24 Avenue to facilitate left turns. Due to the close proximity of the proposed signalized intersection at the interchange, the City would not support signaling the intersection of 157 Street and 24 Avenue.
- The group wanted to know why these works were required, particularly the upgrading of 24 Avenue, when the same people would be using them in the end.
 - Staff explained that these upgrades were required in anticipation of not only the Corridor development at 24 Avenue but also future development in Grandview Heights and development of Campbell Heights.
- The group also noted that 24 Avenue upgrading is needed from the King George Highway intersection to 160 Street in order to address the back-ups created there.
- The owners are extremely concerned with the proximity of the proposed ramps to the existing property lines and houses within Cranley Village.
- The group expressed concern with phasing of the interchange and 24 Avenue upgrades.
 - They feel that with phasing the construction process will drag out. They would rather have any interchange built all at once so that the construction would not disrupt their lives over a longer time period. They are concerned that phasing would also leave them unable to sell their homes, due to uncertainties for potential buyers. They would much rather have a well designed noise attenuation wall built right away than leaving it for additional phases.
 - They also expressed that the elevation of 24 Avenue is well above that of Cranley Village and that some form of protection barrier should be installed once construction begins on either the interchange or 24 Avenue.
- Engineering staff explained possible staging with the 5-lane upgrading and ramps at the north portion of the interchange occurring within the next 2-3 years.
- The group noted that it is the southbound on-ramp that will have the largest impact on Cranley Village. They also stated that headlights from the southbound off-ramp will have an effect on them.
 - Engineering staff indicated that headlight impacts could be addressed through the detailed interchange design.

- From this group's perspective, the major issues with any future interchange are the resulting noise, lights, possible crime from loiterers at the commercial node, and pollution.
- The group also expressed that the dust, noise, and cracking from the construction of the interchange is a great concern.
- The group pointed out that the Preferred Plan Option presented at the April 24 Open House showed two interchange options with one option at 24 Avenue and the other at 16 Avenue. The group questioned why 16 Avenue was not chosen as the preferred option.
 - Staff explained that there were constraints with locating the interchange at 16 Avenue including:
 - That location has multiple environmental sensitivities.
 - There is a lot more ALR lands around 16 Avenue resulting in less development potential while 24 Avenue has much more longer term development potential.
- Engineering staff stated that the City is currently evaluating the phasing option of the interchange as well as the viability of finishing the 152 Street and 32 Avenue interchange versus the 24 Avenue interchange.
- The group expressed that in their opinion, the money for the 24 Avenue interchange should be used to complete the 152 Street and 32 Avenue interchange, which could then accommodate the traffic increases for the area.
- Engineering staff noted possible options to decrease the impacts of an interchange on Cranley Village properties.
 - One option would be to shift the widening of the highway over to the east side of the highway. It was acknowledged that it is very unlikely that the Ministry of Transportation would support this option.
 - There are also options including sound attenuation and headlight attenuation to decrease impacts.
- The group provided some options or solutions that they feel would lessen some of the impacts on them:
 - Their first preference is that the interchange is not built at all.
 - They expressed that even if only 24 Avenue is upgraded and no interchange is built they would like to have noise attenuation walls built around the northeast corner of the site.
 - Engineering staff indicated that this solution could be very expensive.
 - If the interchange were to be constructed, the preferred group's preferred option would be that the southern ramps (northbound off-ramp and southbound on-ramp) were not built and only a half interchange be built with just the northbound on-ramp and southbound off-ramp
 - If the entire interchange must be constructed, they would like to see it built without phasing as discussed above.
 - Although it has been indicated that the City would not provide any compensation to them the group questioned whether the developers would be willing to do so.
- Engineering staff noted that with major roadworks there is some public consultation with properties directly affected in order to determine issues and solutions at that time.
- Planning staff indicated that the group will be placed on the pre-notification list as a community group for any future development applications around the proposed 24 Avenue commercial node.

Buffering of the Corridor:

- Staff explained that there would be a buffer from the proposed commercial at 24 Avenue and their properties.
 - The highway will serve as one buffer.
 - There will also be a 'green edge' between the highway and the proposed commercial so that the commercial development does not front directly on the highway without a buffer.
- The group does not consider the highway as a buffer and feels that further details are needed as to what the 'green edge' will be.

Truck Route on 24 Avenue:

- The group expressed concerns over potential noise and pollution if 24 Avenue is to be designated a truck route.
- Staff noted that if 24 Avenue was made a truck route the current proposal would be to designate it as such from Highway 99 east to Campbell Heights.

Next Steps:

- Detailed minutes will be circulated for review and feedback.
- A package of all of the minutes from the series of stakeholder group meetings will be presented to each group prior to the community workshop.
- The community workshop is scheduled for October 7, 2003.
 - An outside facilitator will conduct the workshop.
 - Will include 2 or 3 members from each of the stakeholder groups.
 - Objective is to synthesize the materials together.
- After the workshop there will most likely be a final public open house to present the final plan to the public.
- It is anticipated that the final plan will be presented to Council before the end of this year.

Appendix "G"







































Appendix "H"



Appendix "I"











Appendix "J"



Appendix "K"



v:\wp-docs\planning\03data\oct-dec\10210912.gf.doc
SAW 10/27/03 10:17 AM