## REGULAR COUNCIL - LAND USE

TO: Mayor \& Council

FROM: General Manager, Engineering

DATE: July 20, 2011
FILE: 7911-0075-00

SUBJECT: Development Application No. 7911-0075-oo - Rezoning and Development Permit for High Rise Residential Project at 13286 and 13300 - 104 Avenue Hydronic Heating System for Future Connection to a District Heating System

## RECOMMENDATION

The Engineering Department recommends that Council:

1. Receive this report as information; and
2. Approve the process that is outlined in this report as an additional requirement that is to be satisfied in advance of final adoption of Rezoning By-law No. 17460 related to Development Application No. 7911-0075-oo for the lots at 13286 and 13300-104 Avenue.

## INTENT

The purpose of this report is to advise Council about progress that staff has made in relation to addressing the matter of having a hydronic heating and hot water system installed as part of the high rise residential development project proposed under Development Application No. 7911-0075-00 for the site located at 13286 and 13300-104 Avenue. Such a system will facilitate the future connection of the project to a district energy system when it is available to the site.

During its consideration of the subject application at the Regular Council - Land Use meeting on July 11, 2011, Council resolved:
"That staff work with the applicant to address the challenges standing in the way of the project being designed and constructed so as to allow its future connection to the City Centre District Energy System and provide a report back to Council on the matter."

## BACKGROUND

At the Regular Council - Land Use meeting on July 11, 2011, Council considered a Planning Report on the subject application, a copy of which is attached as Appendix I. Included in the report was a summary of efforts made by staff up to that date to convince the applicant to design and implement a hydronic heating system as part of the proposed high rise residential development.

Council raised concerns that adequate efforts had not been made by the applicant to establish the viability of such a system for the development. Council indicated that staff should work with the applicant to further investigate the viability of district energy for the project, to discuss the incentives that may be available to the developer for the project with a view to easing the cost burden that such a system may place on the project and to report back to Council on the outcomes.

The subject development application is scheduled for Public Hearing at the July 25, 2011 Regular Council - Public Hearing meeting.

## DISCUSSION

Since the July 11, 2011 Council meeting, staff has worked with the applicant to further review the question of designing and implementing a hydronic heating and hot water system in the proposed 450 -unit project that will allow its connection to a district energy system in the future.

The applicant has expressed concern that the installation of such a system would significantly increase the capital cost of the project in comparison to the system that is currently proposed, being electric baseboard heaters. However, as district energy provides benefits for the development's future occupants, staff is of the opinion that it is reasonable for the applicant to make further efforts toward establishing the feasibility of installing a hydronic heating and hot water system as part of the project.

Since the above-referenced Council meeting, the applicant has agreed to provide an estimate to the City of the cost to design a hydronic heating and hot water system as part of the development, for the purpose of allowing the City an opportunity to decide whether to assist in funding the actual design of such an alternative system. When that design estimate is received from the applicant and subject to the estimate being considered reasonable, staff will approve funding to support the applicant's consultants undertaking such a design. When the design is completed, staff will engage a qualified cost consultant to estimate the difference in the cost of installing the hydronic system in the project in comparison to an electric baseboard system. Staff will then use this estimate of the cost difference to work on developing a business case with the applicant to have them proceed with the installation of a hydronic heating and hot water system as part of the project and to develop incentives, if necessary, to assist in achieving such an outcome; for example, the City's district energy utility becoming a funding partner with the applicant to install a hydronic system in the building with recovery of the utility's investment to be achieved through the monthly energy invoices that would be paid by the future owners of the individual units in the project.

The applicant is agreeable to the above-described process. Staff will provide a report to Council regarding the outcome of this process in the early fall of this year complete with recommendations, prior to the Rezoning By-law related to the subject development application being forwarded to Council for consideration of final adoption.

The investment that the City is making in this process is considered to be a reasonable use of funds in that it will result in an expanded base of information for staff to use in relation to the effective implementation of a district energy system in the City Centre area.

## City Centre Economic Investment Zone Incentives

During its deliberations on July 11, 2011 regarding the subject application, Council questioned the applicant as to whether he had taken into account in the pro forma for the project the incentives that are available to the project under the City's Economic Investment Action Plan. Although the applicant was not able to answer the question at that time, staff has since learned that the applicant had already taken into account the subject incentives in relation to the project.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the above discussion, the Engineering Department recommends that Council approve the process that is outlined in this report as an additional requirement that is to be satisfied in advance of consideration of final adoption of Rezoning By-law No. 17460 related to Development Application No. 7911-0075-oo for the lots at 13286 and 13300-104 Avenue.

Vincent Lalonde, P.Eng.
General Manager, Engineering
VL/JA/JO/JR/brb
Appendix I - Planning and Development Report Related to Application No. 7911-0075-oo
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## APPENDIX I



## RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY

- By-law Introduction and set date for Public Hearing for Rezoning.
- Approval to reduce indoor amenity space.
- Approval to draft Development Permit.


## DEVIATION FROM PLANS, POLICIES OR REGULATIONS

- None.


## RATIONALE OF RECOMMENDATION

- The proposed development complies with the High Rise 5.5 FAR (floor area ratio) designation in the Surrey City Centre Plan Update - Phase II, Stage I Land Use and Density Concept.
- The proposed development supports the intent of the Surrey City Centre Plan to encourage high-rise, high density development near SkyTrain routes. The proposed development is within 400 metres $(1 / 4$ mile) of a SkyTrain Station.
- The area will become a higher density residential hub that will be complementary to the City of Surrey Civic Centre to the east.


## RECOMMENDATION

The Planning \& Development Department recommends that:

1. a By-law be introduced to rezone the subject site from Single Family Residential Zone (RF) (Bylaw No. 12000) to Comprehensive Development Zone (CD) (By-law No. 12000) and a date be set for Public Hearing.
2. Council approve the applicant's request to reduce the amount of required indoor amenity space from 1,413 square metres ( 15,209 sq.ft.) to 1,076 square metres ( 11,582 sq.ft.).
3. Council authorize staff to draft Development Permit No. 7911-0075-oo generally in accordance with the attached drawings (Appendix II).
4. Council instruct staff to resolve the following issues prior to final adoption:
(a) ensure that all engineering requirements and issues including restrictive covenants, dedications, and rights-of-way where necessary, are addressed to the satisfaction of the General Manager, Engineering;
(b) submission of a subdivision (consolidation) and road dedication plan to the satisfaction of the Approving Officer;
(c) submission of an acceptable tree survey and a statement regarding tree preservation;
(d) submission of a finalized landscaping plan and landscaping cost estimate to the specifications and satisfaction of the Planning and Development Department;
(e) resolution of all urban design issues to the satisfaction of the Planning and Development Department;
(f) demolition of existing buildings and structures to the satisfaction of the Planning and Development Department;
(g) the applicant to address the concern that the development will place additional pressure on existing park facilities to the satisfaction of the General Manager, Parks, Recreation and Culture Department.
(h) the applicant to adequately address the impact of reduced indoor amenity space;
(i) registration of a Section 219 Restrictive Covenant to adequately address the City's needs with respect to public art, to the satisfaction of the General Manager, Parks, Recreation and Culture;
(j) registration of a statutory right-of-way and public access easement for the proposed internal road to be located along the east property line; and
(k) registration of a statutory right-of-way to deal with the interim design of 103 Avenue, to allow for vehicular movement onto the subject site.

## REFERRALS

Engineering:

School District:

Parks, Recreation \& Culture:

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

## Projected number of students from this development:

15 Elementary students at Old Yale Road Elementary School 6 Secondary students at Kwantlen Park School

## (Appendix IV)

The applicant has advised that the first phase for this project is expected to be constructed and ready for occupancy by Summer/early Fall of 2014 and the second phase for Spring/Summer 2015.

The applicant should resolve the impact the proposed development will have on existing parks, recreation and culture facilities in the neighbourhood.

## SITE CHARACTERISTICS

Existing Land Use: One existing house on each of the properties, which will be removed.

Adjacent Area:

| Direction | Existing Use | OCP Designation | Existing Zone |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| North (Across 104 Avenue ): | Older, 3-storey <br> apartment buildings. | Multiple Residential | RM-45 |
| East: | Vacant land, part of the <br> Urban Village Master <br> Plan. | Multiple Residential | RF |
| South: | Vacant land, part of the <br> Urban Village Master <br> Plan | Multiple Residential | RF |
| West (Across 133 Street): | Existing single family <br> homes on over-sized lots. | Multiple Residential | RF |

## DEVELOPMENT CONSIDERATIONS

## Context - Urban Village Master Plan

- In 2005, Weststone Group began to assemble the properties in the block bound by 102A and 104 Avenues and 133 and 133A Streets in Surrey City Centre.
- Weststone Group was able to assemble all the lots within the block, except for the two lots under this application, at 13286 and $13300-104$ Avenue.
- Weststone Group assembled the majority of the lands in the subject block in order to develop an integrated, multi-building, high density residential community, referred to as "Urban Village" which Weststone Group intends to build in numerous phases over the next few years. To date, two phases have been constructed just north of 102A Avenue, consisting of two 4 -storey apartment buildings ( 71 units in the phase 1 building and 135 units in the phase 2 building). The third phase (under Application No. 7906-0520-oo), consisting of 362 apartment units in a 35storey high-rise building and 11 ground-oriented units, is under construction three lots to the south of the subject site.


## Development Application

- The subject site, at the south-east corner of 104 Avenue and 133 Street, consists of two properties located at 13286 and $13300-104$ Avenue in the City Centre area. The subject site is approximately 7,113 square metres ( 1.76 acres) in net area.
- The development site is currently zoned Single Family Residential Zone (RF) and designated Multiple Residential in the Official Community Plan. The site is designated High Rise 5.5 FAR in the Surrey City Centre Plan Update-Phase II, Stage I Land Use and Density Concept, which was approved by Council on February 9, 2009 (Corporate Report No. Coor).
- The developer, Rize Alliance, proposes a rezoning from RF to Comprehensive Development Zone (CD) based on the RMC-150 Zone and a Development Permit in order to allow for the development of a total of approximately 471 multiple residential units. The proposed development is to consist of two, 28 -storey apartment buildings containing 450 apartment units and 21, 3 -storey townhouses units.
- The proposed development will complement Weststone's Urban Village.
- The proposed development is to be completed under two (2) phases and sold as market units. A separate Temporary Commercial Use Permit application for their temporary real estate sales centre (application no. 7911-0135-oo) is proposed for the site at the south-west corner of 104 Avenue and 133 Street and is scheduled for consideration by Council on July 11, 2011.
- The proposed unit mix includes 96 studio units, 97 one-bedroom units, 146 one-bedroom and den units, 103 two-bedroom units and 8 three-bedroom units. The proposed 21 townhouse units will each contain two bedrooms.
- The density proposed for the development is a floor area ratio (FAR) of 5.5 , which complies with the proposed land use and density designation of High Rise 5.5 FAR reflected in the City Centre Plan Update.
- The proposed development requires a total of 587 parking stalls according to Surrey Zoning Bylaw requirements, including the $20 \%$ parking reduction permitted in City Centre. This consists of 512 resident parking stalls and 75 visitor parking stalls. The development proposes 471 resident parking stalls and 76 visitor parking stalls, which is based upon a standard of 1 stall per dwelling unit and 0.16 stall for visitor parking, which has been approved for other projects in City Centre, as well as the "Ultra" development (Application No. 7906-0520-oo), located further south of the subject site. 92 of the proposed 547 stalls are proposed to be small car spaces. All parking will be provided in four (4) levels of underground parking.
- The development is required to provide 565 bicycle parking spaces. The development proposes 604 bicycle spaces for the two towers, 424 bicycle parking spaces for Phase I and 180 bicycle spaces for Phase II.


## Proposed CD By-law

- The proposed CD Zone is based upon the Multiple Residential Commercial 150 Zone (RMC-150), with modifications to land use, density and building setbacks.
- Unlike the RMC-150 Zone, which permits multiple unit residential buildings and a wide range of commercial uses, the permitted land uses in the proposed CD Zone will be restricted to multiple residential uses only.
- The proposed floor area ratio (FAR) of the development will be 5.5 , which will exceed the maximum density permitted under the RMC-150 Zone, which would be a 3.5 FAR. However, the proposed density complies with the High Rise 5.5 FAR designation in the Surrey City Centre Plan Update - Phase II, Stage I Land Use and Density Concept.
- The RMC-150 Zone requires the setbacks to be a minimum of $50 \%$ of the building height. The proposed buildings are 87 metres ( 285 ft .) in height, which would result in setbacks of 43.5 metres ( 143 ft .). The building setbacks vary from the RMC-150 Zone as follows: 4.1 metres ( 13 ft .) from 104 Avenue; 8.5 metres ( 28 ft .) from the south (proposed 103 Avenue); 3.6 metres ( 12 ft. ) from 133 Street; and 2.5 metres ( 8 ft .) from the east (measured from the edge of the statutory right-ofway). The reduction in building setbacks is supportable as the reduced setbacks allow for more engagement of the streets and provides for more of an urban feeling, which is desirable for the City Centre area.


## Public Art Policy

- The applicant has been made aware of the City's new Public Art Policy requirements. However, the applicant has not yet indicated how they wish to address this requirement. The applicant will be required to resolve this requirement prior to Final Adoption.

Trees Preservation and Replacement and Landscaping

- An arborist assessment has been submitted by the applicant. The arborist report was prepared by Ken Bell, Certified Arborist of VanArbor Vegetation Consulting Ltd. 25 on-site trees consisting of 6 Cottonwoods, 1 Alder and 18 other tree species have been identified within the development site. 6 off-site trees consisting of 2 Lombardy Poplar and 4 Douglas Fir have also been identified.
- All trees are proposed to be removed as the development proposal incorporates an underground parking structure within the boundaries of the development site, making it difficult for trees to be retained over a concrete slab structure.
- The applicant proposes approximately 77 replacement trees throughout the proposed development. Based upon the proposed tree removal, the applicant would only be required to provide a $1: 1$ replacement ratio for the 6 Cottonwood and 1 Red Alder trees and a 2:1 ratio for all the other trees ( 18 trees) proposed for removal within the site for a total requirement of 43 replacement trees.


## Statutory Right-of-Way and 103 Avenue

- The proposed development incorporates a private roadway in a statutory right-of-way along the east property line. The internal roadway, with a 12.0 -metre ( 39 ft .) right-of-way, will be privately owned, but will allow for public access between 103 and 104 Avenues. The private roadway will only permit right in/right out access from 104 Avenue. Ultimately, when the property to the east proceeds forward for development, a wider extension of this roadway can be achieved.
- Proposed 103 Avenue is intended to provide a connection from 132 Street to 138 Street.
- However, as redevelopment of the property to the south of the subject site is not proceeding forward at this time, only the portion of 103 Avenue falling within the subject site can be achieved at this time due to the curved design of the road. The majority of the ultimate road allowance falls on the property to the south and will be achieved when this property develops.
- Since the applicant wishes to access this road now, the applicant has proposed to construct an interim 103 Avenue, which will allow for vehicular flow on the subject site. A portion of the interim 103 Avenue will be constructed on the subject site, within a statutory right-of-way. When development of the property to the south proceeds, the ultimate design for 103 Avenue will be constructed and the statutory right-of-way on the subject site can be discharged.


## District Energy (DE)

- In order to help meet the objectives of the Surrey Sustainability Charter, greenhouse gas emission targets set out in the OCP and various broader economic development goals, Council established Surrey City Energy to develop, own and operate a district energy utility.
- The proposed development falls within one of Surrey City Energy's district energy (DE) service areas and represents a considerable portion of the projected future demand for thermal energy, as identified in the Surrey Central DE Feasibility Study.
- Beginning in February 2011, staff made efforts to work with the applicant to facilitate the design and implementation of a hydronic heating system that would be compatible to district energy. Staff recently requested that the applicant prepare and tender an alternative hydronic design of the heating and hot water systems, which would be funded by Surrey City Energy, in order to quantify the additional costs of DE compatibility for this project and for future buildings in the service area.
- The developer feels that he has attempted to accommodate City staffs request, but he is unable to prepare and tender an alternative hydronic design of the heating and hot water systems due to the time required to complete this work as the developer wishes to proceed to the July 11,2011 Council meeting due to established construction timelines. The developer also feels that the alternative hydronic design could result in additional capital costs and that these costs could increase the price of their dwelling units. Due to these reasons, the developer has elected to use electric baseboard heaters. Although the developer has concern about additional capital costs, staff were planning to work with the developer to overcome this concern upon completion of the requested alternative hydronic design. The elected system of using electric baseboard heaters precludes any future connection to district energy.
- Staff will continue to address the barriers perceived by the development community, to deviating from the standard heating and hot water systems in order to build a DE compatible building. As this work evolves, further recommendations will be made to Council.


## PRE-NOTIFICATION

Pre-notification letters were mailed on May 19, 2011. Only one caller contacted staff to inquire about the tenancy of the proposed development, as the owner was concerned that the project would be a rental development. Staff advised the caller that the proposal was for market housing. However, once a Strata Council is formed, it would then be up to the strata to determine the limitations of rental units within the development.

## DESIGN PROPOSAL AND REVIEW

- The proposal incorporates two high-rise towers, each at 28 storeys in height, and ground-oriented townhouses that are 3 storeys in height.
- Phase I of the proposed development incorporates Tower A (closest to the new 103 Avenue) and ten (10) of the proposed townhouse units. Phase II will incorporate Tower B (closest to 104 Avenue) and the remaining eleven (i1) townhouse units.
- The proposed towers are offset from one another to maximize views to the north and to create internal open space. Proposed Tower A is to be located at the corner of 133 Street and the new 103 Avenue. Proposed Tower B marks the corner of the new internal roadway and 104 Avenue, along the east property line.
- According to the architect, the two proposed tower forms are organic in design with undulating balcony curves that reference wind, water and schools of fish. The major expression is the wave form that shifts between two types of floor plates all the way up the towers, resulting in a strong and playful form. The wave form balconies provide a dual function, solar shading to the south,
southwest and southeast orientations, in addition to providing large exterior open space for the residents.
- The towers are supported by a linear townhouse base that includes vertical bays and glassy main entries. The tower expression on one side of the townhouse units reaches grade to provide a vertical expression of the tower at street level. The bronze colour, metal clad townhouses are ground-oriented with punched windows, garden entrances, small scale detail both inviting to passing pedestrians and interesting to motorists. The townhouses are to differentiate between the glassy towers by creating a more solid looking base with different character of window detailing and materials.
- The tower materials include 2 colours of low E glass, elastometric painted concrete, window walls and a cut out metal panel roof at the penthouse level to provide sun shading to the south facing common area roof deck. The townhouses are comprised of bronze coloured metal panels, glass and wood detailing at the garden entries.
- The proposed typical tower floor plate is a maximum of 675 square metres ( 7,266 sq.ft.), resulting in a slimmer tower profile.
- A single vehicular access to the underground parking structure is to come from the internal private roadway located along the east property line.


## Landscaping and Outdoor Amenity Space

- Based upon the City's Zoning By-law requirements of 3.0 square metres/32 sq.ft. per unit for outdoor amenity space, the proposed development is required to provide 1,413 square metres ( $15,072 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{ft}$.) in outdoor amenity space. The development proposes 1,511 square metres (16,264 sq.ft.) of outdoor amenity space, which includes a children's playground, landscaped seating areas, herb garden, urban agriculture planting beds, patios and roof decks.
- The main common outdoor amenity space which separates the two towers is to be completed under Phase II, although each phase will incorporate its own indoor amenity space.
- The proposed outdoor amenity spaces will include a children's playground, landscaped seating areas, herb garden, urban agriculture plots and amenity space patio areas. Roof top amenity areas are proposed at the top of both towers.
- The landscape design concept mirrors the wave form of the towers, with undulating pathways through the site, curved seating walls.
- An herb display garden along with urban agriculture plots are proposed along the east side of the development, along the new internal roadway.


## Indoor Amenity Space

- Based upon the City's Zoning By-law requirement of 3.0 square metres/32 sq.ft. per unit for indoor amenity space, the proposed development is required to provide 1,413 square metres ( $15,072 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{ft}$.) of indoor amenity space.
- The development proposes 1,076 square metres ( $11,582 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{ft}$.) of indoor amenity which is planned to include a bike maintenance room, a residents' workshop and tool crib, car wash, dog wash, an entertainment area, exercise rooms, meeting rooms and libraries. The proposed residents' workshop and tool crib with tool storage, will incorporate work benches and allow for workshop ventilation. The proposed library areas are to be located at the main floors of the two residential towers, which will offer areas for a book club or other quiet uses.
- The applicant will be required to provide cash-in-lieu of indoor amenity space for the shortfall in indoor amenity space, which is $\$ 117,600$, based upon $\$ 1,050$ per unit for a deficiency of 112 units.


## SUSTAINABILITY FEATURES

- The proposed development will attempt to incorporate the following sustainability features:

Site
o Best practices implemented to minimize erosion and sedimentation during demolition, site preparation and throughout construction.
o Roof gardens and at grade gardens will enhance the development's livability for residents.
o Landscaping will utilize drought-resistant local varieties of planting.
o Densifying an existing urban site close to amenities and transit.

## Water

o Low flow/low flush plumbing fixtures.
o On-site detention of water to slow down the discharge into the municipal system and potential use for irrigation.

## Energy

o Ozone-friendly refrigerants will be selected for building HVAC systems.
o High performance envelope including Low-E glass.
o Large overhangs on the south, southwest and southeast provide solar shading to high heat gain areas of the plan.

## Materials

0 Use of high fly-ash content concrete to reduce the development's $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ footprint.
o Use of recycled content in major building materials such as concrete, rebar, aluminum, drywall and steel studs.
o Use of construction waste management diversion program to reduce the impact on landfill and incineration.

## Environmental Quality

o Use of Low VOC (volatile organic compound) finishes including adhesives, sealants and paints.
o Use of low emitting materials such as carpets and composite woods.
o Best practices will be implemented during construction to optimize air quality and provide a clean and healthy building, both for construction workers and future residents.

Innovation in Design
o Development of a Green Clean program for building maintenance.

## ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL

ADP Date: June 2, 2011
The majority of the design items have been resolved, with the exception of some drawing coordination, landscaping, grading, finishing and mechanical issues, which the applicant has agreed to resolve prior to Final Adoption.

## INFORMATION ATTACHED TO THIS REPORT

The following information is attached to this Report:
Appendix I. Lot Owners, Action Summary and Project Data Sheets
Appendix II. Proposed Site Plan, Building Elevations, Landscape Plans and Perspective
Appendix III. Engineering Summary
Appendix IV. School District Comments
Appendix V. ADP Comments
Appendix VI. Proposed CD By-law

## INFORMATION AVAILABLE ON FILE

- Complete Set of Architectural and Landscape Plans prepared by IBI/HB Architects and Durante Kreuk Ltd. Landscape Architects, respectively, dated June 29, 2011.
original signed by Judith Robertson
Jean Lamontagne
General Manager
Planning and Development


## PL/kms

## Information for City Clerk

Legal Description and Owners of all lots that form part of the application:

1. (a) Agent: Name: Colleen Dixon, IBI/HB Architects

| Address: | Suite 700, 1285 West Pender Street |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Vancouver, BC V6E 4B1 |

Tel: 604-683-8797 (Work) 604-683-8797 (Home)
2. Properties involved in the Application
(a) Civic Address: 13286-104 Avenue and 13300104 Avenue
(b) Civic Address: 13286-104 Avenue Owner: Ya-Chiu Lin PID: o11-426-187
Lot 6, Except: part Dedicated Road on Plan LMP18314, Section 27 Block 5 North Range 2 West New Westminster District Plan 9655
(c) Civic Address: 13300104 Avenue

Owner: Chia-Ta Lin
PID: 010-074-538
Lot 8 Except: Part Dedicated Road on Plan LMP18314, Section 27 Block 5 North Range 2 West New Westminster District Plan 15335
3. Summary of Actions for City Clerk's Office
(a) Introduce a By-law to rezone the property.

## DEVELOPMENT DATA SHEET

Proposed Zoning: CD (based upon RMC-150)

*If the development site consists of more than one lot, lot dimensions pertain to the entire site.

## Development Data Sheet cont'd

| Required Development Data | Minimum Required / Maximum Allowed in RMC-150 Zone | Proposed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DENSITY |  |  |
| \# of units/ha /\# units/acre (gross) |  |  |
| \# of units/ha /\# units/acre (net) |  |  |
| FAR (gross) |  |  |
| FAR (net) | 3.5 | 5.5 |
|  |  |  |
| AMENITY SPACE (area in square metres) |  |  |
| Indoor | 1,413 m ${ }^{2}$ | $1.076 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| Outdoor | 1,413 m ${ }^{2}$ | 1,511 m ${ }^{2}$ |
|  |  |  |
| PARKING (number of stalls) |  |  |
| Commercial |  | N/A |
| Industrial |  | N/A |
|  |  |  |
| Residential |  |  |
| Bachelor + 1 Bedroom | 353 | 339 |
| 2-Bed | 149 | 124 |
| 3-Bed | 10 | 8 |
| Residential Visitors | 75 | 76 |
|  |  |  |
| Institutional |  | N/A |
|  |  |  |
| Total Number of Parking Spaces | 587 | 547 |
|  |  |  |
| Number of disabled stalls | 6 | 17 |
| Number of small cars | 147 | 92 |
| Tandem Parking Spaces: Number / \% of Total Number of Units |  | N/A |
| Size of Tandem Parking Spaces width/length |  | N/A |


| Heritage Site | NO | Tree Survey/Assessment Provided | YES |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
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INTER-OFFICE MEMO

TO: Manager, Area Planning \& Development

- North Surrey Division

Planning and Development Department
FROM: Development Project Engineer, Engineering Department
DATE: June 23, 2011 PROJECT FILE: 7811-0075-00
RE: Engineering Requirements
Location: 13286104 Ave

## REZONE/SUBDIVISION

## Property and Right-of-Way Requirements

- dedicate 1.308 meters for the widening of 104 Avenue to a 27.0 metre wide ROW.
- dedicate a $5.0 \mathrm{~m} \times 5.0 \mathrm{~m}$ corner cut at the intersection of 133 Street and 104 Avenue.
- dedicate approximately 7.5 metres of 103 Avenue.
- dedicate a $3.0 \mathrm{~m} \times 3.0 \mathrm{~m}$ corner cut at the intersection of 133 Street and 103 Avenue


## Works and Services

- construct a raised median on 104 Avenue to restrict turning movements into the driveway.
- construct 103 Avenue to a half road City Centre Standard.
- widen 104 Avenue to a full arterial road City Centre Standard.
- widen 133 Street to an 11.0 metre wide City Centre Standard.
- construct adequate sized City utilities to service the proposed development.
- remove the existing overhead hydro, telephone and cablevision lines fronting the site on 133 Street.

A Servicing Agreement is required prior to Rezone/Subdivision.

## DEVELOPMENT PERMIT/DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT

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


Rémi Dubé, P.Eng.
Acting Development Services Manager
RWB

## Surrey Schools <br> LEADERSHIP IN LEARNING

Thursday, May 05, 2011
Planning

## THE IMPACT ON SCHOOLS

## APPLICATION \#: 7911007500

## SUMMARY

The proposed 459 highrise units and 21 townhouse units
are estimated to have the following impact on the following schools:
Projected \# of students for this development:

| Elementary Students: | 15 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Secondary Students: | 6 |

September 2010 Enrolment/School Capacity

| Old Yale Road Elementary |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Enrolment (K/1-7): | $32 \mathrm{~K}+335$ |
| Capacity | (K/1-7): |
| Kark Secondary |  |
| Kwantlen Pa |  |
| Enrolment | (8-12): |
| Capacity | (8-12): |

## School Enrolment Projections and Planning Update:

The following tables illustrate the enrolment projections (with current/approved ministry capacity) for the elementary and secondary schools serving the proposed development.

There are no new capital projects proposed at the elementary school and no new capital projects identified for the secondary school. The District is considering possible enrolment move options to eliminate projected overcrowding at Kwantlen Park Secondary School. The proposed development will not have an impact on these projections.

## Old Yale Road Elementary



## Kwantlen Park Secondary


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

# Advisory Design Panel Minutes- draft 

## Chair:

Leroy Mickelson
Panel Members:
N. Baldwin
W. Francl
D. Lee
S. Lyon
L. Mickelson

Cpl. M. Searle

## Guests:

S. Chan, Ionic Architecture Inc.

Meredith Mitchell, DMG Landscape Architects
Tim Clark, Owner Rep
Gordon MacPherson, Remax
Barry Weih, Wensley Architecture
Neil Banich, Wensley Architecture
Joel Smith, Wensley Architecture
Mark Van der Zalm, Van der Zalm \& Associations Inc.
Raj Singh, Van der Zalm \& Associations Inc
Kirk Fisher, Lark Group
John Therney, Lark Group
Martin Brükner, IBI/HB Architect
Colleen Dixon, IBI/HB Architect
Iris Woo, IBI/HB Architect
Peter Kreuk, Durante Kreuk Ltd. Landscape Architect
Chris Vollan, Developer
Andy Tam, Developer
Patrick Cotter, Patrick Cotter Architects
Jason Olinek, Patrick Cotter Architects

## Staff Present:

T. Ainscough, Planning \& Development
H. Bello, Planning \& Development
J. Hunter, Legislative Services
M. B. Rondeau, Planning \& Development

## B. SUBMISSIONS

3. File No.:

New or Resubmit:
Description:

Address:
Developer:
Architect:
Landscape Architect:
Planner:
Urban Design Planner:

## 7911-0075-00

New
Proposed 471 units in 2 28-storey high rise buildings and 3 -storey townhouses to be completed in two phases
13286 and 13300-104 Avenue, City Centre
Chris Vollan, Rize Alliance Properties
Colleen Dixon, IBI/HB Architects
Peter Kreuk, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects
Pat Lau
Mary Beth Rondeau

The Urban Design Planner presented background information and an overview of the proposed project and highlighted the following:

- Westerly side of city centre; in the Urban Village site is on the north west; previous applicant proposed higher buildings on this site.
- A revised precinct plan with tower placement analysis has been done and this site proposes towers in the northwest and southeast corners of the site.
- Road that has been relocated through the site.
- Height concept in City Centre - the building falls within the heights envisaged
for this area.
- A small corner public open space will become part of a consolidated open space across the 3 corners of the intersection.

The Project Architect presented an overview of the context plan, site plan, pedestrian circulation, shadow studies, design concept, parkade floor plan, and building elevations and highlighted the following:

- Road alignment of 103 Avenue - master plan is ongoing, towers positioned away from the corner and amenity on the corner, new right of way access off 104 Avenue.
- Vehicular and pedestrian access, parkade entry off new right of way, throughway private access for residents in centre of the block, drop off area and access, all accesses will be key fobbed and controlled.
- 3 storey townhouses along both frontages; garden entries off 133 Street and 104 Avenue.
- Urban qualities - this is an area in transition, offsetting the towers (90 feet separation between the towers) to take advantage of the views to the north
- Design concept undulating wave form for towers.
- Liveable outdoor space.
- Materials include low E glass.
- Indoor/outdoor amenity space - top of each tower has outdoor amenity space.
- Site development is very urban, not devoting surface area to cars, these will be engaging street frontages.

The Landscape Architect reviewed the landscape plans and highlighted the following:

- Streetscape creates a friendly edge with opportunities for seating, display herb garden, trellis and seating, urban agriculture, main open space is podium area above parking, kids play, open seating area, big open terraces as building steps up, curvilinear forms, plant palette providing textures and colours.
- CPTED - min of 24 inches grade separation between public and private spaces.
- Sustainability - densification of urban areas, creation of urban village.
- Accessibility - elevators serve lobby areas for townhouses and towers.


## ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL STATEMENT OF REVIEW 13286 and 13300-104 Avenue, City Centre File No. 7911-0075-00

It was
Moved by W. Francl
Seconded by N. Baldwin
That the Advisory Design Panel (ADP)
supports the application and recommends that the applicant address the following issues to the satisfaction of the Planning and Development Department

Carried

## STATEMENT OF REVIEW COMMENTS

## Context and Site Planning

- Repositioning of two towers is good, space between towers works better.
- Good that the cul de sac in the courtyard is eliminated.
- Not much shared open space so appreciate the rooftop terraces and enormous private balconies in each suite.
- Vehicle/Pedestrian circulation - Consideration of drop-off zone / parallel street parking adjacent to lobbies.


## Form and Character

- It's going to be a welcome addition to the Surrey skyline.
- The scale works but the podium could go a little higher.
- It would be interesting if the two towers weren't identical pieces with identical orientations. Bi-conic - two iconic buildings.
- Great tower shapes and balcony form. Like the floor plate forms, balconies are going to be fantastic; people will like them very much.
- Caution on tighter corners on glass; curved glass will make or break these elements.
- There could be greater emphasis on the tower main entrances.

The applicant's architect has indicated that the drawings have been revised to show more emphasis on the tower main entrances by extending the main canopy beyond the front face of the building, widening the entrances and changing the character and colour of the unit pavers. Street furniture such as benches and bike racks are given adequate space with an emphasis on the formal entry path to the front doors of the tower.

- Care in detailing the way in which tower forms are integrated into the townhouse base curves into rectilinear takes skilled design development.

The applicant's architect has indicated that care will be taken to integrate the curved tower form and rectilinear base through design development.

- Consider increasing the strength of the townhouse base (3 storeys straight up).

The applicant's architect has indicated that the revised drawings have incorporated a continuation of townhouses along 103 Avenue that partially wraps the corner. In addition, gated townhouse entries have been added at the corner and along the new internal road to add more garden entries to the street. This is an improvement from an Urban Design perspective and adds a finer grain detail at grade.

- Townhouses very important, like treatment and the plans of the townhouses find them quirky in relationship to the building form.
- The rendering shows NE corner where slabs are brought down to the ground, appear relentless. Don't bring curved balcony forms right down to the grade.

The applicant's architect has indicated that the revised drawings show the townhouse "look" at the northeast corner.

- Revise the base treatment to NE corner, preferably by extending "townhouse base" around into the new ROW.

See response above.

## Landscaping

- Use the "Aqua" form and expression in landscape.

The proposed curved wall hedging, planting patterns and paving all contribute to an "Aqua" form character in the landscape. A meandering bioswale utilized along the curved walkway will further enhance this character.

- Corner open space - could be some seating elements in narrow space with linkage into interior; parkettes could be better celebrated.

A seating area will be added at the north west corner of the site to provide a better connection to the herb display garden.

- Do like the grade change and the sinuous pathway; could have a water feature.

The bioswale added along the curved path will create water interest.

- Like the idea of urban agriculture, still unproven - caution the approach and make sure you have solid maintenance plan especially in area where people will be looking down on it.
- ensure provision for composting equipment, shed, etc. with initial planting scheme.
- Concern over long term maintenance by Strata - consider other potentials including tower roofs.

Various herbs and edible plants will be proposed in the herb display garden to establish the urban agriculture planting beds. Residents may later replace these plants as they see fit.

## CPTED

- Enthused by the concept of public and private space and the fob access.
- Request the address be painted on top of building for increasing use of air service for emergency services.

The applicant's architect has indicated that the proposed address will be placed on the roof plans.

## Accessibility

- Wheelchair disabled access units to have no curb out onto the balcony.

The applicant will consider the possibility of deleting curbs out into the balcony with an envelope consultant.

- Elevators buttons to be on side so floor 1 and top are same level.

This will be incorporated into the plans.

- Amenity space, washrooms to be wheelchair accessible.

All amenity space and washrooms will be wheelchair accessible.

- Recommend $5 \%$ of units disabled accessible/friendly.

If there were potential purchasers who required that the units be disabled accessible, the unit plans could be adapted for this purpose.

- Walkways to be wheelchair accessible and grade not to exceed 1:12.

All walkways will meet the BC Building Code requirement for wheelchair accessibility.

- Recommend stairway on west side to be changed to ramp to allow wheelchair and stroller accessible.

The proposed walkway from the internal road leading into the central outdoor amenity area and children's play area is completely at grade and will allow for wheelchair accessibility. The Urban Designer has reviewed this plan and feels that this is a sufficient response.

- Emergency call buttons to be used in parking lobbies for disabled, etc.

The applicant's architect has indicated that this recommendation will be incorporated into the plans.

## Sustainability

- This building is an energy hog - it is a huge radiator with the balcony slab extensions. Try thermal breaking on the slabs.

The applicant's architect has indicated that they will look into thermally breaking the slaps and consider it in conjunction with their envelope consultant and structural engineer.

- Storm water management - consider runnel alongside walkway in courtyard that conveys water to cistern or other storage facility.

The applicant's architect has indicated that a swale/rain garden feature with cobbles has been designed to run within the lawn area along the curving/undulating path as a visible feature towards rainwater management.

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

THE CITY COUNCIL of the City of Surrey, in open meeting assembled, ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

1. Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000, as amended, is hereby further amended, pursuant to the provisions of Section 903 of the Local Government Act, R.S.B.C. 1996 c. 323, as amended by changing the classification of the following parcels of land, presently shown upon the maps designated as the Zoning Maps and marked as Schedule "A" of Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000, as amended as follows:

FROM: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL ZONE (RF)
TO: COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT ZONE (CD)

Parcel Identifier: ou1-426-187
Lot 6 Except: Part Dedicated on Road Plan LMP18314 Section 27 Block 5 North Range 2 West New Westminster District Plan 9655

> 13286-104 Avenue

Parcel Identifier: o10-074-538
Lot 8 Except: Part Dedicated on Road Plan LMP18314 Section 27 Block 5 North Range 2 West New Westminster District Plan 15335

$$
13300 \text { - } 104 \text { Avenue }
$$

(hereinafter referred to as the "Lands")
2. The following regulations shall apply to the Lands:

## A. Intent

This Comprehensive Development Zone is intended to accommodate and regulate the development of high density, multiple unit residential buildings and groundoriented multiple unit residential buildings and related amenity spaces, which are developed in accordance with a comprehensive design.

## B. Permitted Uses

The Lands and structures shall be used for multiple unit residential buildings, and ground-oriented multiple residential buildings.

## C. Lot Area

Not applicable to this Zone.
D. Density

1. The floor area ratio shall not exceed $5 \cdot 5$.
2. Indoor Amenity Space: The amenity space required in Sub-section J.1(b) of this Zone, is excluded from the calculation of floor area ratio.
E. Lot Coverage

The lot coverage shall not exceed $33 \%$.

## F. Yards and Setbacks

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

| Use Setback | Front <br> Yard <br> (104 <br> Avenue) | Rear <br> Yard <br> (103 <br> Avenue) | Side <br> Yard (East) | Side Yard on Flanking Street (133 Street) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Principal and Accessory Buildings and Structures | $\begin{aligned} & 4.1 \mathrm{~m} \\ & {[13 \mathrm{ft} .]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.5 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \text { [28 ft.] } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.5 \mathrm{~m} \\ & {[8 \mathrm{ft} .]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.6 \mathrm{~m} \\ & {[12 \mathrm{ft} .]} \end{aligned}$ |

Measurements to be determined as per Part 1 Definitions of Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000, as amended.
2. Notwithstanding the definition of Setback in Part 1 Definitions of Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000, as amended, the entry canopy may encroach up to 2.0 metres [ 6 ft .] into the required front yard setback (104 Avenue), the entry canopy may encroach up to 3.5 metres [1 ft.] into the required rear yard setback ( 103 Avenue) and the east side yard setback is to be measured from the edge of the statutory right-of-way.
3. Notwithstanding Sub-section F.17(b) of Part 4 General Provisions of Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000, as amended, stairs of more than 3 risers may encroach into the required setback.

## G. Height of Buildings

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

1. Principal buildings: The building height shall not exceed 87 metres [285 feet].
2. Accessory buildings and structures: The building height shall not exceed 4.5 metres [ 15 feet].

## H. Off-Street Parking

1. Resident and visitor parking spaces shall be provided as stated in Table C.6, Part 5 Off-Street Parking and Loading/Unloading of Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000, as amended.
2. Notwithstanding Sub-section H.1, resident parking shall be provided at a rate of 1 parking space per dwelling unit and visitor parking shall be provided at the rate of o. 16 parking space per dwelling unit.
3. All required resident and visitor parking spaces shall be provided as underground parking.
4. Notwithstanding Sub-section A.2(c) of Part 5 Off-Street Parking and Loading/Unloading of Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000 as amended, the underground parking facility may extend to the western lot line.

## I. Landscaping

1. All developed portions of the lot not covered by buildings, structures or paved areas shall be landscaped including the retention of mature trees. This landscaping shall be maintained.
2. Along the developed sides of the lot which abut a highway, a continuous landscaping strip of not less than 1.5 metres [ 5 ft .] in width shall be provided within the lot.
3. The boulevard areas of highways abutting a lot shall be seeded or sodded with grass on the side of the highway abutting the lot, except at driveways.
4. Garbage containers and passive recycling containers shall be located within the underground parking or within a building.

## J. Special Regulations

1. Amenity space shall be provided on the lot as follows:
(a) Outdoor amenity space, in the amount of 3.0 square metres [ 32 sq.ft.] per dwelling unit and shall not be located within the required setbacks; and
(b) Indoor amenity space, in the amount of 3.0 square metres [32 sq.ft.] per dwelling unit.
2. Balconies are required for all dwelling units which are not ground-oriented and shall be a minimum of $5 \%$ of the dwelling unit size or 4.6 square metres [50 sq.ft.] per dwelling unit, whichever is greater.

## K. Subdivision

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

| Lot Size | Lot Width | Lot Depth |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |
| 7,000 sq. m. | 70 metres | 100 metres |
| $[1.7$ acres $]$ | $[230 \mathrm{ft}]$. | $[328 \mathrm{ft}$ ] $]$ |
| Di. |  |  |

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

## L. Other Regulations

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

1. Definitions are as set out in Part 1 Definitions, of Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000, as amended.
2. Prior to any use, the Lands must be serviced as set out in Part 2 Uses Limited, of Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000, as amended and in accordance with the servicing requirements for the RMC-150 Zone as set forth in the Surrey Subdivision and Development By-law, 1986, No. 8830, as amended.
3. General provisions are as set out in Part 4 General Provisions, of Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000, as amended.
4. Additional off-street parking requirements are as set out in Part 5 Off-Street Parking, of Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000, as amended.
5. Sign regulations are as set out in Surrey Sign By-law, 1999, No. 13656, as amended.
6. Special building setbacks are as set out in Part 7 Special Building Setbacks, of Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000, as amended.
7. Building permits shall be subject to the Surrey Building By-law, 1987, No. 9011, as amended.
8. Building permits shall be subject to Surrey Development Cost Charge By-law, 2010, No. 17111, as may be amended or replaced from time to time, and the development cost charges shall be based on the RMC-150 Zone (for City Centre).
9. Surrey Tree Protection By-law, 2006, No. 16100, as amended.
10. Development permits may be required in accordance with the Surrey Official Community Plan, 1996, By-law No. 12900, as amended.
11. This By-law shall be cited for all purposes as "Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000, Amendment By-law, , No. ."

READ A FIRST AND SECOND TIME on the th day of , 20 .
PUBLIC HEARING HELD thereon on the th day of , 20 .
READ A THIRD TIME ON THE th day of , 20 .
RECONSIDERED AND FINALLY ADOPTED, signed by the Mayor and Clerk, and sealed with the Corporate Seal on the th day of , 20 .

