### City of Surrey PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT REPORT File: 7918-0093-00

Planning Report Date: April 29, 2019

### **PROPOSAL:**

### • Development Variance Permit

to reduce the minimum lot width and side yard setbacks of the RF Zone in order to allow subdivision into two (2) single family lots.

LOCATION:	11813 - River Road
ZONING:	RF
<b>OCP DESIGNATION:</b>	Urban





### **RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY**

• Approval for Development Variance Permit to proceed to Public Notification.

### DEVIATION FROM PLANS, POLICIES OR REGULATIONS

• The applicant is proposing a variance to reduce the minimum lot width and side yard setbacks of the RF Zone for proposed Lots 1 and 2 of a proposed 2-lot subdivision.

### RATIONALE OF RECOMMENDATION

- Proposed Lots 1 and 2 exceed both the minimum lot depth and lot area requirements of the RF Zone.
- The proposal is aligned with Official Community Plan (OCP) policies which support infill development that is appropriate in scale and density to the neighborhood context.
- As the proposed lot widths are reduced from the RF Zone, reducing the side yard setbacks will help achieve house widths similar to typical RF Zone houses.
- The proposed lot width reductions will not impact the quality of the streetscape.
- The applicant has demonstrated general neighborhood support for the proposed lot widths by means of a signed petition from adjacent residents.

File: 7918-0093-00

### **RECOMMENDATION**

The Planning & Development Department recommends that:

- The Planning & Development Department recommends that Council approve Development Variance Permit No. 7918-0093-00 (Appendix VI) varying the following, to proceed to Public Notification:
  - (a) to reduce the minimum lot width of the RF Zone, from 15 metres (50 ft.) to 14 metres (46 ft.) for proposed Lots 1 and 2; and
  - (b) to reduce the minimum side yard setbacks of the RF Zone, from 1.8 metres (6 ft.) to 1.2 metres (4 ft.) for principal buildings on proposed Lots 1 and 2.
- 2. Council instruct staff to resolve the following issues prior to issuance:
  - (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 finalized subdivision layout to the satisfaction of the Approving Officer;
  - (c) submission of a finalized tree survey and a statement regarding tree preservation to the satisfaction of the City Landscape Architect;
  - (d) submission of a finalized lot grading plan to the satisfaction of the Planning and Development Department; and
  - (e) the applicant satisfy the deficiency in tree replacement on the site, to the satisfaction of the Planning and Development Department.

### **REFERRALS**

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

### SITE CHARACTERISTICS

Existing Land Use: Vacant single family lot.

#### File: 7918-0093-00

Page 4

### Adjacent Area:

Direction	Existing Use	OCP/NCP	Existing Zone
		Designation	
North:	Truck parking	Mixed	IB-2
	Facility	Employment	
East:	Single family	Urban	RF
	dwellings		
South (Across River Road):	Multi-family	Urban	RM-15
	townhouse		
	development		
West:	Single family	Urban	RF
	dwellings		

### **DEVELOPMENT CONSIDERATIONS**

### **Background**

- The 1,152-square metre (12,397 sq. ft.) subject property is located at 11813 River Road in Whalley. The subject lot is approximately 28 metres (92 ft.) wide and 43 metres (141 ft.) deep.
- The lot is designated "Urban" in the Official Community Plan (OCP) and is zoned "Single Family Residential Zone (RF)".
- The applicant is proposing to subdivide the subject property into two lots under the existing RF Zone.
- The minimum dimensional requirements of the RF Zone for width and depth are 15 metres (50 ft.) and 28 metres (90 ft.), respectively.
- At 14 metres (46 ft.) in width and 43 metres (141 ft.) in depth, proposed Lots 1 and 2 require a variance for reduced lot width.
- In addition to the reduced lot widths, a corresponding variance to reduce the side yard setbacks is requested in order to achieve a house width similar to typical RF Zone houses on the proposed narrower lots.
- An assessment of the requested variances is provided later in this report.

### Lot Grading and Building Design

- A preliminary lot grading plan submitted by the applicant's consultant has been reviewed by staff and found to be generally acceptable. Basements are proposed on both lots.
- The applicant has retained Tynan Consulting Ltd., as the Design Consultant. The Design Consultant conducted a character study of the surroundings homes and based on the findings of the study, proposed a set of building design guidelines (Appendix IV). The guidelines will facilitate modern design, massing and finishing standards.

### PRE-NOTIFICATION

• Development proposal signs for the proposed 2-lot subdivision were installed on the site on August 31, 2018. No phone calls, letters, or emails were received from neighboring property owners.

### <u>TREES</u>

• Nick McMahon, ISA Certified Arborist of Arbortech Consulting prepared an Arborist Assessment for the subject property. The table below provides a summary of the tree retention and removal by tree species:

Tree Species	Existing		Remove	Retain
Alder and Cottonwood Trees				
Red Alder	2		2	0
Deciduous Trees (excluding Alder and Cottonwood Trees)				
Purple Leaf Plum	2		2	0
<b>Coniferous Trees</b>				
Austrian Pine	1		1	0
<b>Total</b> (excluding Alder and Cottonwood Trees)	3		3	0
Total Replacement Trees Proposed		6		
Total Retained and Replacement Trees		6		
Contribution to the Green City Fund		\$800		

### Table 1: Summary of Tree Preservation by Tree Species:

- The Arborist Assessment states that there is a total of 3 protected trees on the site, excluding Alder and Cottonwood trees. Two (2) existing trees, approximately 66% of the total trees on the site, are Alder trees. It was determined that no trees can be retained as part of this development proposal. The proposed tree retention was assessed taking into consideration the location of services, building footprints, road dedication and proposed lot grading.
- For those trees that cannot be retained, the applicant will be required to plant trees on a 1 to 1 replacement ratio for Alder and Cottonwood trees, and a 2 to 1 replacement ratio for all other trees. This will require a total of 8 replacement trees on the site. Since only six (6) replacement trees can be accommodated on the site, the deficit of 2 replacement trees will require a cash-in-lieu payment of \$800, representing \$400 per tree, to the Green City Fund, in accordance with the City's Tree Protection By-law.

• City Tree No.080 on the boulevard fronting lot 2 is proposed for removal. The Arborist Assessment states that the structural health of the tree is poor and that it will be impacted by excavation for the proposed driveway and service connections. Parks Recreation & Culture staff will confirm removal as part of the detailed servicing review stage.

### **BY-LAW VARIANCE AND JUSTIFICATION**

- (a) Requested Variance:
  - To reduce the minimum lot width of the RF Zone from 15 metres (50 ft.) to 14 metres (46 ft.) for proposed Lots 1 and 2; and
  - To reduce the minimum side yard setback of the RF Zone, from 1.8 metres (6 ft.) to 1.2 metres (4 ft.) for principal buildings on proposed Lots 1 and 2.

### Applicant's Reasons:

- To allow for subdivision into two RF-zoned lots.
- With the proposed side yard setback relaxation, the applicant can achieve the maximum house size permitted under the RF Zone on proposed Lots 1 and 2.

### Staff Comments:

- Proposed Lots 1 and 2 exceed both the minimum lot depth (28 metres / 92 ft.) and lot area (560 sq.m. / 6,027 sq. ft.) requirements of the RF Zone. The proposed lots will have a depth of 43 metres (141 ft.) and areas of 579 square metres (6,232 sq ft.) and 570 square metres (6,135 sq. ft.), respectively.
- The proposal is aligned with Official Community Plan (OCP) policies which support infill development that is appropriate in scale and density to the neighborhood context.
- The applicant has demonstrated general neighborhood support for the proposed lot widths by means of a signed petition from neighboring residents.
- The proposed side yard setback reduction will help accommodate typical RF sized homes on the proposed lots with double side-by-side garages and full-sized driveways.
- The proposed 7% reduced lot width is not expected to detract from the established streetscape along River Road.

### Staff Report to Council

File: 7918-0093-00

### **INFORMATION ATTACHED TO THIS REPORT**

The following information is attached to this Report:

Appendix I.	Lot Owners and Action Summary (Confidential) and Project Data Sheets
Appendix II.	Proposed Subdivision Layout
Appendix III.	Engineering Summary
Appendix IV.	Building Design Guidelines Summary
Appendix V.	Summary of Tree Survey and Tree Preservation
Appendix VI.	Development Variance Permit No. 7918-0093-00

original signed by Ron Gill

Jean Lamontagne General Manager Planning and Development

ELM/cm

Page 7

## APPENDIX I HAS BEEN

# **REMOVED AS IT CONTAINS**

**CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION** 

## SUBDIVISION DATA SHEET

## **Proposed Zoning: RF**

Requires Project Data	Proposed
GROSS SITE AREA	*
Acres	0.28
Hectares	0.11
NUMBER OF LOTS	
Existing	1
Proposed	2
SIZE OF LOTS	
Range of lot widths (metres)	14.1
Range of lot areas (square metres)	570-579
DENSITY	(1 /
Lots/Hectare & Lots/Acre (Gross)	17/hectare or 7/acre
Lots/Hectare & Lots/Acre (Net)	17/hectare or 7/acre
SITE COVERAGE (in $\%$ of gross site area)	
Maximum Coverage of Principal &	28%
Accessory Building	3070
Estimated Road Lane & Driveway Coverage	8%
Total Site Coverage	46%
	•
PARKLAND	
Area (square metres)	
% of Gross Site	
	Required
PARKLAND	
5% money in lieu	NO
TREE SURVEY/ASSESSMENT	NO
MODEL BUILDING SCHEME	NO
HEDITACE SITE Potention	NO
TERITAGE SITE Referition	NO
FRASER HEALTH Approval	NO
pproven	
DEV. VARIANCE PERMIT required	
Road Length/Standards	NO
Works and Services	NO
Building Retention	NO
Others (lot width)	YES



Appendix III



INTER-OFFICE MEMO

TO:	Manager, Area Planning & Devel - North Surrey Division Planning and Development Dep	lopment artment		
FROM:	Development Engineer, Engineering Department			
DATE:	Nov 02, 2018	PROJECT FILE:	7818-0093-00	
RE:	Engineering Requirements Location: 11813 River Rd			

### **SUBDIVISION**

### Works and Services

- Construct north side of River Road to Local Road standard.
- Construct 6.0 m paired concrete driveway letdowns.
- Construct storm main along River Road to service the site.
- Construct pumped storm and sanitary service connections to each lot from mains along River Road. **Rear yard servicing is not permitted.**
- Register a Restrictive Covenant (RC) on title for each lot for pumped storm and sanitary service connection up the main.
- Provide an adequately-sized metered water service connection to each lot.
- Provide on-site stormwater mitigation features per the South Westminster Integrated Stormwater Management Plan (ISMP).

A Servicing Agreement is required prior to Subdivision.

### DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT

There are no engineering requirements relative to issuance of the Development Variance Permit beyond those noted above.

Tommy Buchmann, P.Eng. Acting Development Services Manager

AY

## **BUILDING GUIDELINES SUMMARY**

Surrey Project no:18-0093-00Project Location:11813 River Road, Surrey, B.C.Design Consultant:Tynan Consulting Ltd., (Michael E. Tynan)

The draft Building Scheme proposed for this Project has been filed with the City Clerk. The following is a summary of the Residential Character Study and the Design Guidelines which highlight the important features and form the basis of the draft Building Scheme.

## 1. Residential Character

## 1.1 General Description of the Existing and/or Emerging Residential Character of the Subject Site:

With the exception of one RM-D property three homes north of the subject site, and one RM-15 zoned property opposite the subject site (on the south side of River Road), all other lots in the surrounding neighbourhood are zoned "RF".

Site slope is a significant attribute. Lots on the north side of River Road slope down toward the Fraser River at approximately 11 percent. Therefore, homes are naturally configured with basements fully underground at the front and full exposed at the rear.

Most of the north side homes were constructed in the 1980's and 1990's and all homes (with the exception of one older (1960's) Bungalow with a walk out basement) are 3000 - 3500 sq.ft. "Modern California Stucco" or "Neo-Traditional" style Two-Storey type with walk out basements. Massing designs are mid scale to high scale. Entrances are configured as one storey, 1 ½ Storey, and exaggerated two storey structures that dominate the front. Roof slopes range from 5:12 to 8:12 and most homes are configured with a common hip roof at the upper floor and street facing projections of a common gable or common hip form. Roof surfaces include cedar shingles, concrete roof tiles, and asphalt shingles. Homes are clad in stucco only, or vinyl only (no masonry accents) with the exception of one home at 11819 River Road that has full two storey high brick facing covering the entire front, and one new home at 11825 River Road, that is clad in Hardiplank with substantial stone accent veneer, and wood shingles in the gable end. With one exception, landscapes are considered "modest" by modern standards. The new home at 11825 River Road provides the most appropriate architectural context for the subject site.

Lots on the south side slope steeply up the south at approximately 14 percent which means the basement is fully exposed as viewed from River Road, and fully underground at the rear. Due to this slope, the home at 11712 River Road has an exposed basement wall approximately 16 feet high at the front, which is not desirable from a massing design perspective. Most homes on the south side in the vicinity of the subject site are hidden behind steep foliage, with only a steep driveway exposed.

Also on the south side, opposite the subject site is a 15 - 20 year old RM-15 site containing dozens of units which have either three full storeys exposed at the front, or have two storeys exposed at the front with about half of the upper floor concealed within the roof. Roof structures on the RM-15 buildings are 6:12 and 7:12 main common hip and common gable roofs with an asphalt shingle surface. Homes are clad in horizontal vinyl siding in earth tone colours. There are no feature brick or stone accents. There is a 3 - 4 foot retaining wall along the front lot line with either one or two sets of

steps leading up to the lowest floor entrance, about 8 feet above the street level. The multifamily units have an above average landscaping standard. Overall, the design of the units does not translate well to a year 2018 RF zone single family detached residential development, so the multifamily units don't provide specific context for the subject site, though elements such as roof forms, roof slope, and cladding materials will be similar or compatible with those of the proposed homes.

# 1.2 Features of Surrounding Dwellings Significant to the Proposed Building Scheme:

- 1) **Context Homes:** With the exception of one home at 11825 River Road, the housing stock in the area surrounding the subject site does not provide suitable architectural context for a post year 2017 RF zone development. Massing scale, massing designs, roof designs, construction materials, and trim and detailing elements have improved significantly since most homes in this area were constructed. It is more sensible therefore, to use updated standards that result in reasonable compatibility with the older homes and also result in standards that improve over time, than it is to specifically emulate the older homes by building to the older standards.
- 2) <u>Style Character :</u> Most neighbouring homes on the north side of River Road can be classified as older (1990) urban homes that have massing designs and exterior trim and detailing standards that do not meet post year 2017 standards for RF zone lots. Rather than emulating the existing homes, the recommendation is to utilize *compatible* styles including "Neo-Traditional", "Neo-Heritage", and compatible styles which could include compatible manifestations of the "West Coast Contemporary" style as determined by the consultant. Note that style range is not specifically restricted in the building scheme. However, the consultant refers to the character study when reviewing plans for meeting style-character intent.
- 3) **Home Types :** There are a wide range of home types evident, and so some flexibility is justified. Home type (Two-Storey, Bungalow, Basement Entry, Split Level, etc..) will not be regulated in the building scheme.
- 4) <u>Massing Designs</u>: Massing designs should meet new standards for RF zoned subdivisions. New homes should exhibit "mid-scale" massing. Various elements and projections on the front of the home should be interesting architecturally, and should be in pleasing natural proportions to one another. These elements and projections should be located so as to create balance across the façade.
- 5) <u>Front Entrance Design :</u> Front entrance porticos range from one to two storeys in height (two homes have two storey high entrances). The recommendation however is to limit the range of entrance portico heights to between one storey and 1 ½ storeys to ensure there is not proportional overstatement of this one element.
- 6) **Exterior Wall Cladding :** A wide range of cladding materials have been used in this area, including vinyl, cedar, stucco, fibre cement board, brick, and stone. Reasonable flexibility should therefore be permitted, including the use of vinyl siding, provided the overall quality of wall cladding materials meets or exceeds common standards for post 2017 developments.
- 7) **Roof surface :** A wide range of roof surfacing materials have been used in this area including cedar shingles, concrete roof tiles, and asphalt shingles. The roof surface is <u>not</u> a uniquely recognizable characteristic of this area and so flexibility in roof surface materials is warranted. The recommendation is to permit cedar shingles, shake profile concrete roof tiles, shake profile asphalt shingles with a raised ridge cap, and new environmentally sustainable roof products that have a strong shake profile. Where required by the BC Building Code for lower slope applications membrane roofing products can be permitted subject to consultant approval. Small decorative metal roofs should also be permitted.

- 8) **<u>Roof Slope :</u>** The recommendation is to set the minimum roof slope at 6:12. A provision is also recommended to allow slopes less than 6:12 where it is determined by the consultant that the design is of such high architectural integrity that the roof slope reduction can be justified, or that lower slopes are needed on feature projections or at the front entrance veranda to ensure upper floor windows can be installed without interference with the roof structure below. Given the view amenity, a lower slope roof will help to protect views of neighbours. The recommendation also is to set a maximum roof slope of 8:12 so that views for neighbours are not needlessly impacted.
- Streetscape: On the north side of River Road, most homes are late 1980's and 1990's "Modern California Stucco" or "Neo-Traditional" style, 3000-3500 sq.ft. Two-Storey homes with walk out basements situated on lots that slope down to the north, allowing views of the Fraser River and New Westminster. The homes have mid to high scale massing designs and have entrance porticos ranging from one to two storeys in height. Roof slopes range from 5:12 to 8:12 and a variety of roof surfaces are evident including cedars shingles, concrete roof tiles and asphalt. Most homes are clad either in stucco only, or vinyl only. There is one new "Neo-Traditional" style Two-Storey home at 11825 River Road, that has desirable midscale massing characteristics, and is clad in Hardiplank with substantial stone accent veneer, and wood shingles in the gable end. On the south side of River Road opposite the subject site are dozens of multifamily units with either three or 2 ½ storeys exposed to the street. There is one high mass Two-Storey home. There is natural vegetation concealing many homes with only the driveway exposed to street views.

## 2. Proposed Design Guidelines

### 2.1 Specific Residential Character and Design Elements these Guidelines Attempt to Preserve and/or Create:

- the new homes are readily identifiable as one of the following styles: "Traditional", "Heritage", "Neo-Traditional", "Neo-Heritage", compatible forms of "West Coast Contemporary", or other compatible styles with appropriate transitions in massing and character, as determined by the design *consultant*. Note that the proposed style range is not contained within the building scheme, but is contained within the residential character study which forms the basis for interpreting building scheme regulations.
- a new single family dwelling *constructed* on any *lot* meets year 2016's design standards, which
  include the proportionally correct allotment of mass between various street facing elements, the
  overall balanced distribution of mass within the front facade, readily recognizable style-authentic
  design, and a high trim and detailing standard used specifically to reinforce the style objectives
  stated above.
- trim elements will include several of the following: furred out wood posts, articulated wood post bases, wood braces and brackets, louvered wood vents, bold wood window and door trim, highly detailed gable ends, wood dentil details, stone or brick feature accents, covered entrance verandas and other style-specific elements, all used to reinforce the style (i.e. not just decorative).
- the development is internally consistent in theme, representation, and character.
- the entrance element will be limited in height (relative dominance) to 1 to 1 ½ storeys.

### 2.2 Proposed Design Solutions:

- Interfacing Treatment with existing dwellings) There is one home in this area (11825 River Road) that could be considered to provide acceptable architectural context. However, massing design, construction materials, and trim and detailing standards for new homes constructed in most new (post year 2017) RF zone subdivisions now meet or exceed standards evident on the context home. The recommendation therefore is to adopt standards commonly found in post year 2017 RF zoned subdivisions, rather than to specifically emulate the aforesaid context home.
- **Exterior Materials/Colours:** Stucco, Cedar, Vinyl, Fibre-Cement Board, Brick, and Stone.

"Natural" colours such as browns, greens, clays, and other earth-tones, and "Neutral" colours such as grey, white, and cream are permitted. "Primary" colours in subdued tones such as navy blue, colonial red, or forest green can be considered providing neutral trim colours are used, and a comprehensive colour scheme is approved by the consultant. "Warm" colours such as pink, rose, peach, salmon are not permitted. Trim colours: Shade variation of main colour, complementary, neutral, or subdued contrast only.

- **Roof Pitch:** Minimum 6:12, with exceptions to prevent roof ridges from becoming too high (overshadowing of neighbouring lots), to allow for veranda roofs that do not cover upper floor windows, to allow for artistic expression in feature roofs, and to provide a path for exceptional designs with lower slope roofs to be approved subject to consultant approval. Maximum 8:12 to ensure neighbours views are not unreasonably hindered by an over-height roof.
- **Roof Materials/Colours:** Cedar shingles, shake profile concrete roof tiles, shake profile asphalt shingles with a raised ridge cap, and new environmentally sustainable roofing products should be permitted, providing that the aesthetic properties of the new materials are equal to or better than that of the traditional roofing products. Greys, black, or browns only. Membrane roofs permitted where required by B.C. Building Code, and small metal feature roofs also permitted.
- In-ground basements: In-ground basements are subject to determination that service invert locations are sufficiently below grade to permit a minimum 50 percent in-ground basement to be achieved. If achievable, basements will appear underground from the front.
- Treatment of Corner Lots: Not applicable there are no corner lots

Landscaping: Moderate modern urban standard: Tree planting as specified on Tree Replacement Plan plus minimum 17 shrubs of a minimum 3 gallon pot size. Sod from street to face of home. Driveways: exposed aggregate, interlocking masonry pavers, coloured concrete (earth tones only), or stamped concrete.

**Compliance Deposit:** \$5,000.00

Summary prepared and submitted by: Tynan Consulting Ltd. Date: June 14, 2018

Reviewed and Approved by:

Mital

Date: June 14, 2018

Appendix B: Tree Preservation Summary	
Surrey Project No:	
Address: 11813 River Road	
Registered Arborist: Noah Talbot, BA ISA Certified Arborist (PN6822A), Tree Risk Assessment Qualified	
On-Site Trees	Number of Trees
<b>Protected Trees Identified</b> (on-site and shared trees, including trees within boulevards and proposed streets and lanes, but excluding trees in proposed open space or riparian areas).	5
Protected Trees to be Removed	5
<b>Protected Trees to be Retained</b> (excluding trees within proposed open space or riparian areas)	0
Total Replacement Trees Required- Alder & Cottonwood Trees Requiring 1 to 1 Replacement Ratio $2$ Xone(1)=2-All other Trees Requiring 2 to 1 Replacement Ratio $3$ Xtwo(2)=6	8
Replacement Trees Proposed	6
Replacement Trees in Deficit	2
Protected Trees to be Retained in Proposed (Open Space/Riparian Areas)	N/A
Off-Site Trees	Number of Trees
Protected Off-Site Trees to be Retained	1
Protected Off-Site Trees to be Removed	0
Total Replacement Trees Required- Alder & Cottonwood Trees Requiring 1 to 1 Replacement Ratio $\underline{0}$ Xone(1)= $0$ -All other Trees Requiring 2 to 1 Replacement Ratio $0$ Xtwo(2)= $0$	0
Replacement Trees Proposed	0
Replacement Trees in Deficit	0
Summary prepared and submitted by: Noah Talbat Date:	March 01, 2018





#### Impact Mitigation

Tree Protection Barrier: The areas, surrounding the trees to be retained, should be isolated from the construction activity by erecting protective barrier fencing. Where possible, the fencing should be erected at the perimeter of the tree protection zones. The barrier fencing to be erected must be a minimum of 1200mm in height, of solid frame construction that is attached to wooden or metal posts. A solid board or rail must run between the posts at the top and the bottom of the fencing. This solid frame can then be covered with plywood, or flexible snow fencing. The fencing must be erected prior to the start of any construction activity on site (i.e. demolition, excavation, construction) and remain in place through completion of the project. Signs should be posted around the protection zone to declare it off limits to all construction related activity. The project arborist must be consulted before this fencing is removed or moved for any purpose.

Excavation: We recommend that no excavation occur within tree protection zones of trees that are to be retained. Any excavation that is necessary, within the working space setback of trees to be retained must be completed under the direction of the project arborist. If it is found, at the time of excavation, that the excavation cannot be completed without severing roots that are critical to the trees health or stability it may be necessary to remove additional trees.

Demolition: If tree removal is proposed to be undertaken in conjunction with demolition operations, tree removal permits may be necessary. Note that some municipalities may not approve tree removal at this phase. If the municipality relaxes the requirement for barrier fencing installations prior to demolition (subject to onsite arborist supervision during demolition operations) a Letter of Undertaking may be required by the municipality.

Material storage: Areas must be designated for material storage and staning during the construction process. Ideally these areas will be located outside of the tree protection areas that will be isolated by barrier fencing. Should it be necessary to store material temporarily within any of the tree protection areas, the project arborist must be consulted

Mulch layer or plywood over heavy traffic areas: Should it be necessary to access tree protection areas during the construction phase of the project, and heavy foot traffic or vehicular encroachment is required, we recommend that a layer of wood chip horticultural mulch or plywood be installed to reduce compaction. This project arborist must be consulted prior to removing or moving the protection barrier for this purpose.

Pruning: Once tree clearing has taken place we recommend that trees to be retained be pruned to remove deadwood, and to address any structural flaws

We recommend that any pruning of bylaw-protected trees be performed to ANSI A300 standards and Best Management Practices, Stump removal: We recommend that, if stumps require removal, they

are removed under arborist supervision, or ground using a stump grinder to avoid disturbing root systems of trees in close proximity, that are shown on the tree management drawing to be retained.

Windthrow: Where forest edge trees are proposed to be removed, we recommend that trees that may experience an increase in wind exposure, be re-examined, once tree clearing has taken place, to ensure that they are structurally stable, and suitable for retention as leading edge trees.

Paved areas over critical root zones of trees to be retained: Where

paved areas cannot avoid encroachment within critical root zones of trees to be retained, construction techniques, such as floating permeable paving, may be required. (specifications can be provided by the project arborist, in consultation with the design consultant).

Landscaping: Any proposed landscaping within the critical root zones of trees to be retained must be reviewed with the project arborist.

Arborists Role: It is the responsibility of the client or his/her representative to contact the project arborist for the purpose of:

- · Locating the barrier fencing.
- · Reviewing the report with the project foreman or site supervisor.
- · Locating work zones and machine access corridors where required.
- · Supervising excavation for any areas within the critical root zones of trees to be retained including any proposed retaining wall footings and review any proposed fill areas near trees to be retained.

T1

roiect Number

2111-02991-0



#### Impact Mitigation

Tree Protection Barrier: The areas, surrounding the trees to be retained, should be isolated from the construction activity by erecting protective barrier fencing. Where possible, the fencing should be erected at the perimeter of the tree protection zones. The barrier fencing to be erected must be a minimum of 1200mm in height, of solid frame construction that is attached to wooden or metal posts. A solid board or rail must run between the posts at the top and the bottom of the fencing This solid frame can then be covered with plywood, or flexible snow fencing. The fencing must be erected prior to the start of any construction activity on site (i.e. demolition, excavation, construction), and remain in place through completion of the project. Signs should be posted around the protection zone to declare it off limits to all construction related activity. The project arborist must be consulted before this fencing is removed or moved for any purpose.

Excavation: We recommend that no excavation occur within tree protection zones of trees that are to be retained. Any excavation that is necessary, within the working space setback of trees to be retained. must be completed under the direction of the project arborist. If it is found, at the time of excavation, that the excavation cannot be completed without severing roots that are critical to the trees health or stability it may be necessary to remove additional trees.

Demolition: If tree removal is proposed to be undertaken in conjunction with demolition operations, tree removal permits may be necessary. Note that some municipalities may not approve tree removal at this phase. If the municipality relaxes the requirement for barrier fencing installations prior to demolition (subject to onsite arborist supervision during demolition operations) a Letter of Undertaking may be required by the municipality.

Material storage: Areas must be designated for material storage and staning during the construction process. Ideally these areas will be located outside of the tree protection areas that will be isolated by barrier fencing. Should it be necessary to store material temporarily within any of the tree protection areas, the project arborist must be consulted

Mulch layer or plywood over heavy traffic areas: Should it be necessary to access tree protection areas during the construction phase of the project, and beavy foot traffic or vehicular encroachment is required, we recommend that a layer of wood chip horticultural mulch or plywood be installed to reduce compaction. This project arborist must be consulted prior to removing or moving the protection barrier for this purpose.

Pruning: Once tree clearing has taken place we recommend that trees to be retained be pruned to remove deadwood, and to address any structural flaws

We recommend that any pruning of bylaw-protected trees be performed to ANSI A300 standards and Best Management Practices, Stump removal: We recommend that, if stumps require removal, they

are removed under arborist supervision, or ground using a stump grinder to avoid disturbing root systems of trees in close proximity, that are shown on the tree management drawing to be retained.

Windthrow: Where forest edge trees are proposed to be removed, we recommend that trees that may experience an increase in wind exposure, be re-examined, once tree clearing has taken place, to ensure that they are structurally stable, and suitable for retention as leading edge trees.

Paved areas over critical root zones of trees to be retained: Where paved areas cannot avoid encroachment within critical root zones of trees to be retained, construction techniques, such as floating permeable paving, may be required. (specifications can be provided by the project arborist, in consultation with the design consultant). Landscaping: Any proposed landscaping within the critical root zones of trees to be retained must be reviewed with the project arborist. Arborists Role: It is the responsibility of the client or his/her representative to contact the project arborist for the purpose of:

Locating the barrier fencing

City of Surrey

April 24, 2019

- · Reviewing the report with the project foreman or site supervisor.
- · Locating work zones and machine access corridors where required.
- · Supervising excavation for any areas within the critical root zones of trees to be retained including any proposed retaining wall footings and review any proposed fill areas near trees to be retained.

T2

roiect Number

2111-02991-0

### CITY OF SURREY

### (the "City")

### **DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT**

NO.: 7918-0093-00

Issued To:

("the Owners")

Address of Owners:

- 1. This development variance permit is issued subject to compliance by the Owner with all statutes, by-laws, orders, regulations or agreements, except as specifically varied by this development variance permit.
- 2. This development variance permit applies to that real property including land with or without improvements located within the City of Surrey, with the legal description and civic address as follows:

Parcel Identifier: 003-584-691

Lot 26 Fraction Section 25 Block 5 North Range 3 West New Westminster District Plan 65501

11813 - River Road

(the "Land")

3. (a) As the legal description of the Land is to change, the City Clerk is directed to insert the new legal description for the Land once title(s) has/have been issued, as follows:

Parcel Identifier:

(b) If the civic address(es) change(s), the City Clerk is directed to insert the new civic address(es) for the Land, as follows:

- 4. Surrey Zoning By-law, 1993, No. 12000, as amended is varied as follows:
  - (a) In Section K of Part 16 "Single Family Residential Zone (RF)", the minimum lot width is reduced from 15 metres (50 ft.) to 14 metres (46 ft.) for proposed Lots 1 and 2; and
  - (b) In Section F Yards and Setbacks, Part 16 "Single Family Residential Zone (RF)", the minimum side yard setback is reduced from 1.8 metres (6 ft.) to 1.2 metres (4 ft.) for principal buildings on proposed Lots 1 and 2.
- 5. This development variance permit applies to only the portion of the Land shown on Schedule A which is attached hereto and forms part of this development variance permit. This development variance permit does not apply to additions to, or replacement of, any of the existing buildings shown on attached Schedule A, which is attached hereto and forms part of this development variance permit.
- 6. The Land shall be developed strictly in accordance with the terms and conditions and provisions of this development variance permit.
- 7. This development variance permit shall lapse unless the subdivision, as conceptually shown on Schedule A which is attached hereto and forms part of this development variance permit, is registered in the New Westminster Land Title Office within three (3) years after the date this development variance permit is issued.
- 8. The terms of this development variance permit or any amendment to it, are binding on all persons who acquire an interest in the Land.
- 9. This development variance permit is not a building permit.

AUTHORIZING RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE COUNCIL, THE DAY OF , 20 . ISSUED THIS DAY OF , 20 .

Mayor – Doug McCallum

City Clerk – Jennifer Ficocelli

