



# *Development Approval Process Improvement Task Force - Minutes*

Hybrid Format:  
Electronically by Teams  
and In person in  
1E – Committee Room B  
City Hall  
13450 - 104 Avenue  
Surrey, B.C.  
**TUESDAY, JANUARY 28, 2025**  
Time: 9:10 a.m.

**Present:**

Councillor Kooner, Chair  
Councillor Hepner, Vice-Chair  
S. Neuman, General Manager, Engineering  
R. Gill, General Manager, Planning & Development  
R. Blackwell  
A. Johl  
S. Yusuf

**Absent:**

Councillor Bains  
J. Gaglardi

**Staff Present:**

A. Yahav, Legislative Services Assistant

S. Neuman and Councillor Hepner joined the meeting electronically via Microsoft Teams.

**A. ADOPTIONS**

**1. Adoption of the Agenda**

Councillor Kooner proposed to amend the agenda by moving item, "Bike Parking" under section B to the top of the section.

It was  
Approval Process Improvement Task Force meeting of January 28, 2025, be adopted, as amended.

Moved by S. Yusuf  
Seconded by A. Johl  
That the agenda of the Development  
Approval Process Improvement Task Force meeting of January 28, 2025, be adopted, as amended.  
Carried

**2. Adoptions of the Minutes – January 14, 2025**

It was  
Approval Process Improvement Task Force meeting of January 14, 2025, be adopted.

Moved by A. Johl  
Seconded by S. Yusuf  
That the minutes of the Development  
Approval Process Improvement Task Force meeting of January 14, 2025, be adopted.  
Carried

**B. DISCUSSION ITEMS****1. Bike Parking**

The General Manager, Engineering provided an overview of bike parking and requested that the Committee provide specific comments that can be brought to Council. The General Manager, Engineering, asked that the Committee respond to the following comments and concerns:

- The minimum number of bikes able to be stored in new developments;
- The potential for multi-use / shared bike storage options, such as bike storage and change room facilities; and
- The location of bike storage to be within any level in the parking garage or at grade (without impacting FAR).
- 

Discussion ensued as follows:

- There have been a few reports on bike storage in Surrey City Centre. These reports found that bike storage facilities in residential buildings had a 10% utilization rate. The reports also found that mixed-use / shared facilities, like locker room and bike storage amenity, were most effective.
- Residential buildings are not required by bylaw to provide general storage spaces for tenants, but it is common that tenants are provided at least a small space. The dimensions are not mandated nor universal, but are often rectangular 6ft by 2ft lockers. Residential buildings are required, however, to provide 0.4 bike storage spots per unit in new developos.

The Committee provided the following comments:

- Data from bike storage usage in residential towers in Surrey City Centre should be used to inform future required minimums. The required minimum storage space should also be reflective of varying bike usage across different communities in the city.
- Consider providing hanging bike storage in front of vehicle parking spots to maximize space.
- Consider distributing bike parking across several floors of the parkade.
- Bike parking at grade poses several risks, including increased susceptibility of theft and weather damage of bikes.
- Developers could be compensated for offering bike parking at grade by having the space subtracted from their Floor Area Ratio (FAR).
- Consider incorporating other amenities in the bike storage area to maximize space.

**2. Development Permit Lite Process**

The General Manager, Planning & Development provided an overview of the Development Permit Lite process and requested comments from the Committee on the following questions:

- What type of development is suitable for the Development Permit Lite? Consider industrial buildings, townhouses, etc?
- What will the Development Permit Lite look like in practice?
- Should there be any parameters around projects afforded the Development Permit Lite? For instance, should density ranges or setback requirements be set in place?

Discussion ensued as follows:

- Development Permit Lite is a less onerous urban design review process. It is intended to reduce the scope of the review and the time needed to review projects in the city.
- Townhouse zones have recently been simplified, however, there are often variances between townhome designs that lengthen the review process.
- The average timeframe for a townhouse review is longer than a high-rise building due to development attempts to maximize the number of doors and units. This results in back-to-back units or tandem doors, raising concern from staff regarding livability. The Development Permit Lite will ideally be extended to townhomes in the future.
- General form and character is an important aspect of the City's role in allowing developments.
- Metro is working with the City on a 'standard' for a six-storey building. This includes pre-approved plans for certain buildings like coach houses and carriage houses. 6-storey buildings will be subsumed into this pre-approved plan policy. This has brought up some issues regarding sites that are non-conventional shape or have other variances that are hard to anticipate. This plan is still in the early planning stages.

The Committee made the following comments:

- Consider shortening review time of projects by prioritizing comments on form and character.
- Consider creating a set of general requirements which allows development projects to procure the Development Permit Lite. Consider not using density as a criterion.

- Consider establishing an intake interview system in which urban design planners can outline expectations of the Development Permit Lite for developers. Each developer can be shown the costs and benefits associated with complying with the Lite permit as opposed to the standard permit route, which could increase the process by several months.
- Industrial sites should also be part of the Development Permit Lite process. The primary concern of development permits for industrial projects should be safety and function. Design should not be cause for major concern, especially if the proposed development location is out of view from major neighbourhood hubs.
- Six-story developments should also be extended Design Permit Lites, but should be monitored closely for design.
- Ensure that 'standard' plans for six-storey buildings or other small structures like coach houses and carriage houses do not homogenize city neighbourhoods.

S. Neuman left the meeting at 9:46 a.m.

### 3. **Public Art Rates, Policy, and CACs**

Discussion ensued as follows:

- The development industry is currently experiencing a cost delivery issue. This is due to increased interest rates, tariffs, and other costs. Market housing is nearly impossible to make affordable because land, building costs, and are expensive. Units are often made smaller to compensate for these costs. Currently, 0.5% of construction costs are required to be spent on public art, which can be built or paid to the City. Money used for public art could be moved into a fund to support affordable housing. Public art ultimately adds to the cost of housing units, which is directly passed along to buyers.
- Art funds should be capped or implemented on a sliding scale to ensure that these elective fees do not stop developments from being constructed.
- Public art fees should be looked at as a housing affordability issue. It is challenging to decrease housing costs because construction costs are fixed. Decreasing public art costs is one way to decrease overall costs.
- Approximately 90% of developers are paying directly to the City to avoid the public art installation requirement.

- Art instillation processes are difficult and costly. Usually, a developer hires a public art consultant that works with the City and who procures a list of several potential artists. Subsequently, a shortlist of artists is created, and developers pick from sample pieces provided. This results in money being spent more so on administrative costs than the art itself.

**4. Indoor and Outdoor Amenities**

The Chair, Councillor Kooner, deferred this item to the next meeting.

**C. OTHER BUSINESS**

**1. Roundtable**

The Committee had a roundtable discussion on upcoming discussion topics:

- Indoor and Outdoor Amenity Space; and
- Row housing development opportunities in the City Centre

**D. NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Development Approval Process Improvement Task Force is scheduled for 9:00 a.m. on February 11, 2025 in 1E – Community Room B.

**E. ADJOURNMENT**

It was Moved by R. Blackwell  
Seconded by A. Johl  
That the Development Approval Process  
Improvement Task Force meeting be adjourned.  
Carried

The Development Approval Process Improvement Task Force adjourned at 10:31 a.m.

---

Jennifer Ficocelli  
City Clerk and Director Legislative Services

---

Councillor Pardeep Kooner, Chair