



Development Approval Process Improvement Committee - Minutes

Hybrid Format:
Electronically by Teams
and In person
in 2E Community Room B
City Hall,
13450 - 104 Avenue
Surrey, B.C.
TUESDAY, JANUARY 20, 2026
Time: 9:03 a.m.

Present:

Councillor Kooner, Chair
Councillor Hepner, Vice-Chair
Councillor Bains
A. Johl
I. Dhillon
J. Gaglardi
R. Blackwell
S. Yusuf
V. Mehta

Absent:

Staff Present:

S. Neuman, General Manager, Engineering
R. Gill, General Manager, Planning & Development
J. Pang, Director, Land Development
V. Sachdeva, Director, Finance
K. Shackles, Planning Solutions Manager
A. Yahav, Legislative Services Coordinator
J. Gill, Legislative Services Coordinator
S. Prasad, Legislative Services Coordinator

Councillor Bains and R. Blackwell joined the meeting electronically via Microsoft Teams.

A. ADOPTIONS

1. Adoption of the Agenda

It was Moved by J. Gaglardi
Seconded by A. Johl
That the agenda of the Development Approval
Process Improvement Committee meeting of January 20, 2026, be adopted.
Carried

2. Adoption of the Minutes – December 9, 2025

It was Moved by Councillor Hepner
Seconded by J. Gaglardi
That the minutes of the Development Approval
Process Improvement Task Force meeting of December 9, 2025, be adopted.
Carried

B. STAFF PRESENTATIONS

1. Small Scale Multi Unit Housing Servicing Requirements

The Director, Land Development, Engineering, City of Surrey provided a PowerPoint presentation regarding Small Scale Multi Unit Housing servicing requirements. The following information was provided:

- Council requested that the Committee review Small-Scale Multi-Unit Homes (SSMUH) water metering requirements in the City.
- Current regulations require one water meter per legal lot, leaving it to homeowners and strata managers to determine how each water bill is paid. In some cases, this system is inequitable because the water usage for each unit on a multi-unit lot is not measured.
- SSMUH developments and development applications are rising in the City. In 2025, the City issues 133 permits, including 129 for duplexes and four for multiplexes (three units or higher).

V. Mehta joined the meeting at 9:06 a.m.

- The Engineering Department has traditionally favoured one water connection per lot rather than one water connection per unit. This applies to all home types, including multi-family sites, commercial strip malls, industrial strata buildings, etc.
- Water payment options include a flat-fee or metered rate. An average household of two can save 50% on their water bill by selecting metered rate.
- Other utility services, like sanitary payments, drainage fees, gas, and hydro are billed per lot or per parcel, and cannot be separated into per-unit rates.
- Effectuating a system to separate water bills by unit would be more equitable, as homeowners or tenants pay for their own water usage; however, staff note that tackling water fees alone may not solve the greater issue of equity for SSMUH expenses, as other, larger costs like taxes and utilities cannot be separated by unit.
- The upfront capital needed is between \$8,000 and \$15,000 per service connection and between \$2,000 and \$3,000 per water meter or inspection chamber. The City can expect to pay \$250 per asset per year for the duration of the 40-year life expectancy of a service connection and \$55 per asset per year for the duration of the 20-year life expectancy of a water meter or inspection chamber. This means that even when water is not being used, the City is liable for paying these servicing fees to keep these systems in operation.
- The upfront cost of a private sub-meter is around \$600. A sub-meter would allow each unit to access data on their water usage so that tenants can equitably share water costs. By installing sub-meters, the mechanism for water billing does not change, but homeowners can more accurately divide water costs each month.

- Staff recommend maintaining one service connection per lot and one water meter per lot to reduce the need for upfront capital, operating costs, and asset cost replacement. A private sub-meter can be installed by homeowners if desired.

In response to questions from the Committee, the following information was provided:

- The quoted services fees include all parts of the installation, including excavation and installation.
- There is a net loss on the fixed fee water payment portion but no loss overall.
- There are no clear guidelines on legal recourse for unpaid water bills for units on SSMUH lots, like to which title unpaid bills will be applied.
- Stratified units have separate tax accounts, but non-stratified units do not have separate tax accounts.
- By default, there are no provisions for cost sharing water bills. Water bills are addressed to the strata manager, who is responsible for paying and collecting costs from all tenants.
- It may be more costly to change water metering systems than would be saved by separating connections by unit.

The Committee made the following comments:

- Consider strategies to mitigate possible legal battles between owners on a multi-unit lot with unpaid bills. Consider setting clear guidelines for who becomes legally responsible for incurred fees.
- Members of the Committee expressed support for the recommendations from Staff to maintain the correct water metering system, with an option for private sub-meter installation.

J. Gaglardi left the meeting at 9:39 a.m.

J. Gaglardi rejoined the meeting at 9:43 a.m.

Councillor Hepner left the meeting at 9:44 a.m.

2. Proposed Temporary Use Permit Framework

The Development Planning Solutions Manager, Planning & Development, City of Surrey provided a PowerPoint presentation regarding the proposed temporary use permit (TUP) framework. The following information was provided:

- The City needs to implement a framework around the processing and applicant expectations of TUPs.
- Some challenges presented by TUP applications include:
 - Proliferation of property infractions;
 - Incentivization not to complete projects; and
 - Inconsistency in approach at staff level due to an absence of guidelines.
- A TUP framework can help to designate enforcement parameters, decision making, roles and responsibilities, applicant expectations, and processes.
- The proposed TUP framework will centre on applicant expectations. The framework has split applications into two streams: “TUP Applications” and “Infraction TUP Applications” (majority of which are truck parking uses).
- A timeline framework is needed for properties with infractions because TUPs are submitted to avoid continued bylaw contravention. Applicants often prolong completing the minimum steps required to advance their application to Council, while continuing to operate without permits.
- The proposed framework includes the following 15-month timeline from infraction to TUP issuance:
 - Infraction to application in three months;
 - Application to Council in six months; and
 - Council to final approval in six months.

In response to questions from the Committee, the following information was provided:

- The main problem is TUP process misuse. Applicants often try to avoid or delay bylaw infractions through TUP applications.
- The permit is “temporary” because the use is contrary to the zoning. The TUP allows for short-term use of the site for a use that does not comply with zoning provisions. Other times it is used for truck parking, outdoor storage, filming or temporary sales centres.
- The City is limited in how much it can charge in fines because of guidelines set out in the Community Charter. Increasing fines is not a viable solution to disincentivize bylaw infractions.
- A bylaw cannot easily set-out a timeline. A policy would be needed to implement a timeline framework for TUPs.

The Committee made the following comments:

- Consider implementing punitive measures for TUP applications that are in contravention of bylaws. This may help new site owners to recover costs and times associated with site restoration as a result of infractions.
- Consider adding provisions into the proposed timeline framework for extensions for variable circumstances.
- Members of the Committee expressed support for a new TUP timeline framework, as it will communicate to applicants that TUP rules, including timelines will be enforced, ultimately leading to less infractions and bylaw contraventions.
- Consider looking at legal mechanisms to penalize repeat-offenders.
- Consider giving in-stream applicants six months to comply with City requirements.
- The Committee expressed support for implementing a policy rather than a bylaw to set-out a timeline framework for TUP applications.
- Truck parking is needed in the City. Ensure that future policies do not hinder access to truck parking.

C. OTHER BUSINESS

1. 2026 Meeting Schedule

The Committee received the 2026 Meeting Schedule as information

2. Roundtable of Discussion

A roundtable of discussion ensued. The Committee discussed current DCC updates in the City.

D. ADJOURNMENT

It was

Moved by A. Johl
Seconded by I. Dhillon
That the Development Approval Process

Improvement Committee meeting be adjourned.

Carried

The Development Approval Process Improvement Committee adjourned at 10:33 a.m.

Jennifer Ficocelli
City Clerk and Director Legislative Services

Councillor Pardeep Kooner, Chair