

Rosemary Heights Community Survey

June 21, 2018

Resident Comments

Number of comments received: 136

Comments are in response to Porte Developments' proposal to re-zone and develop the former Rosemary Heights Retreat Centre lands. They are listed in no particular order and do not include personal information of the authors. The Rosemary Heights Community Association will provide names if requested AND only if approved by the authors.

1	37A Ave, 36 Ave, 154 st will all suffer very greatly from this development. These are family neighbourhoods where traffic is already a major problem! Rosemary and Morgan Elementary schools are already at maximum capacity, if Porte development was building a public school for the new development and the City of Surrey catchment area then that would be doing "its part" as a developer. Instead they are planning on a francophone school which will be handing over profits from land sale and or rent to the developer in order for the developer to still capitalize on profits from the <u>reduced number of houses being planned. This is horrific how dense this development is.</u>
2	Additional 322 houses would have a major effect on traffic and the schools
3	Although I am in favor of Porte including a school in his revised proposal, the increased # of residences and the negative impact those residences will have on the schools, traffic, environment and community safety is immense and unacceptable. There should be no rezoning of any part of that land. It should remain completely Institutional.
4	As we said before we do not have strong infrastructure for this size of development. We need to preserve forest and wild life for all of us and our children. Make beautiful park so all the people can enjoy it. Thank you and we trust that you will follow wishes of people in South Surrey!
5	At what point can the City of Surrey simply decline to rezone a property? The approach of Porte appears to be to double down, and push for more with each successive revision - in the face of opposition already.
6	Because there is not adequate infrastructure, ie 2 lane roadways, no access to 152nd from the Porte proposal and because new traffic will be added from other Surrey locations due to a francophone school proposal this looks like Porte couldn't care less about the concerns raised initially. I'm <u>completely against this until proper infrastructure is in place first.</u>
7	City of Surrey runs by corruption. There are strong signs that indicate their driving force is something other than what people ask or require.
8	Complete lack of disregard for the infrastructure density this neighbourhood already deals with. Made no effort to take our concerns about the stress the new development will have on our schools.
9	concerned about the traffic patterns and the fact that it is a FRANCOPHONE school only and the area they are trying to draw from seems to be most of the south Surrey district
10	Density + Traffic + School + Ecol. =all a disaster
11	Do not go ahead with Porte's development plan
12	the lands were never intended for use as a multi family development and if approved will destroy an environmentally sensitive Riparian forest and create unwanted density and vehicle traffic that runs counter to the existing NCP. This development should not be approved.
13	Extremely disappointed. Representatives did not have answers to my question of traffic. Qi was contacted by a consultant who said they were still doing a traffic study.
14	Far too much development and density for this neighbourhood. There wasn't enough infrastructure to support the growth 5 years ago, and the area has only grown since.
15	Francophone school makes no sense and adds major traffic. Access to area is very limited and biggest concern.

Rosemary Heights Community Survey

June 21, 2018

Resident Comments

Number of comments received: 136

Comments are in response to Porte Developments' proposal to re-zone and develop the former Rosemary Heights Retreat Centre lands. They are listed in no particular order and do not include personal information of the authors. The Rosemary Heights Community Association will provide names if requested AND only if approved by the authors.

16	George Mallory said he climbed Mount Everest "because it's there." It seems Porte is developing in a similar mindset. Just because... and "other people are doing it." But it doesn't mean it's a good thing. Roads are too narrow, jumbled and don't have a rhyme or reason. Traffic is already too heavy. And each complex of townhomes looks different making the entire neighbourhood seem off. There needs to be an actual plan of the communities and it just plunk something in and say "there. Job done."
17	Growth is too fast, commute is terrible. Roads cannot support amount of traffic, congestion is awful. People cut through neighborhoods to divert from congestion on main roads over speed limit.
18	Housing density in line with ironwood. No francophone school.
19	I am fine with densification in the right environment. South Surrey is not suitable for densification. It is a suburb community where people need to daily commute. Our roads and public transit cannot support densification. The francophone school is a bad option as it would bring traffic into our community from outside neighborhoods.
20	I am strongly opposed based on the huge increase in traffic, roads that are not capable of handling more traffic and the overcrowding of schools. traffic
21	I am very distressed about the proposal considering the lack of infrastructure to support traffic even as it is now.
22	I am very worried about the congestion in our neighbourhood. The school is the worst idea. The children will all be driven in from outer areas. It's just the craziest idea.
23	I am worried sick about the traffic on the 3600 block of 154th Street - exit & entrance to the development. The city has no business allowing a development like this with exit and entrance onto a relatively narrow street - single lane traffic with parking now on both sides. Cars travel between 60-80 kmh unless they have to pull over due to an approaching car. Already it is a busy street due to previous development in the neighbourhood. This immediate neighbourhood will be ruined by the Porte development.
24	I attended a public meeting held by the City of Surrey 2017 Dec. A few things struck me in the material presented by City Planners. 1 - Their study of new building impacts all seems to be piecemeal with not overall impact assessment of all the new development that has been going on since I moved into the area 7 years ago. 2 - They talked about the North America models they use for planning purposes which assumes they are representative of the neighbourhood however ... my understanding is that the Elementary School was at capacity as soon as it opened years ago. For me, this puts into question the applicability / relevance of the models being used for planning purposes. 3 - Seems the impact of the proposed Porte Development on the neighbourhood is being understated.
25	I feel that their most recent proposal will have a more negative impact on the neighborhood than their original.

Rosemary Heights Community Survey

June 21, 2018

Resident Comments

Number of comments received: 136

Comments are in response to Porte Developments' proposal to re-zone and develop the former Rosemary Heights Retreat Centre lands. They are listed in no particular order and do not include personal information of the authors. The Rosemary Heights Community Association will provide names if requested AND only if approved by the authors.

26	I find that the latest Porte Proposal, which proposes even more residential units than the previous development proposed and was strongly opposed by residents to come as somewhat of a surprise. That and the addition of a "new school" that will serve a small portion of the existing community to also come as a surprise. Since our current infrastructure is max'ed out, we strongly believe that Rosemary Heights Retreat Lands could be better utilized as park space, walking trails and perhaps even a community centre for the existing community as well as an area for the wildlife to co-exist, rather than adding yet more density to the Rosemary Heights area. We are strongly opposed to Porte's developments of these lands.
27	I have emailed my comments in opposition to this proposal to Council, Planning, and Porte
28	I have lived in this community for ten years now (moving from where I was born and raised; Richmond). We moved out here to raise our family in a less dense environment.. well that's changed!! Keep building townhomes, condos etc well no upgrades to infrastructures are being made.. schools are over crowded.. kids sports league deny kids due to the fact of too many registrants and not enough volunteers fields/rinks etc.. no highway upgrades.. no bridge options for the south (fuck the tunnel!!!) I work downtown for the city of Vancouver and I'm commute is on average 2-3 hours a day.. and now navigating through my own community is a damn nightmare.. the one lane overpass on 152 (that was closed) is a joke.. the exits to the highway (32nd ave) Joke! But hey let's build more cuz there's vacant land and money right? It takes friends of mine who live in Mission less time to get to work than me living in Rosemary Heights! And a francophone school? They aren't even accepting new kids that live in catchment to Rosemary Heights yet let's bring francophones from out of catchment to this new school tucked into the corner of our community.. I honestly don't think my rant will even be read let alone considered because money talks
29	I have written letters opposing this and I feel that our infrastructure does not even support our current demands. Development is occurring far too quickly at the expense of the residents of this area. We are becoming increasingly unhappy about living in this area as it is obvious the city values tax dollars from developers rather than the needs of its tax-paying residents.
30	I now live in a community where it's making it impossible to get my children anywhere on time. The traffic is horrible, people are honking and making illegal turns/move to avoid congestion. The 152/32 area is way beyond capacity and there are other townhomes/condos already built and not moved into that will already add to the congestion! In addition, the school is already at capacity so this will worsen the situation.
31	I strongly disagree with the way Porte Development has gone about "communicating" (flyer) with the neighbourhood. Also, I am in the Rosemary Heights Community and I did not receive any communication from them. I found out about it second hand. I want to see a regular informative meeting with the developers proposal and city representatives attending to answer questions. 3. Why is the City of Surrey allowing communication done this way?
32	I Strongly oppose
33	I think our schools and streets cannot handle this development. The francophone school will only bring more traffic to the area (what are they thinking).

Rosemary Heights Community Survey

June 21, 2018

Resident Comments

Number of comments received: 136

Comments are in response to Porte Developments' proposal to re-zone and develop the former Rosemary Heights Retreat Centre lands. They are listed in no particular order and do not include personal information of the authors. The Rosemary Heights Community Association will provide names if requested AND only if approved by the authors.

34	I think the city of Surrey should purchase the land and make it a park in which all residents of South Surrey and White Rock can come and find enjoyment and reconnection with nature. A place where residents can find refuge from the increased housing density, traffic and mental stress. I've lived in this area for 12 years and we've experienced relentless development and increased traffic congestion. Adding another development of 300+ townhouses will yet again increase traffic congestion, overcrowding in the schools and doctor's offices. With all the high property taxes that we pay in this area, the city does nothing for the residents here. It is unfair and unacceptable to let developers buy pieces of land that are environmentally sensitive and critical for conservation of wildlife and the wellbeing of residents. With piling up more and more development the beautiful, peaceful and family friendly neighbourhood of Rosemary Heights will lose its livability.
35	I think the overdevelopment of South Surrey is a concern for everyone in the area, not just those in Rosemary Heights. Personally I think the shredding of our landscape and by that I mean the aggressive removal of trees and habitat is disgusting. Absolutely no sensitivity to the neighbourhood or environment inhabited by current residents. There is no need for another densely populated subdivision (benefitting only a few select individuals and groups). These eyesores are in complete contrast to the neighbourhood developers set out to achieve for the area. The end result will of course be increased traffic congestion, high-density housing, overcrowded schools, roads, on-street parking, more traffic, loss of habitat and an eyesore on an otherwise green landscape. I am not interested in another neighbourhood school. Schools = MORE TRAFFIC and congestion. We have two perfectly good schools in the area. Government money would be better spent at either location implementing a French Immersion programme (if indeed needed) and upgrades to existing structures to accommodate a lesser number of students based on a more reasonable Rosemary Heights neighbourhood-appropriate proposal from Porte Developments.
36	I think this is a bad plan as it will corrupt the traffic system adding more families and cars to our already busy streets (an opinion from my 11 year old daughter!!). Also, the proposed development WILL definitely become the last straw of ruining the Rosemary Heights community entirely. If Jane Jacobs were alive today, ask if she would support the proposed idea. Don't know who Jane Jacobs was? Then it Really concerns me!
37	I understand a lot of development is inevitable. However, the community cannot sustain the density that Porte wishes to add to an already popping at the seams neighbourhood. Rosemary Heights is at capacity and cannot support any more portables. Traffic is already congested and there is not enough street parking for current residents who are parking blocks away from their homes. Not to mention how this will negatively impact the environmental aspect of the property. A Francophone school accepting only French speaking families - first language - does nothing to alleviate the pressure on the current schools as very few families in the surrounding areas fit that description.
38	I was very disappointed with the new proposal as it would have more of a negative impact on the environment and community plan than the original proposal.
39	I would be in favour of a smaller scale development that added single family homes along 154 similar to the style and size of existing lots. In favour of an easement space, and some small scale 60 or less town homes with 152 street access only. Our city needs to improve traffic flow on 152 over passes before allowing additional development.

Rosemary Heights Community Survey

June 21, 2018

Resident Comments

Number of comments received: 136

Comments are in response to Porte Developments' proposal to re-zone and develop the former Rosemary Heights Retreat Centre lands. They are listed in no particular order and do not include personal information of the authors. The Rosemary Heights Community Association will provide names if requested AND only if approved by the authors.

40	I'm disappointed that Portes proposed improvements will significantly affect the traffic flow, specifically on 36 and 152. The idea that a franaphone would be a benefit to the community is laughable - it will only increase the traffic as a large amount of the students will be commuting to school. This does nothing to support the current rosemary families.
41	If that area is to be developed, it should be single family homes that fit in with the rest of the neighborhood.
42	If we have to have this land developed, large single family lots are the way to go This will reduce impact on schools and traffic patterns. They purchased his land as institutional and it should remain institutional. A Francophone school is even worse as all attendees will be driven in from out of the area, due to the French language requirement.
43	I'm not opposed to all development in South Surrey but I do not see this parcel as being a reasonable development due to the already congestion of schools and roads in this area. Grandview corners east is where development should occur
44	Infrastructure developments, i.e. roads, schools, parks, walkways need to be built before further housing development is permitted
45	It is a shame the city will not consider turning this into a nature preserve area (or anything else that would save the land) instead it will go the way of the rest of surrey. It's sad. The last thing this area needs (in light of overcrowding - traffic/schools) is more developer-centric mass development. Hopefully one day the city will come to its senses before it is too late.
46	It is a very big worry about it it will change the neighbour too many cars , this is a residential neighbour good it will be changed for the worse. We cannot move as it to unaffordable we do not want move to somewhere like Abbotsford,Chilliwack they are to far all of our children live in Vancouver city and the Island. We feel we would be so unhappy with such a change in our residential neighbour hood. They the developer does not care about that only say they will build a School but it is only for people that already have a Family that is French it will not help our School problems just make it so busy here with all of the School buses in and out of the Neighbour hood there are already buses every day at 36th and 154 and Rosemary Heights Cr and we witness the way people who drive here are annoyed and do not respect the laws regarding School Buses we see it every day a lot of risks for students
47	It is clearly a plan only based on Porte's business stand point. Inconsiderate of existing households and its community.
48	It is just too much and there is already too much . Traffic at 32 Ave and 152 is already crazy
49	It is simply too much for the current capacity of the neighbourhood. The school would not serve local families (at least in the short term) and their proposal has increased density over the previous proposal. That density was my main issue with it.
50	It is totally against what the community feedback has been. It adds more housing unit, more density and the school will not serve the local community. It also destroys further of the forested area on the property. Totally not appropriate for this community.
51	It's one sided to only present their development and not to listen
52	KEEPING the Retreat Centre lands original condition
53	Listen to residents
54	Listen to the current residents regarding their neighbourhood

Rosemary Heights Community Survey

June 21, 2018

Resident Comments

Number of comments received: 136

Comments are in response to Porte Developments' proposal to re-zone and develop the former Rosemary Heights Retreat Centre lands. They are listed in no particular order and do not include personal information of the authors. The Rosemary Heights Community Association will provide names if requested AND only if approved by the authors.

55	Must not only stop development but also stop the French school as it will not solve overcrowding
56	My biggest concern is the road infrastructure. In addition the French school should also be for local non French families and go to grade 7
57	Need to keep green space/protected forest area. Tons of wildlife will be gone if development continues!
58	No justification for French school in this area
59	No more, that's it. No more trees being cut down, no more wild life with no home. Eagles, Coyote, Raccoon, etc., there will be no more pets around because they will all be eaten by these poor residents. We have enough with Harvard, The Falls and all of the other intruders that have built in the area. If you don't live here now, wait till someone sells and keep the beauty. All you greedy politicians and developers, ask yourselves as you look in the mirror, would you want this in your neighbourhood. No you would not. Get out and stay out. You are not welcome here. You've already ruined Surrey, the city of parks. Look at what Mary Hill in Coquitlam looks like. What an atrocity. Enough. We can't handle what we have here as it is. I've lived here all of my life and have paid the lions share of the taxes to see what it has become. No more.
60	Not a suitable development for this area or available infrastructure.
61	Not enough talk/ studies done on wildlife/ nature impact. In fact Porte has done nothing about this neither has Surrey
62	Not in favor of the neighbourhood at all, increase traffic and population. The school they are proposing only favors French as 1st language, it is misleading.
63	Not sure the school issue matters...the city seems to have unlimited resources to build never-ending portables & modulars so I'm not sure this will matter. The francophone school makes absolutely no sense, as there are almost NO francophones in this area meaning students would have to be bused or driven in from surrounding areas. Hardly a sensible solution when the community wanted a high school to alleviate the need to bus hundreds of students out of this area every morning. And condos - really? With increased density from crammed-in townhomes? Again, hardly what the community wanted which was single family homes and large-format townhomes like the Ferngrove & Rosemary Walk complexes Porte built years ago. Such a shame...
64	Porte proposal is ridiculous as there is no infrastructure to support the amount of traffic and people this proposal would bring to the area
65	Porte proposal lacks a coordinated development path for South Surrey, it MIGHT be considered okay for the retreat land but there is a larger picture that politicians must consider, traffic, schools, hospitals and of course this is not Porte Developments' interest it is my interest and I am one of the little people living in this area. I am very concerned that Surrey Council must and should realize that South Surrey has reached a dangerous tipping point of density. There must be a moratorium on permits until needed amenities are developed FIRST. What about hospital, what about schools, what about traffic flow and transit link. I say reduce significantly foot print of retreat lands.
66	Proposal does not fit into neighbourhood at all. Negatively impacts quality of life.
67	Public safety is also a big concern
68	Refer to letter sent to City, Porte, et al this past week.

Rosemary Heights Community Survey

June 21, 2018

Resident Comments

Number of comments received: 136

Comments are in reponse to Porte Developments' proposal to re-zone and develop the former Rosemary Heights Retreat Centre lands. They are listed in no particular order and do not include personal information of the authors. The Rosemary Heights Community Association will provide names if requested AND only if approved by the authors.

69	Rosemary Heights Cresnet I already a very very busy Street & with the speed limit that people travel as they use this Street to take shortcuts from Morgan creek to 152 already a major concern...I can't even imagine how much more traffic will be in this area alone just with new townhouse & single family homes. I am strongly opposed to the school as we can't contain our own neighbourhood busyness let alone buses and families from outside invading our neighbourhood.we need a neighbourhood traffic plan NOW and this proposal makes that on top of this a nightmare to think about.
70	Save Rosemary should consider contacting and involving environmental groups in the process. They have resources to impact on Council decisions
71	Sell back to the city for a park or maintain as a retreat center
72	SouthSurrey City planning is a complete joke. Everyone involved should be embarrassed.
73	Stop. First get proper infrastructures in place before any more developments get approved in south surrey!
74	Strongly oppose
75	Support change and growth on an incremental basis, I'm ok w/ some change here just not to the extent of 300 living units + school
76	Surrey asa whole cannot and has not kept up with the pace of development in terms of providing the needed infrastructure to support the growing expansion of the area. Development needs to be halted until the City of Surrey and/or these developers lay the groundwork to support the number of people that will be flooding the area.
77	Surrey needs to stop developing and work on the infrastructure first then allow developement.
78	Taking everything into consideration, including traffic, population density, school availability, and environmental impact, we do not support the development proposal.
79	Thank you for the opportunity of the survey. It appears that development will take place at some point and it is nice to have an opportunity to share our concerns. I work in the Surrey school district. I continue to witness first hand poor city/school planning with over crowded schools. Not to mention a Francophone school with out of catchment students being bused in.
80	That land is so ecologically sensitive. It should be preserved with no development. The pace of development in the city is ridiculous. Roads, hospitals and schools are unable to keep up. This proposal will turn a nicely balanced neighborhood into a unsafe chaotic nightmare for traffic.
81	The area does NOT need any further developments for housing, which would heavily impact already disastrous traffic backups at 152/32 area plus our already over capacity elementary schools (just look at all the portables at both schools and traffic at drop off/pick up) and how is a francophone school going to elevate anything. The area needs more park space, and less money hungry developers!
82	The area is already overdeveloped and overwhelmed by the pace of growth. Traffic, school overcrowding, increasing crime, dwindling greenspace. Time to slow down densification and catch up on infrastructure.

Rosemary Heights Community Survey

June 21, 2018

Resident Comments

Number of comments received: 136

Comments are in response to Porte Developments' proposal to re-zone and develop the former Rosemary Heights Retreat Centre lands. They are listed in no particular order and do not include personal information of the authors. The Rosemary Heights Community Association will provide names if requested AND only if approved by the authors.

83	The biggest issue with this latest proposal and all previous proposals is the lack of an independent access entrance and exit. ALL traffic must come down 36 th avenue which is already quite busy and also 154 th. We bought into and enjoy an established community. It's too late to change it. The property and Rosemary Heights was not built to support such high density. Development is inevitable but at a MUCH smaller scale. South Surrey is becoming a concrete jungle - not the community we moved to or have lived in our entire lives. Surrey should buy this land and preserve it.
84	the community asked for a high school and single family homes...how on earth did that end up being 'heard' as condos, higher density and a francophone school no homeowners locally can benefit from? To state to the paper that it would 'alleviate' spaces in other schools is disappointing to hear. Francophone students are not going to suddenly switch the schools they have become situated in. Surrey City Council is not looking at what their voters are asking, they are looking at what the revenue projections entail.
85	The developers positioning the school as a net positive for the proposal is disingenuous. It will add more traffic and increase densification while providing little, if any, additional class space for the immediate neighborhood. The loss of 152 as an entrance/exit is not addressed and is a major concern. Without proving viable options for traffic and school space for local students, the current proposal is worse than the first.
86	The fact that they are promoting their development by saying they are adding an Elementary school is absurd! A school none of the residents will be able to attend? More school buses going through the area? What a farse.
87	The francophone school is in no way a solution of the current overcrowded school situation. Students will have to commute from outside of the neighborhood- very small percentage (if any) of the neighborhood family will be able to attend and the traffic congestion will be worse. Horrible non-solution, without addressing any of the current concerns and made it even worse.
88	The infastucture in the area can not support this level of development.
89	The latest Porte proposal does not address any of the concerns raised by local residents, in my opinion. Furthermore, the fact that it is even still on the table is a shocking disappointment in the City of Surrey, to me. There is a neighbourhood plan in place, which was well researched. That land has a designated use, which I see no reason to change.
90	The local roads cannot take the additional traffic. They were not built with this development in mind. Current roads can barely handle current traffic. Mondays, with garbage & re-cycling trucks, 3 buses for Earl Marriot High School, plus local traffic, increased number of people & kids walkingto & from Rosemary Elementary, roads & streets are crowded. Intersection of 154th & 36th is already a bad design. 154th to the south as it meets 36th is on a slight incline. Ditto for 36th as it goes east & meets 154th. With no exit/entry planned for 152nd for this development, with no foresight from the city to have and entry exit off one of the cul de sacs to the south of this land, we are doomed if they allow this development. I fear a child or several will be struck by cars trying to get in and out of this area if the present development is allowed to go ahead.
91	The neighbourhood is already dense with high traffic. It can't handle more.

Rosemary Heights Community Survey

June 21, 2018

Resident Comments

Number of comments received: 136

Comments are in response to Porte Developments' proposal to re-zone and develop the former Rosemary Heights Retreat Centre lands. They are listed in no particular order and do not include personal information of the authors. The Rosemary Heights Community Association will provide names if requested AND only if approved by the authors.

92	The new plan will only increase traffic concerns as it is a specialized school and not only residents will be driving through the community but also parents dropping off children to this specialized school. I am not sure if this has been addressed but why should the city of Surrey be able to rule on this development as is it not the City of Surrey that sold the land to the Porte Development before the land use/zoning has been approved? Would this not be a conflict of interest?
93	The new proposal will mean a higher population density and a school that will attract approximately 1% of the population and not beneficial at all to the community.
94	The number of units and increased population will not be supported within the current infrastructure of the area. A Francophone school only increases out of area traffic to Rosemary. Until infrastructure is dramatically improved in the area, this proposal does not make sense.
95	The plan goes against the neighbourhood plan set out years ago. Townhome/houses should only be considered in the event that the rezoning is permitted by the city. Having a francophone school will involve children from other areas (outside neighbourhood) being bused in adding to traffic issues already existing. Also this francophone school will not help neighbourhood as select few would meet entry requirements. Condos should not be permitted. Access off of 152 is a must to help alleviate traffic pattern through residential area. We already had a girl hit by a car on Rosemary Heights crescent, do not need any more preventable accidents to occur as a result of increased density. Environmental impacts to this land and the river must be taken into consideration.
96	The proposal will have a significant negative impact on our local neighbour traffic and density. The school is already overcrowded with no additional room for extra classrooms. Things were so bad at the start of school last year, there were students taking class in the gymnasium. The Francophone school proposed will provide absolutely no relief, as only students with a French speaking parent can attend. Most students who attend a Francophone school are not local children, but must be bused into the neighbourhood from surrounding areas. And let's not kid ourselves, most kids will get driven in by car. Traffic in this area is bad and unsafe enough without further increase in cars because of this school. NO THANK YOU! And please explain how adding 96 condos is an improvement on your last proposal?? We want LESS density, not more. For every household you add to this development, that is an additional 2 cars to the area at least. And once those kids in the neighbour grow up, that will be another vehicle on our local roads. This neighbourhood is maxed out as it is, with very limited street parking, small roads with absolutely no infrastructure to get on to major thoroughfares. During rush hour, traffic is backed up all along 152nd to get onto the 32 diversion. Even when you get on there, it takes MINIMUM 4 traffic light changes before you can get through the overpass. The average speed of travel down this small stretch of road is LESS than going through the counter flow lane of the Massey tunnel during rush hour!

Rosemary Heights Community Survey

June 21, 2018

Resident Comments

Number of comments received: 136

Comments are in response to Porte Developments' proposal to re-zone and develop the former Rosemary Heights Retreat Centre lands. They are listed in no particular order and do not include personal information of the authors. The Rosemary Heights Community Association will provide names if requested AND only if approved by the authors.

97	The proposed development is much too dense for the area. In addition there is not adequate roadway access and the one propose major entrance and exit directly into the community road ways will create excess traffic, increased stress to the community users, and reduced safety to pedestrians and drivers. The size of the proposed green spaces in the development are much too small. Each of the green spaces within the area to be developed must be made much larger. This is in regards the green space areas that will be publically accessible within the main area of development. I am also opposed to the francophone school as it will only increase traffic into the area as it will not be local students attending the school. I feel the proposed francophone school is an attempt to mislead the local population into thinking it will be a public French immersion school open to the general public, which it will not. I feel this is intentional deceptive advertising. The new proposal is even worse than the first and the first proposal was also highly unacceptable for the same reasons listed here. The developer has not adequate advertised within the community. The government and city have also not attempted to reach the large Mandarin speaking-new Immigrant community in this area who are likely largely not aware of this development, its impact, or what they can do about it.
98	The roads (152st and 32Ave) are already very very busy. There is accidents happening all the time at this intersection. Harvard Gardens is still not complete. Once that is completed it will add hundreds of cars on the roads. The roads are not set up for Portes development proposal. Does someone need to die before the City realizes that the roads cant handle this type of traffic. Where will the dear, owls and birds go?? Very few people in the neighbourhood will be attending the Franchophone school. This will make additional traffic in the neighbourhood.
99	The traffic is already bad around here. Schools are overflow and a francophone school is not the answer. We need more parks, trails, english scools. The traffic on 36th will be horrible with +300 houses and kids walking to school. Public transport will colapse, everything the whole neighbourhood will be a caos.
100	The traffic issues are a big concern. Another elementary school is not needed.
101	The way land is being used in this area is nothing short of disgusting. It is being abused for the rich to get richer and no actual thought is given to the extensive and irreversible adverse ecological impact the current land use practices are creating. When I first moved in 7 years ago, I was woken on summer mornings to eagles calling. That has cease to occur since the development of Harvard Gardens. I don't doubt those eagle, as well as other wildlife, have sought refuge in what little greenery remains around the retreat. My heart aches to think of what else we stand to lose if this development goes forward
102	There appears to be no consideration for the traffic congestion that this proposal will create. Having all of that extra traffic funneling out to 36th street is ridiculous. The area is already too saturated and this will put far too much traffic on the residential roadways We have young children walking on these streets. It is dangerous and poorly thought out. How can there be no provision for an entrance into the complex from 152nd. Unreal!!!!
103	there are already 3 construction projects currently in the neighborhood. it's too many new units at one time. the surrounding infrastructure already can't handle the volume of people and cars.

Rosemary Heights Community Survey

June 21, 2018

Resident Comments

Number of comments received: 136

Comments are in response to Porte Developments' proposal to re-zone and develop the former Rosemary Heights Retreat Centre lands. They are listed in no particular order and do not include personal information of the authors. The Rosemary Heights Community Association will provide names if requested AND only if approved by the authors.

104	There is too much traffic, our schools are contested, and or tree canopy is dying. There needs to be green space in community to make it a liveable neighborhood
105	They need to have local residence more involved in every aspect of the development!
106	They should have to have another public consultation for any new plans as they held at Morgan Creek, not selectively canvassing the neighborhood!! If the traffic issues cannot be addressed in such a way that it minimally impacts the existing neighborhood they should consider giving up their plans altogether!!!
107	This added density combined with additional school traffic is terribly planned and inappropriate for this area. Please don't ruin our neighbourhood. There are ways to density in areas that can support density... This is not one of those areas. Not to mention the environmental impact.
108	This area is already at a standstill with traffic, schools are overcrowded, hospitals can't cope with current numbers. Leave the greenspace for the animals. We do not. We do not need more houses and cars in this area.
109	This development is significantly worse than the first proposal. My main concerns are significant traffic increase, safety for children on 36 and arterial due to one entrance/exit for the development and total destruction of a riparian ecosystem that will destruct the habitat to owls, bald eagles, coyotes, deer and raccoons. Also the destruction of our natural barrier of trees is unfathomable. This development should not be allowed as currently proposed.
110	This development will drop any where from 750-1250 people in our neighbourhood with no increase of roads schools or the infrastructure needed to keep our community
111	This development will ruin rosemary heights and further more, increase congestion on 152 and 32nd ave. There is not enough close to enough infrastructure to support any further growth. Single family homes only without a school and adding a park is the logical choice for the development.
112	This is rampant disregard for our community and the politicians are completely responsible.
113	This proposal is crazy to consider. The impact on the school (who found out yesterday that the new 56 home development by portrait homes is in their catchment) CANNOT support this development. Please do not approve it.
114	This proposal should absolutely not go through until a school that can serve all public school students as well as a high school can be put into place. The roads absolutely can not handle more traffic in this area. I strongly oppose any residential buildings in this area.
115	Too many units, Francophone School will add additional traffic with very few if any students from the area. City of Surrey is not following the long term plan for this area and instead are doing everything they can to generate more tax revenue and ignoring quality of life for the residents in the area.
116	Too much traffic volume increased, and too much residential density created in this area in the current proposal. Regular size of detached single homes with enough green belts from the existing houses might be reasonable!

Rosemary Heights Community Survey

June 21, 2018

Resident Comments

Number of comments received: 136

Comments are in response to Porte Developments' proposal to re-zone and develop the former Rosemary Heights Retreat Centre lands. They are listed in no particular order and do not include personal information of the authors. The Rosemary Heights Community Association will provide names if requested AND only if approved by the authors.

117	Unfortunately I see no advantages to this development and don't believe the developer has any interest in the negative impact to all the citizens that live in the near vicinity
118	Very concern about the increase traffic by and near Rosemary Elementary School as it is already dangerous for our kids to walk to school!
119	Very concerned about impact of traffic
120	We agree it doesn't make sense to put a francophone school in our neighborhood. That will not relieve any congestion in local schools. We are opposed to condominium buildings being added to the project. This latest proposal is worse than the first. We are frustrated with the greatly increased traffic in our whole area. It just isn't reasonable to think this area can handle any more densification. As far as question 15, we would cautiously say we could possibly help in some way, but we both work and have limited time available.
121	We are totally opposed to it.
122	We bought into the NCP and currently own 2 homes in the neighborhood. This whole development does not fit with our neighborhood. The traffic alone will be a nightmare, let alone the overcrowding already at Rosemary. The francophone school is the craziest idea yet, as not one kid in the new development will most likely qualify to go there, putting all the new families into Rosemary which is already crowded. We back into that Greenspace and daily see deer and owls, raccoons etc. The wildlife is being pushed out. We truly feel that our roads and schools cannot support this development. Putting in condos now instead of the detached only brings more families, and vehicles. Not to mention the lower price point which may incur more rental properties and with that often comes more crime in the neighborhood. We love our tight community feel and are not going to give it up without a fight
123	We do not have the road infrastructure to support this development. We do not have room in the public schools. A francophone school will only create more traffic.
124	We don't need to create more housing in the neighbourhood unless the traffics, school and public facilities can be improve in the area.
125	We have emailed the city and Porte directly to express our disapproval.
126	We lived in Ferngrove directly backing onto the easement. We sold as a result of the Porte proposal and moved across the street to Edgewater. We had deer, raccoons, coyotes traverse the easement we back onto and owls and eagles were nesting in the trees. The addition of the school with French as the first language won't help out the area at all.
127	We really need to stop building in South Surrey!!! It's shocking that it continues to be allowed. Our community is gradually getting ruined by horrible traffic and overcrowded schools.
128	We value our neighbourhood and don't want it to be destroyed by overdevelopment. This area makes our neighborhood beautiful, green space.. would be ruined by this
129	We were horrified by the last proposal and had expected improvements. This felt like a slap in the face. We are losing faith quickly in Porte and wondering at what point the city will start to protect its people and infrastructure from the vested interests of developers.

Rosemary Heights Community Survey

June 21, 2018

Resident Comments

Number of comments received: 136

Comments are in response to Porte Developments' proposal to re-zone and develop the former Rosemary Heights Retreat Centre lands. They are listed in no particular order and do not include personal information of the authors. The Rosemary Heights Community Association will provide names if requested AND only if approved by the authors.

130	We were told Porte would keep the strip of trees running immediately along the back of Rosemary Walk all the way to 156 St. We were pleased with that, although we're still not sure really how much of these trees would remain.
131	We're definitely opposed to the proposal. Our neighbourhood & school have become overpopulated since we purchased our home in 2010. We live on 36 Avenue and everyday, we see cars speed up and down our street. Adding a school that doesn't serve the overall needs of our community will only increase the traffic in our area. Rosemary Heights Elementary is already bursting at the seams... Not to mention, the displacement of all the animals that are currently living in the property.
132	What are the benefits of this proposal for anyone? The only one to benefit will be the developer will make a tidy sum of money but at a serious cost to the liveability and quality of life of our neighbourhood. More traffic, parking, noise, safety concerns, over
133	When I asked the developer's representatives what was being done to improve traffic impacts, they said they couldn't speak to that issue. Disappointing that they failed to address this fatal flaw to the plan
134	When the Porte people came to our door all they did was hand the flyer to my son and keep moving to the next house. They didn't stop to discuss or listen to anyone
135	without increasing infrastructure we can not keep increasing housing. Our roads, schools and neighbourhoods can not handle it.
136	Would be a shame to lose all those beautiful and majestic trees in the name of development.