



# City of Port Moody

## Minutes

### Special Council Meeting

Electronic Meeting via Zoom  
Friday, January 29, 2021  
at 4:12pm

**Present:**

Mayor R. Vagramov  
Councillor D.L. Dilworth  
Councillor A.A. Lubik  
Councillor M.P. Lahti  
Councillor H. Madsen  
Councillor S. Milani  
Councillor P.Z.C. Royer

**In Attendance:**

Tim Savoie – City Manager  
André Boel – City Planner  
Kevin Jones – Senior Planner  
Jeff Moi – General Manager of Engineering and Operations  
Angie Parnell – General Manager of People, Communications, and Engagement  
Dorothy Shermer – Corporate Officer  
Tracey Takahashi – Deputy Corporate Officer  
Kate Zanon – General Manager of Community Development

1. Call to Order

2. Unfinished Business

**Official Community  
Plan Amendment –  
Coronation Park  
(Wesgroup  
Properties)**

2.1 Report: Community Development Department – Development Planning Division, dated January 11, 2021

The following main motion and amendment motion from item 9.1 of the January 26, 2021 Special Council meeting were on the table for Council consideration:

RC21/038-050

Moved and seconded

THAT City of Port Moody Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2014, No. 2955, Amendment Bylaw No. 27, 2021, No. 3285 (Coronation Park) be read a first time as recommended in the report dated January 11, 2021 from Community Development Department – Development Planning Division regarding Official Community Plan Amendment – Coronation Park (Wesgroup Properties);

AND THAT prior to bringing Bylaw No. 3285 back for consideration of second reading and referral to Public Hearing, staff be directed to work with the applicant to further refine the project based on the current proposal, including the following key elements:

- inclusion of the amenity commitments into the amendment Bylaw, based on a more thoroughly developed amenity package that can be viably delivered as part of the development;
- how the density is distributed on the site, taking into account building height, massing, built form, and grade transition, including where towers are located, the number of towers, and how tower heights transition across the site between loco Road and Balmoral Drive;
- opportunities to increase the amount of employment generating floor space;
- completion of the Transportation Impact Assessment and determining how its findings influence the project;
- the amount and configuration of the public park space versus the semi-public open space; and
- ensuring that the properties in this part of the neighbourhood that are not part of the application are left with a practical development potential in the future;

AND THAT a road network and grading plan be considered that varies from that included in Corporate Policy – 13-6410-2019-01 – Coronation Park Development Application Requirements;

AND THAT Council advise the applicant to address the following issues for second reading:

1. Pull back proposed project residential density to closer alignment with the Community Plan vision, with most towers not to exceed 26 storeys;
2. Improve family-oriented unit mix and options;
3. Increase accommodation of essential local shopping options in light of increased demand from the project;
4. Expand office and light industrial space allocation to be better aligned with Council's jobs-to-population ratio guidance;
5. Increase voluntary amenity contributions toward nearby park maintenance;
6. Conversion of as much existing road network to park as possible;
7. Rent-to-own as an alternative to the affordable housing component;

8. Explore reconfiguration of towers from east to west, with taller buildings situated to the east; and
9. Investigate designs for mitigating impact of high rises on social connectedness/mental health;

AND THAT Council express a stronger desire for OCP compliance than affordable housing via subsidy to the applicant.

RC21/051

Moved and seconded

THAT the foregoing motion be further amended by adding “AND THAT staff be directed to cap the population of Wesgroup’s proposed development in Coronation Park at approximately 4,000 people.”.

The question on amending motion RC21/051 was put to a vote; the following motion was DEFEATED:

**THAT the foregoing motion be further amended by adding:**

**“AND THAT staff be directed to cap the population of Wesgroup’s proposed development in Coronation Park at approximately 4,000 people.”.**

(Voting against: Councillors Dilworth, Lahti, Lubik, Madsen, Milani, and Royer, and Mayor Vagramov)

RC21/052

Moved and seconded

**THAT the foregoing main motion (RC21/038-050) be amended by adding:**

**“AND THAT staff work with the applicant to bring the Gross Floor Area (GFA) to an amount representative of the tower heights and overall project density presented to the public during the 2017 OCP Amendment Process for the Coronation Park neighbourhood.”.**

RC21/053

Moved, seconded, and DEFEATED

**THAT the foregoing amending motion (RC21/052) be further amended by replacing “the Coronation Park neighbourhood” with “the Coronation Park neighbourhood relative to the specific area of this application.”.**

(Voting against: Councillors Dilworth, Lahti, Lubik, Madsen, and Royer)

RC21/054

Moved, seconded, and CARRIED

**THAT the foregoing amending motion (RC21/052) be further amended by replacing “presented to the public during the 2017 OCP Amendment Process for the Coronation Park neighbourhood” with “as directed by Council”.**

The question on the main amending motion (RC21/052) as amended (by RC21/054) was put to a vote; the following amending motion was CARRIED:

**THAT the foregoing motion be further amended by adding:**

**“AND THAT staff work with the applicant to bring the Gross Floor Area (GFA) to an amount representative of the tower heights and overall project density as directed by Council.”.**

RC21/055

Moved, seconded, and CARRIED

**THAT the foregoing main motion (RC21/038-050) be amended by adding:**

**“AND THAT Council advise the applicant that interesting and innovative architectural design should be a component of the Coronation Park development.”.**

RC21/056

Moved and seconded

**THAT the foregoing main motion (RC21/038-050) be amended by adding:**

**“AND THAT staff encourage the proponent to provide a community garden within the development;**

**AND THAT staff encourage the proponent to provide the City with purpose-built space within the development in exchange for a reduction in fees of equal value, with the amount of space and related reduction in fees to be decided by staff.”.**

Separation was requested.

The question on the first clause of the main amending motion (RC21/056a); the following amending motion was CARRIED:

**THAT the foregoing main motion (RC21/038-050) be amended by adding:**

**“AND THAT staff encourage the proponent to provide a community garden within the development.”.**

The following second clause of the main amending motion (RC21/056b) was considered:

**THAT the foregoing main motion (RC21/038-050) be amended by adding:**

**“AND THAT staff encourage the proponent to provide the City with purpose-built space within the development in exchange for a reduction in fees of equal value, with the amount of space and related reduction in fees to be decided by staff.”.**

RC21/057

Moved, seconded, and CARRIED

**THAT the foregoing amending motion (RC21/056b) be replaced with the following:**

**“THAT the foregoing main motion (RC21/038-050) be amended by adding:**

**“AND THAT staff discuss with the proponent the possibility of building the City purpose-built space (such as a library, seniors’ centre, dog park, space identified by staff, performance space, etc.) within the development.”.**

(Voting against: Councillors Dilworth and Lahti)

The question of the amending motion (RC21/056b) as further amended (by RC21/057) was put to a vote; the following amending motion was CARRIED:

**THAT the foregoing main motion (RC21/038-050) be amended by adding:**

**“AND THAT staff discuss with the proponent the possibility of building the City purpose-built space (such as a library, seniors’ centre, dog park, space identified by staff, performance space, etc.) within the development.”.**

The question on the main motion (RC21/038-050) as amended (by RC21/052, RC21/054, RC21/055, RC21/056, and RC21/057) was put to a vote; the following motion was CARRIED:

**THAT City of Port Moody Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2014, No. 2955, Amendment Bylaw No. 27, 2021, No. 3285 (Coronation Park) be read a first time as recommended in the report dated January 11, 2021 from Community Development Department – Development Planning Division regarding Official Community Plan Amendment – Coronation Park (Wesgroup Properties);**

**AND THAT prior to bringing Bylaw No. 3285 back for consideration of second reading and referral to Public Hearing, staff be directed to work with the applicant to further refine the project based on the current proposal, including the following key elements:**

- inclusion of the amenity commitments into the amendment Bylaw, based on a more thoroughly developed amenity package that can be viably delivered as part of the development;
- how the density is distributed on the site, taking into account building height, massing, built form, and grade transition, including where towers are located, the number of towers, and how tower heights transition across the site between loco Road and Balmoral Drive;
- opportunities to increase the amount of employment generating floor space;
- completion of the Transportation Impact Assessment and determining how its findings influence the project;
- the amount and configuration of the public park space versus the semi-public open space; and
- ensuring that the properties in this part of the neighbourhood that are not part of the application are left with a practical development potential in the future;

**AND THAT a road network and grading plan be considered that varies from that included in Corporate Policy – 13-6410-2019-01 – Coronation Park Development Application Requirements;**

**AND THAT Council advise the applicant to address the following issues for second reading:**

1. pull back proposed project residential density to closer alignment with the Community Plan vision, with most towers not to exceed 26 storeys;
2. improve family-oriented unit mix and options;
3. increase accommodation of essential local shopping options in light of increased demand from the project;
4. expand office and light industrial space allocation to be better aligned with Council's jobs-to-population ratio guidance;
5. increase voluntary amenity contributions toward nearby park maintenance;

6. conversion of as much existing road network to park as possible;
7. rent-to-own as an alternative to the affordable housing component;
8. explore reconfiguration of towers from east to west, with taller buildings situated to the east; and
9. investigate designs for mitigating impact of high rises on social connectedness/mental health;

**AND THAT Council express a stronger desire for OCP compliance than affordable housing via subsidy to the applicant;**

**AND THAT staff work with the applicant to bring the Gross Floor Area (GFA) to an amount representative of the tower heights and overall project density as directed by Council;**

**AND THAT Council advise the applicant that interesting and innovative architectural design should be a component of the Coronation Park development;**

**AND THAT staff encourage the proponent to provide a community garden within the development;**

**AND THAT staff discuss with the proponent the possibility of building the City purpose-built space (such as a library, seniors' centre, dog park, space identified by staff, performance space, etc.) within the development.**

RC21/058

Moved, seconded, and CARRIED

**WHEREAS any redevelopment path of Coronation Park will take years to come to fruition regardless of the path chosen;**

**AND WHEREAS every resident in Port Moody should feel safe and comfortable in neighbourhoods that are well kept up;**

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT staff report back to Council within 90 days to provide a condition assessment for the Coronation Park neighbourhood, drawing from complaints and public input that have been received by Council and staff, and offering preliminarily costed options for neighbourhood upkeep and enhancement for Council consideration.**

3. **Adjournment**

Mayor Vagramov adjourned the meeting at 6:21pm.

Certified correct in accordance with section 148(a) of the *Community Charter*.

---

D. Shermer, Corporate Officer

Confirmed on the \_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2021.

---

R. Vagramov, Mayor