

Summary Report:

Preliminary Public Information Meeting

Re: The potential redevelopment of the 3000 Henry St site, City of Port Moody

Overview: A Public Information Meeting was held on Monday, September 9, 2019, from 5:30pm - 8:00pm at Moody Middle School, 130 Buller St, Port Moody. 188 invitations were mailed out to the neighbourhood and 2 ads were placed in the Port Moody local newspaper. Key stakeholders, such as City Planning Department Staff, were invited.

Meeting Format: Fourteen presentation boards depicted the proposed, early stage plans for the redevelopment of the site. A sign-in station was located near the entry door and attendees were encouraged to fill out exit surveys in another location. Attendees were given the option to take away their feedback forms for further consideration and privacy. Information boards explained the preliminary schematic designs, design rationale, schematic site plan, floor plans, preliminary unit matrix, OCP excerpts, building elevations with material image examples, 3D video fly-through, and building sections.

Purpose: To gather comprehensive Community feedback on the preliminary plans and receive suggestions.

Attendees: Residents of the neighbourhood, members of the City of Port Moody Community, including two City of Port Moody Planners, the two clients, development manager, various consultants, and two members of the Ankenman Marchand Architects team.

Outcome: Approximately 55 people attended the Meeting. 43 people provided their names on the sign in sheet or feedback forms. A total of 21 respondents submitted feedback forms either at, or after, attending the Meeting. Attendees' views and comments are tabulated in the Summary of Results below and at the end of this document in spreadsheet form. Electronic copies of the presentation material were forwarded to attendees upon request.

Summary of Results

Review and Analysis

All forms were first reviewed to determine the percentage of people who supported or did not support the project as proposed. Once this initial count was complete, all comments were closely reviewed to determine the reason why a person supported or did not support the project.

The intent of our review was to understand people's reasoning and ask "why" people felt a certain way about our application so we could better guide our proposal.

Support	Do Not Support
52%	48%

Reasoning Provided for Supporting the Project

Reasons why people supported the project were grouped into the following categories: *Architecture, Revitalization, Affordability, Access to Amenities, Environmental Considerations, and Unit types*. These categories are not necessarily mutually exclusive (i.e. *Architecture* is connected to *Revitalization* etc.) however, grouping concerns into categories helps us better understand what is at the forefront of a person's support or opposition to the project.

As these comments are in support of the project, no response is provided.

Reason for Support	% of Respondents Mentioning
Architecture	45%
Access to Amenities	36%
Environmental Considerations	36%
Revitalization	34%
Unit Types	27%

Affordability	18%
---------------	-----

Architecture

Architecture was the most common reason cited to support the project.

Comments included:

- "I support the project overall, and I think the overall design is lovely"
- "The tiered design is a good way to build into the hillside"
- "Positive about the mix of unit types & sizes, the terraced design"
- "The design makes great use of difficult land"
- "Looks good. View Spectacular! Video gives a proper idea about the project!"

Environmental Considerations / Revitalization

Environmental Considerations and *Revitalization* were all closely connected to each other in people's comments.

Comments included:

- "It's an attractive design that is respectful to the mountain environment"
- "Positive about the fit into the physical space"
- "A contribution to develop walking trails on Chines hillside would be most welcome... and responsibility to maintain existing trees"
- "The terracing blends the project in with the surrounding landscape"

Affordability / Unit Types

A common theme was that the development would add value to the community.

Comments included:

- "As a first-time homebuyer, this is perfect for me, as I have recently gotten married. I like the fact that there are larger 2-bedroom units, which are perfect for younger families. The fact that there is lock-off suites in the townhomes also provides a great option."
- "Interested in sizes of units. Interested to see 3 bedroom & 4 bedroom units for families"
- "Positive about the mix of unit types & sizes"

Other Topics

Access to Amenities

The location of the project was deemed desirable because it is close to natural and urban amenities.

Comments included:

- "Should be walkable to skytrain/bus and should be close to whatever retail etc that appears on St. Johns St."
- "Good access to schools and shops"

Reasoning Provided for Not Supporting the Project

Reasons listed to not support the project included *Height/Density*, *Environmental Impact (Stability, landslide, animals)*, *Parking*, *Traffic*, *Architecture*, *Construction (noise)* and *Building Maintenance*. Like the reasons provided to support the project, they are not mutually exclusive. For example, *Height and Density* are likely connected in someone's opposition to categories such as *Environmental Impact and Architecture*. Furthermore, when a person states that the project is too dense, they may be implying that the project has inadequate parking to satisfy the needs of the specific number of residents.

Reason for Opposition	% of Respondents Mentioning
Environmental Impact (Stability, landslide, wildlife)	80%
Traffic	50%
Height/Density	40%
Architecture	40%

Parking	20%
Construction (noise)	10%
Building Maintenance	10%

What follows describes each concern as we have understood it and provides a response. In most cases our design rationale specially intended to mitigate the stated issues (i.e. unique dwelling units with design emphasis on integrating the building into the sloping site to reduce the environmental impact) and (the proposed dwelling units are configured around a courtyard between Henry Street and the main entrance which serves simultaneously as a light well, circulation zone, and a more functional open space to mitigate setback and density impact). We have evaluated people’s concerns and have begun to further incorporate their recommendations (i.e. height, parking, traffic, and environmental impact).

Environmental Impactful (Stability, landslide, wildlife)

The most mentioned reason for opposition to the development was that it has too large of an environmental impact for the proposed building on the sloping site, the concern for wildlife and landslides. The specific concerns related to a greenfield site, perception of landslide hazard, and potential flooding. Impacts on trees were also raised.

Comments included:

- “I would like to see a green roof, solar panels, use of rainwater.”
- “Not convinced environmental impacts are properly assessed and storm water issues and diversion seem to be under assessed.”
- “Needs further geo technical review as hillside will likely slide in 1 or 50 years as roots of trees are loosed & disrupted.”
- “Loss of natural resources. Development of what is a greenfield in advance of the development of brownfield sites in the city. Geotechnical concerns to the stability of the slopes. Unforeseeable impacts on the ground water regime.”
- “Concern is fragility of hillside with these 2 creeks on it. Landslides are a huge concern.”
- “More removal of natural green space, this is permanent home to many animals and transient animals - where do they go?”
- “I am worried about potential slides and devastation to the water courses creeks and the effect it will have on our wildlife (bears, cougars, coyotes, etc)”

Response - Environmental Impactful (Stability, landslide, wildlife)

Our current proposal includes certain strategies to address the sloping site, stability, and sustainability:

- *Building streamside protection and riparian area enhancement,*
- *Green-roof strategies for rainwater collection, thermal resistance, and urban heat gain reduction,*
- *Geotechnical complexity was reduced in the revised parkade design with a terraced excavation,*
- *Over 2/3 of the site is being left in its’ natural state, with only 20% site coverage.*
- *Energy demands benefiting from building orientation within heavily tree shaded surroundings, reducing solar heat gain and requirements for air conditioning.*

Environmental Impact Analysis

- Design revisions to decrease environmental impact could be to reduce building footprint and increase open green space
- A geotechnical report has been completed and the findings suggest that “the proposed development is feasible provided the recommendations outlined in the report and incorporated into the overall design.” Further geotechnical engineering will be done to ensure full code compliance with respect to foundation stability.
- Resilience to flooding will be increased using waterproofing add mixture in the concrete structure of the parking garage. Furthermore, sump pumps will be installed to deal with any flooding that may occur and as required by the City’s floodplain construction regulations.

Traffic

A large amount of comments focused on the development creating traffic and relating to terms about parking, school zone safety and congestion.

Comments included:

- “Impact on traffic on Buller & Henry Streets”
- “Terrible location for the school, corner & traffic – already a nightmare. Possible elementary school to be built to add to the chaos.”

- “Too much traffic on this street now, especially with a school around the corner, 2nd school in future”
- “Traffic concerns from additional residential traffic. Future Build of new elementary school, fronting the middle school, creating more traffic issues, parking issues & safety concerns for children.”
- “Too much traffic on this right-angled corner - going right into a busy school zone. Traffic will increase immensely all through the neighbourhood.”

Response – Traffic

The application proposes suitable strategies to plan for the new residents mobility needs in relation to the needs of the existing community.

- *The Transportation Demand Management (TDM) tools and travel mode options are available to residents to help reduce the impacts of excessive vehicle use on our transportation network, while saving residents money and adding to the livability of the building.*
- *Approximately a 10 minute walk (650m) to the Moody Centre Skytrain Station and West Coast Express, for easier commuting by transit for residents.*
- *There is convenient, ground floor access to 2 car share options; dedicated motorcycle/scooter parking; reduced private vehicle use and ownership.*
- *Off-street loading (pick-up / drop-off) at the main entrance, accommodating a future with a higher mode share for alternative forms of vehicle use, such as community shuttles, ride-sharing, autonomous vehicles, and taxis, etc.*
- *Convenient, secure bike storage and an area dedicated to basic bicycle maintenance / cleaning.*
- *Our traffic consultant Binnie created a Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) with a report that considers potential traffic impacts.*
- *A Construction Management Plan will be formulated to develop strategic vehicle routing and establishes access and egress to and from the site safely during the construction phase.*

Therefore, locating the proposed building in such close proximity to an existing network of transit and connection to amenities truly exemplifies the opportunity for reducing traffic. The development is located along transit-serviced Barnet Hwy with buses and two train links, making it convenient for commuting. It is located three blocks down the road from shops and restaurants, providing high walkability.

Height / Density

Some comments focused on the development being too high and/or too dense. While this statement is connected with other categories (architecture, traffic, and parking), it was commonly stated in terms of matching similar buildings in the immediate vicinity.

Comments included:

- “Height. 200' - Can a visible test balloon be put to that altitude?”
- “I like the look of the project terraced, but too many”
- “Concern that amending the OCP, currently at 6 stories, could open the door for more and more within the neighbourhood.”

Response – Height / Density

Residential Density is Needed for Commercial Viability and Revitalization

The application is consistent with the parameters of the land use area in the City of Port Moody OCP:

- *The terraced building form with green roofs relates to the site’s natural sloped setting*
- *The aim is to have a 6 storey height from the local grade at any point. The building will be setback at certain locations of the building to maintain the 6 storey massing.*
- *Townhomes oriented to Henry Street, on either side of the courtyard, provide scale that helps reduce the massing of the building.*
- *The revised proposal results in only 20% site coverage.*
- *Proposed density of 1.0 FAR (of full site area, or 189,00 sq. ft.) before park dedication, or 1.33 excluding area to be dedicated back to Port Moody as natural parkland.*

The balance between height/density and the location on the sloping site has driven the design of the project. The site acts as a guide for the proposed terraced levels and unit density within a CD57 High Density residential zoning. The proposal sits within the prescribed maximum building height limit of an 11 storey building form that is well-suited from a community planning perspective. The development is located a few blocks from transit-serviced Barnet Hwy including a 10-minute walk to the Moody Centre Skytrain Station and

West Coast Express. Three blocks down the road there are shops and restaurants, and across the street from significant open space, which provides a relief to the massing of the building.

Building Dimensionality Analysis

In an effort to refine the design and provide a more contextual fit to the adjacent neighbours, the following could be considered.

Architecture

Some comments focused on the architectural characteristics of the proposed development. Some were concerned that the building is too modern.

Comments included:

- "Port Moody is losing its small town feel and character"
- "I don't like the design at all, although I support green space absolutely"
- "Design of building does not fit the more heritage style and character of Port Moody"

Response - Architecture

The proposed development has a terraced building form and exemplary architecture, as previously approved and extremely well received by the Land Use Committee, Design Panel, Staff and Council remains virtually unchanged and will become a welcome addition to Port Moody's architectural library. Unlike much of the surrounding architecture, this project from the outset was designed to mimic the existing treed hillside. The building's siting, scale, and design offers many opportunities for integrating artist's functions, particularly in the extensive landscaping where the site's seamless perimeter interacts with public spaces and natural features. Both the indoor and outdoor amenity spaces are organized to promote community gathering, health and wellness. The shared work spaces and meeting rooms promote interaction amongst residents, while exercise studios and other communal flexible spaces contribute to further interactions.

Parking

Some comments focused on the perceived lack of parking around the proposed development and parking issues around commercial spaces surrounding the building. Some were concerned with lock off units creating more issues for parking.

Comments included:

- "There is no proper drop off area for these kids now and with all the extra traffic from this new building it will only exacerbate this problem"
- "Lock off suites - Additional residents' vehicles with many using street parking"
- "Proposal to add a dance studio in the development creating more parking, traffic issues"
- "Future Build of new elementary school, fronting the middle school, creating more traffic issues, parking issues, + safety concerns for children"

Response - Parking

The proposed development provides 267 parking stalls, one for each unit, plus visitor stalls to mitigate parking along Henry Street. As per the zoning bylaw for high density developments, the parking requirement was set at 1 stall per 1-bedroom unit, 1.5 stalls per 2 bedroom+ unit, 2 stalls per 3 bedroom+ unit, and the required visitor parking requirement was set at 0.2 per unit <100 units and 0.1 per unit >100 units requiring 245 parking stalls.

Parking Analysis

The development is located a few blocks from transit-serviced Barnet Hwy including a 10-minute walk to the Moody Centre Skytrain Station and West Coast Express for easier commuting by transit for residents. There is also convenient, ground floor access to 2 car share options and dedicated motorcycle/scooter parking to reduce private vehicle use and ownership. There is some overlap with the category of traffic, although to reiterate, there is off-street loading (pick-up / drop-off) at the main entrance, accommodating a future with a higher mode share for alternative forms of vehicle use, such as community shuttles, ride-sharing, autonomous vehicles, and taxis, etc. Additionally, there is a long stretch of available visitor street parking directly across the street from the site.

**The members of the public whom both attended and signed in or provided their contact info.
at the meeting were as follows:**

	Full Name (first/last)	Address	Email
1	H Mason	St George	FIPPA s. 21
2	Patricia Mace	Capilano Rd	FIPPA s. 21
3	S. Chadwick	Terravista Pl	FIPPA s. 21
4	Bronwen Fairbrother	erravista Pl	FIPPA s. 21
5	M. Clay	Foxwood Pt	
6	W. Brown	Iyoa St	FIPPA s. 21
7	Dan Parker	St George	FIPPA s. 21
8	D. Prince	James Rd	
9	J Boyer	ames Rd	
10	James Charles	Henry St	FIPPA s. 21
11	Jonathan Ho	Panorama Dr	FIPPA s. 21
12	John Grasty	Clarke	FIPPA s. 21
13	Pieter Poel	Terravista	FIPPA s. 21
14	Colin Lyons	Terravista	FIPPA s. 21
15	George Broderick	Cardiff Way	FIPPA s. 21
16	Yolanda Broderick	Cardiff Way	FIPPA s. 21
17	Ashkan Azrahimi		FIPPA s. 21
18	Moe Azrachini		FIPPA s. 21
19	Marko Mackilop		
20	J. Schweitzer		FIPPA s. 21
21	Steve Milani		
22	Nigel Elphick		FIPPA s. 21
23	Hossein Bahrani		FIPPA s. 21
25	Moe Hamedani		FIPPA s. 21
26	A Mattinson		
27	A Knowles		FIPPA s. 21
28	Evon		
29	S. Myers		
30	S. Carr		
31	E. Chan		
32	Gracie Wong		FIPPA s. 21
33	Marianne Vlek		FIPPA s. 21
34	G Eliad		
35	Jill Rosenfeld		
36	Sarah Bon-Antoun		
37	Andrea LeBlanc		
38	Daniel DeSantis		
39	Charley Xiu		
40	Ray Mattinson		FIPPA s. 21
41	Peter Duncan		
42	Genda Benson		
43	K Taylor Hill		