



City of Port Moody

Minutes

Community Planning Advisory Committee

Minutes of the electronic meeting of the Community Planning Advisory Committee held on Thursday, May 28, 2020 via Zoom..

Present

Councillor Steven Milani, Chair
Councillor Zoë Royer, Vice-Chair
Megan Chalmers
Melissa Chaun
Darquise Desnoyers
Greg Elgstrand
Allan Fawley
Patricia Mace
Wilhelmina Martin
Hazel Mason
Severin Wolf

Absent

Edward Chan
Ronda McPherson (technical difficulties)
Callan Morrison

In Attendance

Doug Allan – Senior Planner
André Boel – General Manager of Planning and Development
Philip Lo – Committee Coordinator

1. Call to Order

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:08pm

2. Adoption of Minutes

Minutes

2.1 CPAC20/021

Moved, seconded, and CARRIED

THAT the minutes of the regular meeting of the Community Planning Advisory Committee held on Monday, May 11, 2020 be amended by:

- **removing “close to transit, and the proposal” and replacing with “close enough to frequent transit service, and the immediate neighbourhood”; and**

- adding “not conforming to the OCP designation on Map 11 of the OCP” to the first paragraph under Item 4.1 – Revised Rezoning (Multi-Family) at 148 and 154 James Road (Laidler); and
- adding “not conforming to the OCP designation on Map 11 of the OCP” to the first bullet point under Item 4.1 – Revised Rezoning (Multi-Family) at 148 and 154 James Road (Laidler).

(Voting against: Wilhelmina Martin)

CPAC20/022

Moved, seconded, and CARRIED

THAT the minutes of the regular meeting of the Community Planning Advisory Committee held on Monday, May 11, 2020 be adopted as amended.

3. Unfinished Business

4. New Business

OCP Amendment and Rezoning - 1865-1895 Charles Street (Porte Communities)

4.1 Report: Planning and Development Department – Development Planning Division, dated April 27, 2020

The Development Planner gave a presentation regarding the OCP amendment and Rezoning application, noting that project approval is contingent on Translink’s confirmation that the project will not impact their underground infrastructure, and on the provision of greenspace and protection of surrounding environmental attributes. The Development Planner noted that staff considers the proposed building height to be 9 storeys.

The applicant gave a presentation on the application, including information on the site context and geometry, building form, massing, and height, traffic and parking, public art component, colour palette, sustainability and environmental strategy, and affordable housing component.

Staff and the applicant answered questions regarding: the affordable housing component and the total value of the 10% fee reduction by the City; whether another partner aside from the City could be brought onto the affordable home ownership program; if the units are wheelchair accessible; mitigation of noise and other impact from the Skytrain tunnel; the vertical distance of the development from the Evergreen line tunnel; unit pricing for the affordable homes and market suites; notification to the School District of the population growth in the area; provision of open park space for children and families; community outreach and the feedback received; walkability and

pedestrian connections including sidewalks; envisioned uses of roof space including green roofs; footprint of the parkade; location of the outdoor Class B bicycle parking facilities; the mix of upright and vertical bicycle storage faces; unit depth and frontage; sight line impediments between the two buildings; location of the lane and road allowance; percentage of the Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) that is impacted; a monitoring plan for invasive species removal; window treatments for the prevention of bird collisions; the grade of the slopes and their accessibility by wheelchairs; other projects contemplated in the Charles Street area; the use of heat recovery ventilation (HRV) technology and whether it can be used throughout the building; and height calculations in relation to the Zoning Bylaw and the terrain contour.

CPAC20/023

Moved, seconded, and CARRIED

THAT the meeting be extended for 30 minutes.

The Committee noted the following in discussion:

- the architecture and design on a challenging site was generally appreciated;
- some concerns were expressed regarding the significant impact on the cul-de-sac, suggesting that the development may be too dense and overwhelming for the location;
- concerns were expressed regarding the impact to the surrounding Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) and regarding the current assessment scheme for ESAs;
- one member suggested that the project does not conform to the existing OCP and the conditions of creating significant additional greenspace and connections to existing parks and trails, and protecting and enhancement of local water courses;
- concerns were expressed regarding the lack of greenspace, and the small size of the playground and its proximity to the road;
- parking on Charles Street should be permitted on one side of the road only;
- some members were not in support of the City subsidizing private home ownership, and suggested that the applicant look to alternative solutions to fund the affordable housing component;
- this application should be reviewed by the Advisory Design Panel if that body is reinstated, as some aspects of this design should be further examined;
- some of the unit layouts, sizes, view corridors, and limited lighting are compromised as a result of the massing and design;
- more information is needed on rooftop amenities and the affordable housing component;

- the rationale for the proposed 9-storey height needs to be better understood;
- some members suggested that applicants should have the option to provide either a public arts contribution towards something else that could generate greater value over time, or to provide public art pieces for each development;
- the sustainability report card should to be updated;
- species movement corridor need to be preserved;
- developers should note that insurance for multi-family buildings are currently at unsustainable levels, as the assessment of replacement value by insurers is problematic;
- the applicant should work towards increasing the Sustainability Report Card score, which is currently low;
- consider using heat recovery ventilation technology in all the units;
- consider having a 3D “fly through” of the project as part of public outreach; and
- clarification is needed on why underground areas are counted as floors, and how this is calculated.

CPAC20/024

Moved, seconded, and CARRIED

THAT the meeting be extended for 15 minutes.

CPAC20/025

Moved, seconded, and CARRIED

THAT staff and the applicant consider the comments provided during the Community Planning Advisory Committee meeting held on May 28, 2020 regarding the proposed project presented in the report dated April 27, 2020 from the Planning and Development Department – Development Planning Division regarding OCP Amendment and Rezoning Application – 1865-1895 Charles Street (Porte Communities).

CPAC20/026

Moved, seconded, and CARRIED

THAT the Community Planning Advisory Committee support this application.

(Voting against: Melissa Chaun, Patricia Mace, and Hazel Mason)

5. Information

6. Adjournment

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 9:33pm.

Councillor Steve Milani,
Chair

Philip Lo,
Committee Coordinator