

ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

Tuesday, May 21, 2019 at 6:30 p.m.

Council Chambers

MINUTES

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:

Christa MacArthur - Chair/Community Member
Ken Bourdeau - Vice-Chair/Community Member
Stephen Beasley - Community Member
Darlene Carty - Community Member
Margaret Fairweather - Community Member
Andrew Feltham - Community Member
Melinda Michael - Community Member

REGRETS:

Rebecca Bateman - Community Member
Tobi May - Community Member

GUESTS:

James Burton - Birmingham & Wood Architects
Geoff Hepworth - Pennyfarthing Homes

STAFF:

Rupinder Basi - Senior Development Planner
Hardev Gill - Planning Technician
Jackie Teed - Manager of Planning
Mike Watson - Planner
Heather Corbett - Committee Clerk

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m.

1.0 ADDITIONS TO AGENDA

There were no additions.

2.0 ADOPTION OF MINUTES

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the minutes of the April 16, 2019 Advisory Planning Commission meeting be adopted.

CARRIED.

All members of the Commission present voted in favour of the motion.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the minutes of the April 25, 2019 Advisory Planning Commission meeting be adopted.

CARRIED.

All members of the Commission present voted in favour of the motion.

3.0 INFORMATION PRESENTATIONS

3.1 Follow-up Orientation Presentation and Discussion on APC Scope of Review

Jackie Teed, Manager of Planning, and Rupinder Basi, Senior Development Planner, provided the Commission with an update on the orientation session that was originally provided at the February 2019 meeting, reviewing the following information:

- Scope of the Commission, which includes reviewing rezoning applications, including Heritage Revitalization Agreements (HRAs), to evaluate whether they are consistent with the overall goals of the Official Community Plan, the land use map, and other city policies;
- City policies and procedures in relation to Land Use;

In response to a question from the Commission, Ms. Teed noted that the APC's role is to focus on the land use sections of the applications they review.

The Commission noted the following comments in regards to three questions about the staff reports that are provided to them as background information:

1. *What information have you found useful for your review?*
 - Information and research in reference to HRAs, including the property's heritage value and staff's recommendation of whether it merits saving;
2. *What information have you not found useful in your review?*
 - The Bylaw – this may not be required every time;
 - Recommendations lack consistency – it would be preferable to present the Commission with recommendations to choose from, similar to Council reports;

3. *What other information would you like to see included?*

This question did not receive any comments.

The second part of the staff presentation to the Commission reviewed the timing and placement of the APC's review of a proposal within the existing process. Ms. Teed and Mr. Basi presented three options and requested the Commission's feedback on the most optimal stage in the process for the APC to be consulted.

In response to questions from the Commission, Ms. Teed and Mr. Basi provided the following information:

- It is a City requirement to hear from the public at an APC meeting; therefore, this process would continue no matter where in the timeline an APC meeting would occur;
- A consideration of holding APC meetings earlier in the process would be that the Commission may receive delegates who have not yet attended public consultations, and may not receive opinions from the Community Heritage Commission (CHC) or New Westminster Design Panel (NWDP);
- Staff are considering whether it may be possible for straightforward applications, which align with the OCP and are consistent with the existing zoning, to bypass the APC process;
- It may be possible for Development Services to revise the APC process to distribute the package for comment by members at an earlier stage and maintain the meeting at the current step; however, staff are sensitive to members' time commitments and creating multiple steps in the process;
- The APC is able to comment on City policies as they relate to proposals, but at a high level, for example:
 - The NWDP's role is to review detailed design, whereas the APC's role is to look at massing in relation to livability;
 - The APC's role is to review environmental goals of the City as they pertain to a project, whereas issues of the tree bylaw would be handled at the staff level;
 - The CHC's role is to review heritage value and the APC's role is to evaluate an HRA proposal in the context of land use;
- The LUPC's role in the process is to bring a project forward to the public domain and to approve the steps that a project would go through; and,
- The LUPC is composed of three members of Council, who are legally obligated to keep an open mind; therefore, no decisions on whether a project would be approved are made at this step.

The Commission made the following comments in regards to the position of the APC's review in the overall development application process:

- The current position provides the Commission with a high level perspective and all the information that is valuable when making a decision; and,
- The provision of an opportunity to provide input and request additional information earlier on in the process, and in addition to the current position, may be beneficial.

3.1 New APC Report Template

Ms. Teed noted that Development Services staff are currently reviewing the APC staff report template to ensure that the most relevant information for the Commission’s review is included, and it would be circulated shortly. Some new aspects of the report may include the following:

- Pointed questions about aspects of the applications that staff are requesting feedback on;
- Staff recommendation suggestions;
- A section highlighting OCP policies and how they relate to the land use under review;
- Focus on areas where applicant is requesting variance from existing zoning and how is that consistent or non-consistent with OCP policy; and,
- Considerations of heritage value.

4.0 REZONING

4.1 1935 Eighth Avenue

HER00534

Mike Watson, Planner, summarized the staff report dated May 21, 2019, regarding a Heritage Revitalization Agreement (HRA) and Heritage Designation application in order to subdivide the property and construct an infill house on the new parcel.

Mr. Watson noted details of the site context, proposed floor space ratio, heritage value, public consultation, and advised that the application had previously been reviewed by the Commission in April 2016; however, proposed changes to the parking and driveway access had prompted its return for further review.

In response to questions from the Commission, Mr. Watson provided the following information:

- Any commercial proposed for Twentieth Street would be on the Connaught Heights side of the street;
- The space needed for a left or right turn bay on Eighth Ave would be taken out of the existing street right of way;

- A majority of future commercial activity planned for the area would centre around the 22nd Street station area;
- Current commercial properties on the west side of Twentieth Street would be maintained; and,
- The future right turn bay would be the priority for improvements at the corner of Eighth Avenue and Twentieth Street to improve transportation in the area.

James Burton, Birmingham & Wood Architects, explained the recent consultation process, noting that they had worked with the neighbours to come up with a solution for concerns about overlook.

The Chair called three times for speakers from the public and none came forward.

The Commission made the following comments in regards to the proposed development:

- Support was expressed for the proposed HRA;
- Concerns regarding the width of Eighth Avenue have been addressed; and,
- Parking on the site is tight, however the rationale is understandable.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the Advisory Planning Commission recommend that Council support the application for 1935 Eighth Avenue in accordance with the Development Services report dated May 21, 2019.

CARRIED.

All members of the Commission present voted in favour of the motion.

4.2 34 South Dyke Road

REZ00149

Hardev Gill, Planning Technician, summarized the staff report dated May 21, 2019, regarding the proposal for a sixteen unit ground-oriented townhouse development organized into two separate buildings, in Queensborough.

Mr. Gill reviewed the details of the proposal, including the location, site context, re-zoning proposal, site access, and consultation and notification details.

Geoff Hepworth, Pennyfarthing Homes, reviewed the project details, covering the following information:

- Details of the history and timeline of the development;
- Proposed building features and site plan, including vehicle access, landscaping details, and community amenity space;
- Context images and renderings of the project;

- Variances needed for the project and details of the construction implemented as a result of required setbacks;
- Family friendly, and environmental considerations; and,
- Details of the dedication and restoration of the foreshore and boardwalk.

In response to questions from the Commission, Mr. Gill and Mr. Hepworth provided the following information:

- The dyke does not currently meet the required height but will be constructed to the full standard at a future date
- The Queensborough Landing shopping mall is within walking distance of the project, with many available amenities;
- Further commercial space is planned for the Queensborough Eastern Node, which would be within 1 km of the proposed site;
- An intersection of Wood Street and Salter Street would occur with completion of projects to the North of the site;
- Although it is not detailed in the images, a new fence is planned along the property line of the completed townhouses;
- 2-3 feet of allowance for bicycle parking would be provided within the individual garages;
- The provision of parking for the marina is not required; however, there is ample parking within the neighbourhood along South Dyke Road;
- Wood Street was determined as the driveway access when Phase Two of the overall development was developed;
- Other than the four spots provided within the project, visitor parking would be on-street parking along South Dyke Road; and,
- There would be sufficient room to park within most of the interior driveways.

The Chair called three times for speakers from the public and none came forward.

The Commission made the following comments in regards to the proposed development:

- Support for the proposal was expressed given its family-friendly nature and predicted affordability;
- The project's environmental and social contributions were commended;
- Concerns were expressed about the project's car-dependent nature and a need for increased transit in the area; and,
- Concerns were expressed about completion of the nearby flood protection.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the Advisory Planning Commission recommend that Council support the application for 34 South Dyke Road in accordance with the Development Services report dated May 21, 2019.

CARRIED.

All members of the Commission present voted in favour of the motion.

5.0 NEW BUSINESS

There were no items.

6.0 REPORTS AND INFORMATION

There were no items.

7.0 CORRESPONDENCE

There were no items.

8.0 NEXT MEETING

June 18, 2019 in Council Chamber, City Hall

9.0 ADJOURNMENT

ON MOTION, the meeting adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

Certified Correct,

ORIGINAL SIGNED

Christa MacArthur
Chair

ORIGINAL SIGNED

Heather Corbett
Committee Clerk