

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE MEETING – MINUTES

Minutes for the Committee of the Whole Meeting scheduled for Tuesday, January 21, 2020 at 6:00 p.m. in Council Chambers at Village Hall, 2697 Sunnyside Road, Anmore, BC



ELECTED OFFICIALS PRESENT

Mayor John McEwen
Councillor Polly Krier (via teleconference)
Councillor Tim Laidler
Councillor Kim Trowbridge (via teleconference)
Councillor Paul Weverink

ABSENT

OTHERS PRESENT

Juli Halliwell, CAO
Karen Elrick, Manager of Corporate Services
Jason Smith, Manager of Development Services

1. Call to Order

Mayor McEwen called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

2. Approval of the Agenda

It was MOVED and SECONDED:

That the Agenda be approved as circulated.

Carried Unanimously

3. Public Input

Mayor McEwen advised that Council will include the opportunity for those in attendance to ask questions throughout the meeting as information is presented.

4. Delegations.

None.

5. Adoption of Minutes

None

6. Business Arising from Minutes

None.

7. New Business**(a) Burrard Commons – Servicing Options**

Mr. Jason Smith, Manager of Development Services, provided an overview of the staff report which outlines 3 options for water and sewer servicing for the proposed development. Mr. Chris Boit, ISL Engineering, outlined the options noting that the servicing review is a high level review using currently available information. It was noted that given current information staff considers the loco servicing option the most cost effective and easy way to connect services to the development. However, Council may wish to request additional information including further costing, other implications, Metro Vancouver requirements, and financial implications. Mr. Boit reported that the report contemplated capital cost but that there would also be ongoing operating costs to consider.

Those in attendance at the meeting were provided an opportunity to ask questions:

Q – Would the option for the East Road/Sunnyside connection be the best option for consideration of future service to the rest of the Village? It was noted that additional approval requirements exist which would include Metro Vancouver should that be contemplated. IOCO has been identified as a special study area while the rest of the Village would have a higher threshold to designate from rural to urban which is not part of this development application and is not being contemplated at this time.

Q – Whether it was the desire of Council to designate IOCO lands from rural to urban and if that decision has been made? There have been no decisions made at this time.

Q – If the East Road option was considered would land expropriation be required? No. There is sufficient right of way available should this option be considered.

Q – Would the operational costs of this service connection be borne by the Village? Yes and those costs will need to be analyzed.

Q – Concerned about maintaining rural and the future of Anmore. This is just the beginning of the process.

Q – Do residents get a say? The purpose of this meeting is to start the process of engagement with the community.

Staff noted that given the information available at this time a recommendation of an option may be premature and that Council may wish to defer this decision.

It was MOVED and SECONDED:

That the Committee defer recommendation of a decision to Council on a desired servicing option for Burrard Commons and request additional information and analysis of options from staff.

Carried Unanimously

(b) Anmore loco Lands – Public Engagement and Next Steps

Mr. Jason Smith, Manager of Development Services, provided an overview of the staff report. Mr. Smith outlined the consultants that the Village has retained at the cost of the developer and the process for public engagement and consultation as contained in the report.

Those in attendance at the meeting were provided an opportunity to ask questions:

Q – Clarification on the urban versus rural threshold and whether it is just the sewer hookup that would trigger this change? If there was a lack of access to sewer services than this would be a constraint on development of the site.

Q – What policing and fire implications would this development have? It was noted that this will be part of the financial analysis conducted during the review process.

Q – What benefit would current residents see from this development? There could be an opportunity to age in place, provide housing for younger families, provide services and amenities within the community, and to diversify the tax base. Part of this consultation process will be to engage citizens to determine what current residents wish to see developed at this site.

Concern was expressed regarding number of people in urban area vs rural area should this development proceed.

Q – When engaging with residents how will consensus be defined? Citizens need to choose be engaged in this process to get the best outcome.

Q – Would there be a referendum? This is not being considered as part of the engagement process as we need a much more comprehensive process to make sure residents are informed about the full scope of the Anmore loco Lands and the development application for Burrard Commons, and that they have multiple opportunities to share their input with us.

Q – Would there be an opportunity to hear from developer? Resident is not clear on what the specifics are of the engagement and needs more information in order to engage in the process.

Q – Whether there is concern with emergency access if the access option through Bert Flynn Park is removed? The Village has expressed concerns to Port Moody.

Q – Access to development. It was noted that the access route is in Port Moody.

Q – Whether Anmore was currently working with Port Moody to address the Bert Flynn Park access and transportation issues? Currently Port Moody is not engaged with the Village on these matters.

Q – If the number of residents double along with a commercial component, where would the traffic be routed? There would be no designated route per se but traffic studies would indicate the most probable routes that traffic would flow.

Q – Would the engagement process described only include the “input zone” and not the involve, collaborate and empower zone? Yes, the intent is that the majority of the engagement would fall within the “input zone”.

Q – Why has Council decided to not work in partnership with Port Moody regarding development of IOCO lands? Efforts have been made but Port Moody Council has chosen to work independently from Anmore Council.

Q – What additional costs or other impacts would there be on policing? Analysis of this component will be part of the development process and has yet to be determined.

Q – What are tax ramifications for sewer hook-up? This has yet to be determined.

Q – Port Moody could absorb this type of development easier than Anmore and why consider it if Port Moody will not? This development is being considered as part of the application process.

Q – Queried about the difference between the growth forecasts for Amore in the OCP and Metro Vancouver statistics and what growth this development would bring? It was noted that this is a special study area and that this application is applying to Council to consider amending the current OCP.

It was MOVED and SECONDED:

That the Committee recommend that Council support the initial engagement plan and direct staff to begin implementation of the engagement plan as presented in the report dated January 17, 2020 and titled “Anmore loco Lands – Public Engagement and Next Steps”

Carried Unanimously

8. Public Question Period

None.

9. Resolution to Close Meeting

It was MOVED and SECONDED:

That pursuant to section 90 1 (k) of the *Community Charter* as it refers negotiations, the Special (In Camera) meeting immediately following this meeting be closed to the public.

Carried Unanimously

10. Adjournment

It was MOVED and SECONDED:

THAT the meeting be adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

Carried Unanimously

“Karen Elrick”

“John McEwen”

Karen Elrick
Corporate Officer

John McEwen
Mayor