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Good afternoon,

I wanted to pass along my thoughts on the development application from Bold regarding 2002-2014 St. George Street and 2003-2009 St. Johns Street (RM8).

I grew up in this City and played for the Port Moody Soccer Club, volunteered with 1st Glenayre Cubs and Scouts, learned to swim at Rocky Point pool, and had my first dance at Kyle Center.

As an adult, I joined the Port Moody Police Department where I worked as a police officer for several years. I loved working for the PMPD and was treated well by the City, but ultimately moved to Vancouver and transferred to VPD to pursue a more specific field of law enforcement.

Despite the move to a different department, I wanted to maintain a primary residence in Port Moody. At 33 years old, I had the opportunity to move back to my home city with the purchase of a townhouse at the Edgestone development. I was pleased to see that the City supported a development that was large enough for young families but priced below the unattainable level that single family homes have ascended to.

I'm pleased with the quality of my townhouse and the post-purchase support from Bold has been excellent.

As a long-time and once again current Port Moody resident - I hope counsel will continue to support the young families in the area by ensuring they have an opportunity to own their home.

Thank you,

Eric Ludeman
From: Peter D [mailto: _________________]
Sent: June-01-20 11:52 AM
To: Clerks <Clerks@portmoody.ca>

clerks@portmoody
Public Hearing, Item 1.1 - June 02, 2020
OCP Amendment and Rezoning - 2002-2014 St. George Street and 2003-2009 St. Johns Street

To: Council

Re: Geotechnical study

from page 13, Community Planning Advisory Committee Item 4.2, July 2, 2019

Land Use Policy:
Official Community Plan (OCP):

The site is located within Development Permit Area 1: Neighbourhood Residential which regulates the form and character of commercial, industrial, and multi-family residential developments. Portions of the two easterly lots are located in Development Permit Area 4: Environmentally Sensitive Area due to the tree resource on the bank to the east. **The west edge of the site is designated DPA5: Hazardous Conditions due to the existence of steepleland sediment soil conditions**

(note: the west edge is actually the **east** edge as noted below on page 73)

Considered at April 14, 2020 Special Council Meeting ( also, public hearing June 02, 2020)
Page 73

Official Community Plan

The site is located within Development Permit Area 1, which regulates the form and character of development in neighbourhoods, and the east portion of the site is designated as an Environmentally Sensitive Area (Development Permit Area 4) for the protection of the existing tree resource on the bank to the **east**.

Comment:

You will note at the Cpac meeting of July 02, 2019. the sentence - *The west edge of the site is designated DPA5: Hazardous Conditions due to the existence of steepleland sediment soil conditions* but:

**Not shown** at the Special Council Meeting, April 14, 2020, is the sentence - *The west edge of the site is designated DPA5: Hazardous Conditions due to the existence of steepleland sediment soil conditions*

In the on Table item, Cpac meeting, July 02, 2019, lists Geopacific Consultants as a project consultant.

**Considered at April 14, 2020 Special Council Meeting**
from page 72,
**Site and Conditions**
The site slopes down by approximately 10.35m (34ft) from St. George Street to the northeast to St. Johns Street. The site is located at the top of a heavily-treed, steep bank that separates the site from the vacant property to the east. This bank varies in height from 12.2m (40ft) at the south end of the site to 3m (10ft) at the north end, see attachment boldslope.pdf

Question for staff:
Considering that the 6 storey building sit on top of a 40 ft. slope designated DPA5 zone (Cpac meeting July 02, 2019) why is there not a requirement for a geotechnical study of the slope.

Peter Dasnieres
Clarke Street
Port Moody, B.C.
To Whom It May Concern:

Re: Public Hearing re Bold Properties, St. George/St. John’s Streets, June 2, 2020

Regarding the Bold Properties project on St. George/St. John’s Streets, it was mentioned at the July 2019 meeting that a traffic study would be done by Bold Properties and that this issue would be revisited at a meeting in the fall. We have not yet heard of this meeting or of any outcome of this study.

It is our understanding that there will be a traffic light placed at the top of Seaview Drive and Clarke Road and that there will be no left turn from St. George onto Clarke Road. There will still be, however, congestion at St. George and Clarke Road with traffic coming and going from the Bold condo vehicles as well as the Seaforth/Seaview vehicles turning onto St. George, both wanting to make a right turn onto Clarke Rd. Also, the traffic going up the hill, wanting to turn left onto St. George/Seaforth Way could present a problem with traffic backing up behind on Clarke Road. We do not think that it would be a good idea for the homeowners to have to go up to the top of the hill to turn left at the new light just to backtrack down to the bottom of Seaforth Way or St. George to get to their destination.

The actual buildings themselves are quite nice but with there being only one entrance/exit site, the traffic will be horrendous both for the Bold residents themselves, as well as the residents on Seaforth Way and Seaview Drive and the upcoming residents in the new townhouses on Seaview Drive, with more townhouses coming. Also, there are many people who park on Seaforth Way and Seaview Drive, along with many pedestrians including students walking to and from Port Moody Senior Secondary School. We know Bold Properties was offering to upgrade the walk bridge at the end of St. George Street going to the school, but we think the more pressing issue for the students would be the traffic density on their way to and from school. Also to note, the boulevard on Seaforth Way is a good buffer from the Clarke Road busy road, both for the students as well as all the residents.

We hope you will consider the above points and we look forward to hearing your point of view along with any other options you may have.

Thank you.

John and Janis Falle

[99x694]From: Janis Falle [mailto: _________________]
[72x694]Sent: June-01-20 7:07 PM
[72x679]To: Clerks <Clerks@portmoody.ca>
[72x663]Subject: June 2, 2020 - Public Hearing re Bold Properties, St. George and St. John's Streets
Hello,

My name is Andrea Jauck, I am a Port Moody resident. I would like to give my support and speak on behalf of Bold Properties at tomorrow's meeting. Please provide the zoom ID. Thank you!

--

Sincerely,

Andrea Jauck

Keller Williams Elite Realty
Hello City of Port Moody council,

I would like to send an email in support of this Development located on St Johns and St George street in Port Moody, that is being proposed by Bold Developments.

I have had the privilege of working with Bold Developments on their development Edgestone townhomes on St Johns and Clarke Street. While representing Bold Developments along with Bill Laidler in the sale of their units we have received a tremendous amount of positive feedback. You can feel the passion and that Bold has to build superior quality homes. I’m especially proud to walk buyers through these townhomes and show them the quality of the build and the smart features and upgrades that are included to make the buyers lives easier.

I wish to offer my support for the following reasons outlined below;

- I’m excited to hear that with this development being approved;
- The sharp corner on Clarke would be widened and a multi-use pathway that allows bikes and pedestrians to use would be built along with the site this would significantly improve the safety of this gateway area to Port Moody. I feel that this definitely needed and has been long over due.
- I think it’s great that Port Moody Residents will have first priority to buy.
- Large family size floor plans and more than 60% of the homes have a den/office which promotes working-from-home lifestyle (I think there is going to be an even greater demand for this due to COVID)
- A partnership with BC Housing for Affordable Home-Ownership program that covers more than 70% of the homes in the development. Homes under this program would be selling at 10% below the market to qualified buyers.
- Create more hundreds of job opportunities that could be an important means of economic recovery plan.
- Bold has proven to build a superior quality product.
- Bold has shown to be very supportive of the Port Moody business and residents. (The closing gifts consist of items selected from local Port Moody business)

Thank you for taking the time to review my email. I would also like to be part of the live video feedback via Zoom via email address [email].

Warm regards,

Danielle Jones
Hello Mayor and Council,

Please consider my support for the Bold project. I was raised in Coquitlam and am a Burnaby Firefighter. My wife and I purchased a property in Port Moody in 2016 and moved to Maple Ridge so we could afford a larger home for our two children. This project would have been perfect for us before we had our kids and I can see other firefighters, family and friends being able to have help getting into the market with the BC Housing program.

We would like to see Port Moody grow with more people to support more businesses. This side of Port Moody is good for growth as it will not add more traffic to St Johns and Clarke.

Thank you,

Steve and Chelsea Hay
Dear Madam, Dear Sir -

We are the owners of St. George Street in Port Moody and are writing to submit feedback on Application #6700-20-18.

We would like to express our strong opposition to Bylaw No. 3243 which seeks to rezone the properties listed in the application from single family homes to six storey apartment buildings. We'd also like to express our opposition to the proposed development of two six-storey apartment buildings on the properties.

We base our opposition on these reasons:

1. There’s a protected salmon habitat creek (School Creek) right to the east behind the proposed development. With the population density suggested to increase at least by a factor of 10 we are concerned about the impact to the creek. What is especially concerning is the developer’s proposal to upgrade the footpath from St. George St. to Moody Secondary which would drive even more people to the creek area.

2. The proposed development is largely surrounded by single family homes and presents a large jump in building height and layout which is unsettling and out of place for this area of Port Moody. It completely changes the character of this Port Moody neighbourhood.

3. There is no proper infrastructure in place to support that many extra people and cars in such a small geographic area. The proposed infrastructure changes to Clarke Road don't seem appropriate for an apartment complex with over 240 car parking spaces. Seeing that St. George St. is a cul-de-sac there would be extensive amounts of cars turning from and onto Clarke Road just before a corner with poor visibility. Traffic is already heavily congested there, especially in the mornings due to regular rush hour traffic and parents dropping students off at Port Moody Secondary. Traffic is also heavy in the afternoon rush hour. Pairing this development with another large development proposal on the empty Barnet Hotel lot is going to turn this area of Port Moody into an all-day traffic nightmare.

We feel a 3 storey apartment building with a smaller amount of apartments could make sense in this area, but even that needs to be very carefully considered. This is a quiet area of Port Moody with mostly single family homes and townhouses therefore a large increase in population density needs to be planned with a long-term view and a long-term plan for infrastructure support. It should not be decided by looking at individual development projects, especially ones that completely change the character of this Port Moody neighbourhood - this is not a change we'd like to see.

Respectfully,

Tim & Lisa Tschirner
From: Derek Wilson [mailto:]
Sent: June-02-20 9:27 AM
To: Clerks <Clerks@portmoody.ca>
Cc: Council <council@portmoody.ca>; Jeff Moi <jmoi@portmoody.ca>; André Boel <aboel@portmoody.ca>
Subject: Public Hearing Submission: Bylaws No. 3242/3243
Importance: High

Planning & Development
City of Port Moody
100 Newport Drive
Port Moody, BC  V3H 5C3

Attn.:  André Boel, General Manager

Re:  Public Hearing:  Bylaw No. 3242 and Bylaw No. 3243

The attached PDF document provides my feedback on the proposed OCP amendment and rezoning application for the BOLD "Paramount" redevelopment.

In general I support both the OCP amendment and rezoning - but further work is required to mitigate the impact of the proposed project on traffic operations as detailed in my letter.

If you have any questions or need clarification of my letter, please phone or email.

Regards,
Derek Wilson
Dundonald Dr.
Port Moody, BC  V3H
Tel:  

June 2, 2020

City of Port Moody
Planning & Development
100 Newport Dr.
Port Moody, BC  V3H 3C5

Attn.:  Mr. André Boel, General Manager

Dear Mr. Boel:

Re:  **Bylaws No. 3242/3243** – BOLD “Paramount” redevelopment

I am responding to the public notice that was published in the *Tri-City News* of May 21, 2020.

I attended the public open house hosted by BOLD at Kyle Centre on May 23, 2019. In general, I am satisfied with the scale and appearance of the proposed low-rise, multi-family redevelopment. However, at that time, I expressed concerns about (a) increased safety hazard of more traffic movements at the Clarke Rd.-St. George St. intersection, and (b) poor access for fire-rescue and ambulance personnel to the units on the north side of the project.

I reviewed the traffic impact analysis prepared by Binnie Consulting Ltd. dated June 28 2019. In spite of assuming that 50% of exiting traffic uses Seaview/Seaforth, the Clarke Rd.-St. George St. intersection was found to have a failing level of service which would promote collisions from risky turning movements.

Thus, I am writing to suggest a novel access concept that will divert project traffic from Clarke Rd. I propose the evaluation of extending St. George St. E. on the road allowance westward over Miller Creek by a new bridge to access a low-level rear entrance to the “Paramount’s” underground parkade (red dashed line in street plan to right). The rear access would eliminate the parkade ramp, from St. George St. W., thereby permitting the provision of 3-4 more groundfloor units. Consequently, almost all traffic generated by the proposed redevelopment would use the major signalized Barnet Hwy.-St. Johns St. intersection. This rear access would be useful during the construction phase of the project to minimize use of the Clarke Rd.-St. George St. intersection.

The traffic impact analysis did not specifically consider the arrival and departure of large service vehicles to the proposed development site. The residents on Seaview/Seaforth will likely not appreciate the routine operation of large waste disposal, courier and other service vehicles on their narrow, steep residential streets. The proposed rear access might be designed to accommodate the waste disposal vehicles.

The Binnie traffic impact assessment considered broadly the impact of the BOLD redevelopment on Clarke Rd. intersections assuming a 1% annual growth rate in background traffic.
However, the more recent proposed redevelopment of Woodland Park, if it proceeds as proposed, would result in a significant increase in traffic through the Clarke Rd.-Cecile Dr. intersection. The proposed installation of a pedestrian activated crosswalk at this intersection, as proposed in the Binnie report, is inappropriate from both a traffic operation, and pedestrian and motorist safety points-of-view. In correspondence to the City of Port Moody on May 6, 2020, I proposed an alternate new access road to the Woodland Park site by extending Clarke St. westward to connect to Angela Drive. The City of Port Moody’s Engineering Department needs to commission a traffic engineering consultant to model such road network alternatives in order to avoid degradation of the operation of the road network by a thousand straws on the proverbial camel’s back.

I hope this feedback is found constructive. If you have any questions or need additional information please email; or to request my attendance at a meeting.

Sincerely,

[c] Mayor Vagramov & Council
c: Mr. Jeff Moi, Engineering, City of Port Moody
To whom it may concern.

As a port moody resident of Glenayre, I drive past the development site 3 to 5 times a week and see a lot of potential for that corner to be better utilized and developed to provide more opportunities for people to reside in Port Moody. I love my city and I want to see it grow. I'm in support of development for the city and for long term growth. I strongly feel that the development in this location will be a great addition to the city, particularly as it's a very visible site from people commuting through Port moody from other cities. It shows that as a city we are progressive and welcome change.

I am in favor of this particular development as it is trying to provide more housing options for residents and it really animates the otherwise very barren hill.

Please take my submission as a support for this development proposal.

Regards,

Jonathan Cheung

Dundonald Dr, Port Moody, BC V3H
Rezoning/Development Application
2002-2014 St George St, 2003-2009 St Johns St, Port Moody

Public Hearing, June 2020
Item 1.1

Significantly Improve the Gateway Area of Port Moody

- Multi-use pathway
- Widening the corner
- Trail improvement to Port Moody Secondary
- Turn old single family houses to brand new development

---

Job Opportunities

- Construction workers and suppliers employment
- At our completed Edgemont (Port Moody) Gatedhome project –
  - Employed 40 sub-contractors onsite.
  - Purchased material from 90 material suppliers
  - Have a daily onsite worker count of 50 to 60 workers daily
- Proposed subject development would create 300 jobs in next 3 years
Livability and Affordability

- Desirable layout for working from home: 101 units with desks, 60% of the units have home office space. A business would not be limited by space.
- Partner with BC Housing to provide 198 units at 10%, lower than market price, which is 7% of the whole development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$ 500,000 Market Value Purchaser has $25,000 cash deposit (5%)</th>
<th>Market Purchase</th>
<th>10% Below Market AHOP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market Value</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buyer’s cash deposit</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHOP 2nd Mortgage</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Mortgage (base)</td>
<td>$475,000</td>
<td>$425,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est. Loan Insurance Premium</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$19,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly P&amp;I on 1st mortgage 25 years @ 3% (incl. premium)</td>
<td>$2,311</td>
<td>$2,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings ($300)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum household income (stress test 5.19%)</td>
<td>$108,450</td>
<td>$96,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PITH = +$400 (taxes, heat and strata)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAVINGS

- Additional density permitted by OCP amendment and rezoning
- Developer Contributions: Reduced profits
- BC Housing Contribution: Low cost interim construction financing

2nd mortgages are released and reinvested into Community

Home Buyer Eligibility

- Be a Canadian citizen or permanent resident
- Have resided in BC for the past 12 months
- Be living in rental housing or other non-ownership tenure prior to purchase

Home buyer must qualify for a 1st mortgage from an NHA approved lender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Units</th>
<th>Maximum Gross Household Income (2020)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than two bedrooms</td>
<td>$116,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two bedrooms or more</td>
<td>$163,220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bold Properties
2002-2014 St. George St. and
2003-2009 St. Johns St.

Public Hearing Presentation – June 2, 2020

Location / Area Context
Site Consolidation

- dedication of land for road improvements along Clarke Road and St. Johns Street
- agreement to purchase St. Andrews Street to consolidate site
- requires a separate road closure bylaw process (Bylaw 3244)
Proposal

• 2, six storey buildings surrounding an exterior amenity courtyard
• 162 units consisting of:
  • 79 (49%) studio, one-bedroom units
  • 73 (45%) two-bedroom
  • 10 (6%) three-bedroom
  • 92 (56.8%) adaptable units;
• Floor Area Ratio:  2.4
• 217 resident and 27 visitor parking spaces
• north building - 57.4ft high and south building - 61.7ft
• new roof deck amenity space

Affordable Home Ownership Program (AHOP)

• affordable housing component based on BC Housing’s new AHOP
• intent is to offer eligible first time home buyers currently renting an opportunity to enter home ownership market
• 10% reduction in the market price of 118 (73%) of the 162 units
  o funded by reduced profit from developer and low cost construction financing from BCHousing
  o BC Housing would hold a no payment/no interest second mortgage to cover the 10% reduction
• all units on floors 1 – 4 in both buildings marketed as AHOP units
• units on floors 5 and 6 in both buildings sold at market price
• locals first marketing program
• details still to be refined before Housing Agreement is prepared
Parking Variance

- proposal to reduce project costs by reducing area of Level 3 parking

- results in a reduction of 34 spaces
  - eliminate the current 13 excess spaces
  - seek a variance for the remaining 21 spaces

- variance off-set by:
  - provision of 2 Modo car share vehicles
  - membership incentives from Modo
  - transit passes
  - expanded bike facilities in project

- included as a variance in a development permit

Implementation

- official community plan amendment – bylaw no. 3242
  - change of land use designation from ‘mixed use – moody centre’ to ‘multi-family residential’

- rezoning – bylaw no. 3243
  - single detached residential zone (rs1) to six-storey apartment residential zone (rm8)

- road closure bylaw no. 3244
  - closure of st. andrews street to enable site consolidation

- housing agreement bylaw

- development permit
  - form and character of development
  - variances
Conclusion

• project complies with OCP other than the absence of commercial space
• affordable home ownership component will help local renters get into ownership market and free up existing rental units
• design has addressed the applicable development permit design guidelines
• adjacent to secondary school, transit and commercial uses on St. Johns St.
• overall, project represents a positive addition to the community