Disclaimer: These minutes were prepared as a reasonable summary of the essential content of this meeting, not as a transcription.



MINUTES of the <u>Advisory Design Panel</u> Meeting held on Wednesday, March 3, 2021 at 11:00 a.m. via video conference.

PΙ	RES	SEI	N٦	T:

Voting Members: R. Dafoe

A. Hayes L. Kan

Non-Voting Members: B. Berkner, RCMP

Council Liaisons: Councillor MacDonald

Councillor Meachen

Other Council Members: Councillor Hayes

Staff: A. Berry, Director of Planning & Development

(Chair)

A. Dominelli, Development Services TechnicianS. Maki, Director of Engineering and Operations

M. Roberts, CAO

A. Wallace, Manager of Community Development

Guests: Applicant 1 + Representatives

Sgt. M. Luca, RCMP

Regrets: J. Brady

E. Hirota S. Kim S. Raht

E. Rojo

Recording Clerk: T. McCaw, Committee Clerk II

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 11:05 a.m.

2. LATE ITEMS

None.

167959v1

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

There was general consent amongst the Committee to proceed with the Agenda for information purposes only as quorum was not achieved.

4. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

Due to lack of quorum, the Minutes from the January 13, 2021 Advisory Design Panel Meeting will be carried forward to the next meeting for adoption.

5. NEW BUSINESS

(1) <u>Development Permit Application for Golden Ears Business Park Phase 4</u>

The Applicant presented recent revisions made to the Development Permit Application for Golden Ears Business Park Phase 4. Some of the points of the presentation included:

- Revisions to site access points;
- Vehicle entrance/exit on Airport Way moved further east to align with parking location;
- Exit on Fraser Way removed;
- Median added on Harris Road to promote a right turn only;
- Traffic updates regarding onsite circulation for vehicles and trucks;
- Addition of a pedestrian crossing on Fraser Way and Harris Road currently under review;
- Acoustical Study conducted indicates amendments made to the site have resulted in improved decibel levels for closest residents;
- Site is within the City's Noise Control Bylaw requirements;
- Tenant has supported the revised development proposal with the addition of an acoustical wall on the of the site resulting in improved the noise levels; and
- Acoustical Study found that the addition of an acoustical wall on the south side of the site would not provide acoustic improvements.
- S. Maki, Director of Engineering and Operations provided some input around the traffic report discussions presented by the applicant. Some of the points included:
 - Newly revised access points improves level of services at these access points;
 - The addition of a north bound left turn lane on Harris Road and Airport Way will improve the level of service at this intersection;

- The traffic study anticipates 40% of vehicles leaving the site using the Harris Road exit and 60% using the Airport Way exit in morning hours; and
- There are no concerns with spacing of the intersections and site access points.

Following the presentation, Council Liaisons and the CAO discussed the application and the following were some of the key themes of the discussion:

- Support for improvements made on the application;
- Concerns around the new median on Harris Road as it may increase traffic leaving from Phase 1 to travel east onto Fraser Way and into Osprey Village (Staff noted engineering will monitor);
- Concerns around the traffic movement on Fraser Way as a result of residents and visitors utilizing the City's dike and trail networks;
- Request for solutions for no traffic movement from Phase 1 and 4 into Osprey Village;
- Importance of signage for newly proposed crosswalk on Fraser Way;
- Importance of an acoustical wall on Lasser Road and on Fraser Way;
- Concerns around site operations being 24/7 and sound travelling further in the evening;
- Support for the removal of the Fraser Way exit;
- Support for the new median on Harris Road;
- Concerns raised around the location of the proposed crosswalk on Fraser Way and Harris road (Staff noted safety and location of the crosswalk was reviewed and from a safety standpoint meets requirements);
- Question was raised around how exit/entrance on Phase 4 on Airport Way lines up with the exit/entrance on Phase 3;
- Support for revisions presented today;
- Question was raised if the decibel readings in the sound study included potential noise from the employee parking lot;
- Clarification around site security and whether fencing was still proposed for the perimeter of the property; and
- The question was raised whether fencing was planned on the top of the berm to secure the site.

Some of the comments made by the Applicant in response to the comments made by the Council Liaisons and CAO included:

 Acoustical study considered the loudest noise generating items on the site with the loudest noted as loading;

- The acoustical study took into consideration the rooftop mechanical equipment which was identified as being louder than employee vehicles on the site;
- The acoustical study found that a sound attenuation wall provided zero reduction in decibel readings on site; therefore there was no justification;
- Sound generating sources are several hundred feet away from residents; and
- In this version of development permit design, fencing is only proposed around the loading court on the west side of the building with no plans for fencing around the employee parking.

The voting members of the ADP participated in a guided discussion on the Applicant's presentation. Some of the comments included:

- Support for revisions made to site circulation;
- Proposal of a raised crosswalk with special paving to assist with pedestrian safety;
- Question raised around the acoustical study stating no need for a sound attenuating wall and who would be responsible for the cost of installation of one once the site is fully operational and it is deemed necessary;
- Recommendation for a Memorandum of Understanding with the applicant should a sound attenuating wall be deemed necessary post construction;
- Should quorum have been achieved today, support for the application would have been given;
- Recommendation for City Staff and/or the RCMP to assist in coordinating an education piece to increase awareness in the area regarding the newly revised traffic changes;
- Recommendation was made to review opportunity on how to restrict access to these parking lots, possibly gating off entrances and exits to parking lot;
- City is faced with speeding, vehicles congregating and burnout concerns in the parking lots of Phase 1 and Phase 2;

Some of the comments made by the Applicant in response to the Committee's comments included:

• Based on current acoustical reports there is no justification for a noise wall;

- Agreement to signing a Memorandum of Understanding to outline responsibilities should an acoustical wall be required post construction;
- Site is intended to be in operation 24 hours a day;
- Gates are planned for site entrances; and
- The Applicants leasing teams are currently reviewing traffic mitigation and noise concerns in Phase 1 and Phase 2.

The Council Liaisons, CAO and members of the ADP were given a final opportunity to engage in a discussion and the following were some of the key themes:

- No concerns moving the application forward as presented today;
- Consensus of the meeting is to move forward the application to Council;
- Many concerns will be unknown until site is active and fully operational;
- Recommendation was made for site security;
- Traffic calming around Fraser Way crosswalk serves dually as it promotes calming measures on Fraser Way;
- Recommendation was made that the Memorandum of Understanding held with the Applicant should outline that the City will not be held accountable for the cost of an acoustical wall after the site is fully operational should decibel readings be unacceptable;
- Support for Memorandum of Understanding and the that Applicant is in agreement; and
- Thanks was given to the Applicant for their review of traffic calming measures for Phase 1 and their other sites in Pitt Meadows.

6. ROUND TABLE

The Committee engaged in a round table discussion. There were no motions or recommendations put forward.

7. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 12:06 p.m.

The next meeting for the Advisory Design Panel is tentatively set for Wednesday, *April 14, 2021* at 2:00 p.m.