A Public Hearing was held on Monday, November 26, 2012 at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers, City Hall, 3000 Guildford Way, Coquitlam, B.C. with the following persons present:

Council Members Present:  
Councillor Lou Sekora, Acting Chair  
Councillor Brent Asmundson  
Councillor Craig Hodge  
Councillor Neal Nicholson  
Councillor Terry O’Neill  
Councillor Mae Reid  
Councillor Linda Reimer  
Councillor Selina Robinson

Absent:  
Mayor Richard Stewart

Staff Present:  
Peter Steblin, City Manager  
John DuMont, Deputy City Manager  
Jim Ogloff, Deputy Fire Chief- Operations Support  
Maurice Gravelle, General Manager Strategic Initiatives  
Lori MacKay, General Manager Parks, Recreation and Culture Services  
Jim McIntyre, General Manager Planning & Development  
Bill Susak, General Manager Engineering & Public Works  
Raul Allueva, Manager Development Services  
Dan McDonald, Manager Corporate Communications  
Catherine Mohoruk, Manager Transportation Planning  
Carlos Perez, Senior Transportation Planning Engineer  
Erica Tiffany, Supervisor Development Planning  
Kerri Lore, Deputy City Clerk  
Laura Shaw, Legislative Services Clerk

REPORT OF GENERAL MANAGER PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

The General Manager Planning and Development submitted a written brief to the Public Hearing dated Monday, November 26, 2012, a copy of which is attached to and forms a part of these minutes.
ADVERTISING OF PUBLIC HEARING

The Public Hearing was advertised in the Tri Cities News on the following dates: Friday, November 12, 2012; Wednesday, November 14, 2012; and Wednesday, November 14, 2012.

OPENING REMARKS

The Acting Chair provided opening remarks in which he set out the Public Hearing process.

ITEM #1 - Reference No. 12 008450 RZ
Bylaw No. 4351, 2012
Address: 954 Charland Avenue

The intent of Bylaw No. 4351, 2012 is to amend City of Coquitlam Zoning Bylaw No. 3000, 1996 to rezone the property located at 954 Charland Avenue from RS-1 One-Family Residential to RT-1 Two-Family Residential.

If approved, the application would facilitate the subdivision of the subject property into two (2) One-Family residential lots.

The Supervisor Development Planning provided an overview of the application and highlighted the following:
- Location of subject property
- Current OCP land use designation
- Adjacent zoning
- Current use of the property
- Proposed OCP designation and use of the property.

Discussion ensued relative to the long term parking and street improvement plan for Charland Avenue.

The following submissions were received, are attached to, and form a part of these minutes:

1. E-mail from Dr. Luigi Sulmona, COO & Chief Development Officer, Blue Mountain Vistas Developments Ltd, Burnaby, received November 21, 2012

There were no further representations to this item.
ITEM #2 - Reference No. 12 005922 RZ  
Bylaw No. 4349, 2012  
Address: 279 Tenby Street

The intent of Bylaw No. 4349, 2012 is to amend City of Coquitlam Zoning Bylaw No. 3000, 1996 to rezone the property located at 279 Tenby Street from RT-1 Two-Family Residential to RT-3 Triplex and Quadruplex Residential.

If approved, the application would facilitate the development of a four-unit strata development, comprising three (3) building, with the building fronting Tenby Street containing two (2) units and two (2) buildings in the rear containing one (1) unit each.

The Supervisor Development Planning provided an overview of the application and highlighted the following:
- Location of subject property
- Current OCP land use designation
- Adjacent zoning
- Current use of the property
- Proposed OCP designation and use of the property.

Richard Coulombe, 289 Tenby Street, Coquitlam, appeared before Council to express concern relative to the narrow cul-de-sac on the street and the resulting limited street parking for residents in the area.

Discussion ensued relative to the following:
- The size of the cul-de-sac on Tenby street
- The parking space ratio for Triplex and Quadruplex Residential zoning
- That the developer is already proposing more parking than is required
- Access to, and flow of traffic through the site
- Whether there is room on the lot for additional parking spaces

There were no further representations to this item.
ITEM #3 - Reference No. 12 004980 RZ
Bylaw No. 4348, 2012
Address: 910 Delestre Avenue

The intent of Bylaw No. 4348, 2012 is to amend City of Coquitlam Zoning Bylaw No. 3000, 1996 to rezone the property located at 910 Delestre Avenue from RT-1 Two-Family Residential to RT-3 Triplex and Quadruplex Residential.

If approved, the application would facilitate a quadruplex development comprising two (2) buildings, each containing two (2) units.

The Supervisor Development Planning provided an overview of the application and highlighted the following:
  - Location of subject property
  - Current OCP land use designation
  - Adjacent zoning
  - Current use of the property
  - Proposed OCP designation and use of the property.

There were no further representations to this item.

ITEM #4 - Reference No. 12 011487 RZ
Bylaw No. 4352, 2012
Text Amendment for Parking Requirements related to the Transit-Oriented Development Strategy (TDS)

The intent of Bylaw No. 4352, 2012 is to amend City of Coquitlam Zoning Bylaw No. 3000, 1996 to implement changes to the parking requirements for apartment, townhouse and commercial uses within the Evergreen Line “Core and Shoulder” Station areas as defined in the Transit Oriented Development Strategy (TDS).

If approved, the proposed amendment will accommodate the supply of parking relative to the trend of reduced vehicle ownership and lower parking utilization rates within transit station communities.

The Manager Transportation Planning appeared before Council and provided an onscreen presentation entitled “Zoning Bylaw Parking Requirements in Station Areas and City Centre”. She referred to slides titled as follows:
  - Context – Transit-Oriented Development Strategy
  - Parking Demand Comes From
  - Anticipated Change in Parking Supply
  - Average Number of Vehicles per Dwelling Unit in Coquitlam (Existing)
  - Municipal Comparison – Parking Requirements for Multi-Family Residential
• Parking Strategy for New Developments
• Transportation Demand Management
• Payment In-Lieu of Parking
• Conclusions
• Next Steps – Monitoring To Achieve the Right Balance
• Questions

Discussion ensued relative to the following:

• The average cost associated with building a parking stall
• The impact that reduced parking will have on “Core and Shoulder” Station areas and how these areas can be controlled through a parking management program
• How the payment-in-lieu program works in other municipalities
• Whether there would be any benefit or additional cost to those who purchase a unit in developments that have utilized the payment-in-lieu program

Ben Craig of 639 Elmwood Street Coquitlam, President, Oakdale Neighbourhood Association, appeared before Council expressing concern relative to the potential impact the proposed parking requirements will have on “Shoulder” neighbourhoods and that the funds collected as part of the payment-in-lieu program will not necessarily be spent in the neighbourhood they were collected in.

Hildagard Richter, 597 Westley Avenue, Coquitlam, Director, Oakdale Neighbourhood Association, appeared before Council relative to expressing concern that the funds of the payment-in-lieu program may not be spent on projects in the neighbourhoods they were collected in, that Coquitlam can not be compared to other municipalities, as most have greater transit services, and that a parking management plan will be needed to regulate street parking in the neighbourhoods affected.

Discussion ensued relative to where the funds collected from the payment-in-lieu program could be directed.

Patrick Santoro, Policy Analyst, Urban Development Institute, appeared before Council relative to UDI’s concern with the proposed bylaw. He stated that UDI does not feel that the proposed parking requirements have been reduced enough and could potentially result in a parking surplus. He also expressed concern that the payment-in-lieu fee is too high for developers and might impact affordability for real estate buyers and suggested that a $10,000 – 15,000 fee would be more appropriate, and lastly that a comprehensive parking management plan will be needed. He also questioned how staff would measure the success of the program and asked that the City reconsider this policy.
Discussion continued relative to the following:

- Some of the parking requirements and management strategies used by the City of Vancouver
- That the payment-in-lieu program is optional, and that if the City achieves a balanced parking ratio that many developers may not choose to utilize it
- The changing trends in urbanization and who is using vehicles

David Kirk, 2677 Booster Drive, Coquitlam, appeared before Council relative to expressing concern that Coquitlam will need to develop a parking management plan for areas such as Lafarge Lake and Town Centre Park, and he asked that Council take a position that Lafarge Lake will not be used for a park and ride.

Therese Wheel, 528 Ebert Avenue, Coquitlam, appeared before Council to seek clarification as to what is defined as a “Core and Shoulder” Station area and what areas would be affected by the proposed parking regulations.

Graham Hill, 581 Thompson Avenue, Burquitlam Community Association, appeared before Council in support of the proposed parking regulations, but cautioned that a formal parking plan for the affected neighbourhoods will need to be developed before future development begins.

Sandra Marsden, 3420 Highland Drive, Coquitlam, appeared before Council to oppose the proposed bylaw, and expressed concerns that the proposed parking ratio is too low, and that the proposed payment-in-lieu fee for developers is too low, as they are already profiting from selling parking stalls to real estate buyers. She also noted that that residents from areas without transit will need places to park to use the Evergreen Line.

Councillor Robinson left the meeting at 8:50 p.m. and returned at 8:52 p.m.
Councillor Reimer left the meeting at 8:54 p.m. and returned at 8:55 p.m.

Ben Craig, 639 Elmwood Street, Oakdale Neighbourhood Association, appeared again before Council to state his concerns relative to the need for a parking management plan for “Core and Shoulder” Station areas, and that the Payment-in-lieu program could prove costly to the real estate buyer and may be spent outside of the neighbourhood the funds were collected in.

Janet Klopp, 3440 Highland Drive, Coquitlam, appeared before Council to oppose the proposed parking requirements. She spoke relative to her concerns that the requirements may lead to a parking shortage around rapid transit areas and that residents living in the outlying areas with poor transit service will need parking access when using the Evergreen Line.
The following submissions were received, are attached to, and form a part of these minutes:
1. E-mail from Cory Redekop, received November 16, 2012.
2. E-mail from Patrick Santoro, Policy Analyst of Urban Development Institute, received November 22, 2012
3. Speaking notes from Hildegard Richter of 597 Westley Avenue, Coquitlam, Director of the Oakdale Neighbourhood Association, received November 26, 2012

There were no further representations to this item.

CLOSURE OF PUBLIC HEARING

The Chair declared the Public Hearing closed at 9:05 p.m.

I hereby certify that I have recorded the
Minutes of the Public Hearing held on November 26, 2012
as instructed, subject to amendment and adoption.

Laura Shaw
Legislative Services Clerk
**PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**
**BRIEF TO PUBLIC HEARING, MONDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 2012**

**ITEM # 1 - 12 008450 RZ - BYLAW NO. 4351, 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Mara + Natha Architecture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address of Applicant</td>
<td>1-3171 Flint Street, Port Coquitlam, BC V3B 4H9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Hyo Jee Sim and Michele Young Kim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address of Owner</td>
<td>7291 Broadway, Burnaby, BC V5A 1S1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address of Property</td>
<td>954 Charland Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present CWOCP Category</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Attached Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed CWOCP Category</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Zoning Category</td>
<td>RS-1 One-Family Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested Zoning Category</td>
<td>RT-1 Two-Family Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Development</td>
<td>Two (2) One-Family Residential lots</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation:**
1. That Council give second and third readings to *City of Coquitlam Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 4351, 2012*; and
2. That Council give fourth and final reading to *City of Coquitlam Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 4351, 2012*.

**First Reading:**
On November 5, 2012 Council gave first reading to Bylaw No. 4351, 2012 and referred the bylaw to Public Hearing.

**Additional Information:**
No additional information was requested.
ITEM #2 - 12 005922 RZ – BYLAW NO. 4349, 2012

Name of Applicant: Architype Design
Address of Applicant: 233 West 28 Street, North Vancouver, BC V7N 2H9
Name of Owner: Zulfikar Singh Gill
Address of Owner: 279 Tenby Street, Coquitlam, BC V3K 3X7
Address of Property: 279 Tenby Street
Present OCP Designation: Neighbourhood Attached Residential
Proposed OCP Designation: No change
Present Zoning: RT-1 Two-Family Residential
Requested Zoning: RT-3 Triplex and Quadruplex Residential
Proposed Development: Quadruplex

Recommendation:
1. That Council give second and third readings to City of Coquitlam Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 4349, 2012; and
2. That Council give fourth and final reading to City of Coquitlam Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 4349, 2012.

First Reading:
On October 15, 2012 Council gave first reading to Bylaw No. 4349, 2012 and referred the bylaw to Public Hearing.

Additional Information:
Staff provide additional information relating to the following questions that were raised by Council at its October 15th meeting:

1. **Is there the ability to have secondary suites in the proposed development?**
   The RT-3 Triplex and Quadruplex Residential zone does not permit secondary suites. While the proposed units all have full basements, none of the units have direct man-door access to outside from the basement level, making it difficult to accommodate illegal suites in the future.

2. **How will parking be accommodated for the development?**
   The Zoning Bylaw requires six (6) off-street parking stalls for the proposed development. The applicant has proposed eight (8) parking spaces on-site in recognition of the on-street parking constraints (i.e. cul-de-sac adjacent to the site). A site plan has been provided to delineate where these proposed stalls are located on-site in relation to the two proposed access driveways (Attachment 1 to Item #2).
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Attachment 1 - Item #2
ITEM #3 - 12 004980 RZ – BYLAW NO. 4348, 2012

Name of Applicant: Architype Design
Address of Applicant: 233 West 28 Street, North Vancouver, BC V7N 2H9
Name of Owner 1: Amarjit Singh Ahluwalia
Address of Owner 1: 5424 Chaffey Avenue, Burnaby, BC V5H 2S2
Name of Owner 2: Pawitter Singh Basra
Address of Owner 2: 1251 Eckert Avenue, New Westminster, BC V3M 6X3
Address of Property: 910 Delestre Avenue
Present OCP Designation: Neighbourhood Attached Residential
Proposed OCP Designation: No change
Present Zoning: RT-1 Two-Family Residential
Requested Zoning: RT-3 Triplex and Quadruplex Residential
Proposed Development: Quadruplex

Recommendation:
1. That Council give second and third readings to City of Coquitlam Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 4348, 2012; and
2. That Council give fourth and final reading to City of Coquitlam Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 4348, 2012.

First Reading:
On October 15, 2012 Council gave first reading to Bylaw No. 4348, 2012 and referred the bylaw to Public Hearing.

Additional Information:
No additional information was requested.
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
BRIEF TO PUBLIC HEARING, MONDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 2012

ITEM # 4 - 12 011487 RZ – BYLAW NO. 4352, 2012

Applicant: City of Coquitlam
Text Amendment: Application to amend City of Coquitlam Zoning Bylaw No. 3000, 1996 to implement changes to the parking requirements for apartment, townhouse and commercial uses within the Evergreen Line “Core and Shoulder” station areas, as defined in the Transit Oriented Development Strategy (TDS) – Bylaw No. 4352, 2012.

Recommendation:
1. That Council give second and third readings to City of Coquitlam Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 4352, 2012;
2. That Council give fourth and final reading to City of Coquitlam Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 4352, 2012; and
3. That Council authorize staff to establish two reserve funds with revenues received through the payment-in-lieu of parking program directed to a Parking Reserve Fund, and a Multi-modal Infrastructure Fund as outlined in the report of the General Manager Engineering and Public Works and Acting General Manager Planning and Development dated October 29, 2012.

First Reading:
On November 5, 2012 Council gave first reading to Bylaw No. 4352, 2012 and referred the bylaw to Public Hearing.

Additional Information
Staff provide additional information relating to the following questions that were raised by Council at its November 5th meeting:

1. What are the parking bylaw requirements of other municipalities that have SkyTrain?

   For convenience, a summary of parking requirements in municipalities with SkyTrain has been complied in Attachment 1 to Item 4. While there are some methodological differences in the application of parking requirements, the data is useful to compare general trends.

   As indicated, parking requirements may vary between 1.0 and 1.5 spaces per dwelling unit. Some municipalities allow parking reductions of up to 20% in their City Centre (usually coinciding with areas with rapid transit). Richmond’s parking requirements within their City Centre for dwelling unit with two or more bedrooms varies between 1.0 and 1.4 spaces per unit. Surrey requires 1.5 spaces per two-bedroom dwelling unit but allows a 20% reduction (i.e. 1.2 spaces per two-bedroom dwelling unit) in their City Centre.
ITEM # 4 cont'd/

2. What is the experience from other municipalities with SkyTrain service that have had a similar Payment-In-Lieu of parking program?

Other municipalities have indicated that Payment-in-Lieu of parking programs work well to address the challenges of providing parking on some sites. The programs vary widely in terms of uptake and use of the funds.

New Westminster has had a Payment-in-Lieu of parking program in its downtown for over 30 years. Uptake has been quite good from dozens of mixed use and commercial developments along Columbia Street corridor who pay a fee of $35,000 per parking space required. The program is currently being used to maintain and eventually upgrade the downtown parking structure. Furthermore a new Citywide Payment-in-Lieu policy is now in place to include all new developments who seek parking variances. These applicants would pay a lower rate of $25,000 per parking space with the funds being used for walking, cycling and alternative transportation improvements.

The City of Burnaby has had a Payment-in-Lieu Program in the Metrotown area since 1982. The program is not widely promoted and thus uptake is relatively low. However, funds from the program have been used to build an underground parking structure along with a library and City square. While funds have not been used to build multimodal transportation infrastructure, Burnaby staff are considering walking, cycling and alternative transportation projects in the future.

3. What Type of parking management measures have been implemented in other station areas?

Common widely used parking management measures in SkyTrain station areas include pay parking; time limited parking, residential permit parking, passenger drop-off zones, and enforcement. Parking measures and issues near rapid transit stations are shown in Attachment 2 to item 4. Based on the feedback from other cities, parking management measures near stations work relatively well.

Staff will analyze the suite of parking management measures and recommend the most appropriate solutions near Evergreen Line Stations considering neighbourhood characteristics. As indicated in previous reports, staff will be advancing the on-street parking strategy in early 2013. In addition, assessment of long-term needs for City Centre and other rapid transit station areas are underway and will be reported to Council in 2013.

J.L. McIntyre, MCIIP, RPP
General Manager Planning and Development

JP/JJ/ET/CP/MZ/ms
### Parking Requirements in Municipalities with SkyTrain Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Apartment Parking Space Minimum</th>
<th>Visitor Spaces per Dwelling</th>
<th>Reduced parking for Mixed Use / Shared Parking?</th>
<th>Option to provide payment in lieu to city for parking requirements?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-Bdr</td>
<td>2-Bdr</td>
<td>3-Bdr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby¹</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Citywide)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coquitlam - Existing (Citywide)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coquitlam - Proposed in Station Areas</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Westminster (Citywide)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond City Centre²</td>
<td>1.0 - 1.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes - Subject to conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey City Centre³</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source**: Zoning Bylaws and policies from the various municipalities as of November 2012.

**Notes:**

1. In Burnaby, additional reductions in parking requirements apply in some multi-family zones through density bonuses. Bonuses are granted for buildings that provide underground parking, affordable housing and/or other items specified in the Bylaw. Parking requirements can be as low as 1.1 stalls per dwelling if all of the density bonusing conditions are provided.
2. Richmond City Centre parking requirements vary based on geographic zones within the City Centre. The zones encompass all Canada Line stations. Generally the zones closer to stations have lower parking requirements than zones further from stations.
3. In Surrey, the lower parking requirements apply only within the City Centre and exclude the area around Scott Road Station.
### Parking Management Near Rapid Transit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Parking measures used near SkyTrain</th>
<th>Comments on parking practices, measures &amp; policies</th>
<th>Measures taken to mitigate parking issues near SkyTrain</th>
<th>Staff resources used for parking management, enforcement, and operations near Station Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Burnaby</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One staff resource is to manage parking in the City with nearly 50% of time used for the areas surrounding transit stations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No - Resident Permit Parking</td>
<td>Street and Traffic Bylaw specifies a 3 hour daytime parking time limit in residential areas which is enforced on a complaint basis.</td>
<td>Monitoring of parking near stations</td>
<td>Enforcement depends on the city's commitment. About 0.25 staff resources are currently being used around stations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes - Closest to stations</td>
<td>Parking meters are used closest to stations and allow all day parking (in non commercial areas)</td>
<td>Additional time limited parking zones were added based upon resident requests</td>
<td>An Automatic License Plate reader was purchased to aid in enforcement of time limited parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes - Further from stations</td>
<td>Time limited parking is used further away from stations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>It is important to put in parking measures fronting public or vacant land before stations are in operation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parking management measures should be put in place with new development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Westminster</strong></td>
<td>Single Family Areas Only Yes - Yes -</td>
<td>Permit parking is limited to single existing single family housing. When areas redevelop to higher density permits are not provided.</td>
<td>Monitoring of parking near stations</td>
<td>Significant resources to set up policy, practices, and measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial Areas</td>
<td>It is important to have a well defined policy and practices on the application of permit parking.</td>
<td>Added and adjusted passenger drop off and taxi zones to fit demand</td>
<td>Once in place about 10% of a position is used to manage parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial Areas</td>
<td>No significant Issues associated with commuters parking near SkyTrain Stations in New Westminster. Most parking issues are to do with Royal Columbian Hospital.</td>
<td></td>
<td>About 3-4 enforcement officers for all parking areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Richmond</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>High drop off volumes around stations during peak hours require regular enforcement</td>
<td>Monitoring of parking near stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Drop off zones are adjusted as needed</td>
<td>Drop off and pick up are and enforced during peak hours</td>
<td>No new enforcement staff were needed for the Canada Line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>About 3-4 hours of staff time per station are needed to enforce drop off zones each week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surrey</strong></td>
<td>Awaiting information from Surrey staff at the time this report was compiled.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Compiled based upon interviews with municipal staff in November 2012.
November 21, 2012

Your Worship Mayor Stewart and Council City of Coquitlam
3000 Guildford Way, Coquitlam, V3B 7N2

Re: Public Hearing Submission 954 Charland

As the owners of 945 and 951 Charland, we support the proposed changes to 954 Charland.

In particular, the proposed form of development will increase the number of residents in the vicinity of Austin Heights, which will contribute to revitalization of the area.

In addition, this form of development will commence the process of improving the streetscape on the southside of Charland.

In closing, we apologize to your Worship and Council for not attending in-person to submit our views as we unfortunately have a previous commitment for the evening of the Public Hearing.

We look forward to Council supporting the 954 Charland development proposal.

Respectfully,

Luigi G. (Joe) Sulmona

Dr. Luigi G. (Joe) Sulmona
COO & Chief Development Officer

Copy:

Basain and Margaret Seena Van Elswyk
954 Charland Avenue, Coquitlam, BC V3K 3K6

Mara -1- Natha Architecture
1 - 3171 Flint Street, Port Coquitlam, BC V3B 4H9
November 15, 2012

Coquitlam City Council
Coquitlam City Hall
3000 Guildford Way
Coquitlam, BC
V3B 7N2

Dear Mayor and Councillors,

RE: Public Hearing of November 26th – Item 4: Text Amendment for Parking Requirements

I am writing to express my opposition to the changes in parking requirements for development around the coming Evergreen Line transit system as outlined in Bylaw No. 4352, 2012.

I would like to register my opposition to reducing the requirement for parking spaces for 2-bedrooms+ units from 1.5 to 1.35, as I fail to see what this will accomplish beyond further alienating people own vehicles and forcing neighbouring streets and communities to absorb the inevitable parking overflow.

This proposed change seems to be following Metro Vancouver’s suggestions to halve visitor parking requirements and reduce parking stall requirements to between 1 and 1.5 units, a plan which has been publicly rebuked by municipal leaders from across the region and the political spectrum who reference crowded streets and rampant parking complaints from their residents. I fail to see why Council would willingly adopt policies that would force a similar fate on Coquitlam residents and neighbourhoods.

The City’s own transportation strategy acknowledges that trips by car will continue to increase for the foreseeable future, and while it is laudable to provide transportation alternatives and encourage less vehicle use, it is short-sighted to try and manufacture this societal change by simply denying adequate parking infrastructure in the first place. I would like to see Council follow time-tested policies and make common-sense decisions rather than rush to be at the vanguard of transportation social engineering.

There exist myriad examples across the region of poorly planned developments which have not provided adequate parking infrastructure for residents, resulting in crowded peripheral streets, illegal parking, and other nuisances. I would like to see Coquitlam instead insist developers provide ample parking for their residents and visitors in all future development in the City.

I thank you for the opportunity to submit my concerns with the proposed changes as outlined in Bylaw No. 4352, 2012 and I trust Council will vote against the proposed changes and preserve adequate parking infrastructure for our residents.

Sincerely,

Cory Redekop
From: Patrick Santoro [mailto:PSantoro@udi.org]
Sent: Wednesday, November 21, 2012 7:19 PM
To: Stewart, Richard
Subject: UDI's response to Coquitlam's proposed parking amendments (payment-in-lieu of building parking)

Dear Mayor Richard Stewart,

I have also sent this e-mail to the rest of Council. On Monday, November 26th, there is a Public Hearing regarding amendments to Coquitlam’s parking requirements (including a payment-in-lieu of $20,000 for each required off-street parking stall not built).

The Urban Development Institute (UDI) provided comments on the proposed changes in today's Coquitlam Now news:

UDI also provided a letter to City staff on this matter on October 23, 2012 (please see attachment).

In summary, UDI opposes the proposed parking changes for the following reasons:

- The parking requirements have been kept higher than necessary in order to gain revenues from a payment-in-lieu of parking program. Indeed, staff have predicted that in the City Centre there could be a “take up rate of between 30% and 60% by developers” who utilize the cash-in-lieu program (generating revenues of $10 to $20 million over a 10 year period). Staff proposed no parking changes for studio, 1 bedroom, and visitor parking requirements. Vehicle ownership rates are decreasing (particularly near Sky Train stations) – the new parking requirements should reflect this trend.

- The money received from the payment-in-lieu of parking program will have no direct benefit to the new homebuyers who indirectly pay for not having a parking stall. Instead, the money will be used for a “public parking facility” for visitors to use from outside the area.

In our October 23rd letter to staff, UDI explained that we would support a fee of $10,000 - $15,000. However, we would only support this fee if the above issues were addressed (a further reduction in parking requirements and if there is a direct benefit to the new homebuyers who are paying a fee for not having a parking space). The above issues were not addressed.

We ask Council to re-evaluate staff's proposed policy. There are a range of more practical, cost effective
measures to address the anticipated concerns that arise if off street parking requirements are reduced too much (i.e. parking spill over on streets). A more comprehensive plan to manage on street parking is needed. This plan may include a "residents only" parking permit program and/or on-street pay parking and timing restrictions for vehicles without a permit. There are many municipalities in North America that have implemented successful parking strategies (without the need to financially burden new homebuyers).

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns about UDI's position on this matter. I would be pleased to have a conversation with you about this important topic prior to the Public Hearing.

Sincerely,

Patrick

Patrick Santoro | Policy Analyst
Urban Development Institute
#200 - 602 West Hastings Street
Vancouver BC V6B 1P2
Tel 604.669.9585 | Fax 604.689.8691
Email psantoro@udi.org
Web udi.bc.ca
October 23, 2012

Carlos Perez  
Senior Transportation Planning Engineer  
City of Coquitlam  
3000 Guildford Way  
Coquitlam, BC V3B 7N2

Dear Mr. Perez:

Re: Development Related Parking Management Measures for Evergreen Line Rapid Transit Station Areas

The Urban Development Institute (UDI) is pleased that the City of Coquitlam has allowed us the opportunity to provide feedback on the City’s adjustments to parking requirements, shared parking, and the cash-in-lieu of parking program.

The establishment of efficient vehicle parking requirements (that corresponds to existing demand) is a very important policy matter. As partners in community building, it is critical that industry and government work together to ensure that parking is not overbuilt. An oversupply of parking has a negative impact on housing affordability and automobile dependency.

UDI has recently shown support for a number of initiatives under Coquitlam’s Transit-Oriented Development Strategy (TDS). On July 10th, 2012, UDI sent a letter to Coquitlam demonstrating our support for the City’s proposed amendments to the City’s High Density Apartment Residential Zones and the Transit Village Commercial Zones. These initiatives will help to facilitate increased density around transit nodes, which helps to reduce automobile dependency and fully leverage the Evergreen Line investment.

In that letter, we mentioned that “The City should commit to reduced parking requirements to facilitate residential density, particularly in pedestrian and bicycle friendly areas that are close to transit. This should be achieved through changes in City policy as opposed to making developers seek parking variances on a regular basis”.

On January, 27th, 2012, UDI sent a letter to Coquitlam demonstrating our support for the City’s proposed changes to their bicycle parking requirements. These changes help to reduce automobile dependency.
Review of Coquitlam’s Proposed Development Parking Management Measures

UDI has a number of concerns regarding Coquitlam’s proposed Development Related Parking Management Measures for Evergreen Line Rapid Transit Station Areas. They include the following:

1. **UDI believes that the minimum parking requirements were not reduced enough, particularly for one bedrooms and visitor parking (where no reductions occurred).** It appears that the City is keeping parking requirements higher than necessary in order to gain revenues from a cash-in-lieu of parking program.

   Indeed, staff have predicted that in the City Centre there could be a “take up rate of between 30% and 60% by developers” who utilize the cash-in-lieu program. This, according to staff, could result in “revenues in the range of $10M to $20M over a ten year period” for the City. It seems that staff are suggesting that the market will request fewer parking stalls than are required.

   Staff also state that their “proposed rates provide a supply that is slightly higher than the average number of vehicles per household in areas within the frequent transit network in Metro Vancouver and the Evergreen Line Corridor”.

There are a range of other reasons to believe that the proposed parking requirements have not been reduced enough:

- **Staff’s sample of existing multi-family locations indicate that under the current Bylaw, there would be an oversupply of parking spaces ranging from 17% to 37% in the Lougheed and Burquitlam area neighbourhoods (an average of 20% oversupply).**

- **The City’s data shows, that on average, vehicles per dwelling unit in Coquitlam in the City Centre is 1.1. This is less than the City’s proposed requirement.**

- **Staff suggest that Coquitlam will continue to experience lower vehicle ownership rates (particularly as the Evergreen Line is complete and Coquitlam urbanizes). UDI believes these trends will continue to occur, especially with an ageing population.**

- **The results of the Metro Vancouver Apartment Parking Study suggest that there is less demand for visitor parking and parking for one bedroom units (compared to existing municipal requirements throughout the region), particularly near Frequent Transit Network (FTN) Stations and Bus stops. The Study states that “one bedroom units may be able to support much lower minimum parking requirements than is typical in current parking bylaws”. For one bedroom units, the results indicated that the parked vehicles per dwelling unit near FTN Stations were .96 and .90 for FTN Bus stops. The Study also suggests that “visitor parking supply may be over supplied. Observed visitor parking demand rates were below 0.1 stall per apartment unit, compared to the typical municipal requirement of 0.2 stall per apartment unit”.**
Given the above points, we are concerned that no changes in the parking requirements were made for one bedrooms and visitor parking. In the report, staff explain that one bedroom units have an “inherent need for private vehicle storage”. However, there is no rationale for this in the report and no evidence to suggest that every unit needs a parking stall. There is also no rationale for why visitor parking requirements are not reduced.

Staff have indicated that these changes could equate to a total of about a 15% reduction in required parking. We note, however, this would only be true if all new units in a building are 2 or more bedrooms.

Given the data and analysis provided by Coquitlam staff, the results and analysis of the Metro Vancouver Apartment Parking Study, and our member’s observations, **UDI recommends the following changes in Coquitlam’s parking requirements:**

- A 10% reduction for one bedroom units;
- A 15% reduction for two bedroom units;
- A 15% reduction for visitor parking; and
- An extra 5% reduction if TDM measures are in place

We believe that our recommendations are reasonable and based on evidence and foresight into the market trends. Recognizing that each municipality is unique, our recommendations are not nearly as aggressive as those put forward in the Metro Vancouver Apartment Parking Study.

We believe that these requirements should be reviewed every other year, and should be as accurate as possible to reflect current vehicle demand levels. Ultimately, the goal should be to reduce the need for parking variances. A parking variance is a lengthily process that requires costly studies and delays.

**2. UDI is opposed to a cash-in-lieu of parking program unless the money directly benefits the home buyers who do not receive on-site parking stalls.** Under the City’s proposal, new public parking facilities would be “shared amongst the various user groups destined to the area including those attending sports or cultural events, tourists, etc”. This is not a direct benefit to the home buyers who pay for these facilities (unless they are given free parking stalls in these facilities).

The benefits of a cash-in-lieu program should be jointly discussed by the developer and municipality and marketed to the buyer. It should appear to the buyer that they received a direct benefit for not having a parking stall. This amenity, however, should not deter from the goal of creating affordable housing near transit. **Indeed, a competitively priced housing unit near rapid transit is a key incentive to encourage people out of cars.**

Parking reductions are an excellent strategy to reduce housing costs, but the cost savings can vanish when a cash-in-lieu of parking program is implemented. People who buy housing near transit to save money by not owning a car should not end up subsidizing the cost of parking or amenities for others.

If a developer seeks a parking variance, a compelling planning case should be made to explain why less demand for parking will occur. Money to a municipality should not be the focus of a parking variance policy. If a municipal parking requirement is outdated or
not applicable to a specific project, then staff should work with the developer to change the requirements for the projects’ specific needs.

UDI believes that in a healthy housing market, with a reasonable amount of new supply and competition, the savings achieved from not building parking would be passed onto new homebuyers.

3. The City’s assumptions about parking costs are inaccurate. Indeed, in urban areas of Metro Vancouver, an underground parking stall, on average, costs around $40,000. However, the cost per stall can vary greatly depending on the type of development, location and site size. For underground parking, the biggest cost is the depth of excavation (i.e. the number of levels of underground parking has the largest impact, not the number of stalls). Costs increase dramatically for each additional underground level.

In Coquitlam, lot sizes are generally wider/longer (as opposed to small lots in downtown Vancouver). Therefore, the level of excavation is less. In many cases, a parking stall in Coquitlam could range from $15,000 - $45,000 per stall. If parking is at grade the costs are substantially reduced.

A developer will need to consider if the $25,000 cash-in-lieu option is enough of an incentive not to build parking. The inclusion of a parking stall adds value to the unit price. For example, if it costs $30,000 per parking stall a developer would likely not choose the cash-in-lieu option (since a parking stall adds more than $5,000 of value to a unit).

Therefore, under the current proposal, we believe that there will continue to be an oversupply of parking in Coquitlam because the high cash-in-lieu fee is not enough of an incentive.

We believe that if cash-in-lieu of parking is to occur, then a more appropriate fee would be $10,000 for any building that is 6 stories or less, and $15,000 for a building that is 6 stories or more. There should, however, be flexibility with this based on areas of the City and type of development. Each development varies, and a flexible process is needed. The Shoulder Station Areas of the Evergreen Line should certainly have smaller cash-in-lieu fees than the Core Station Areas.

4. In an effort to reduce construction costs, and make new housing more affordable in Coquitlam, both industry and staff should work together on the following parking initiatives:

- Alternatives to costly underground parking should be explored. Parking at grade should be encouraged. This is especially the case on smaller sites. Floor space ratio exclusions may be required.

- UDI would be pleased to work with Coquitlam staff to explore strategies to promote and incentivize the unbundling of parking as a way to provide consumers with more choices.

- Shared parking facilities (for commercial parking needs and residential visitor parking) should be further explored. This is an excellent way to fully utilize existing parking infrastructure, particularly in mixed use development areas.
**Conclusion**

Overall, UDI believes that the City’s proposed parking policies will hinder the ability to have affordable multi-family development along the Evergreen Line. Already, multi-family developers in Coquitlam are subject to DCC increases, possible CAC increases, and now a $25,000 parking fee (for not building a parking stall).

In summary, **UDI’s key recommendations are the following:**

1) Lower all of the parking requirements by the following: 10% for one bedroom; 15% for two bedroom; 15% for visitor parking; and an extra 5% for TDM measures.

2) Cash-in-lieu should only occur if the money benefits the home buyers who are indirectly paying this charge. It should appear to the buyer that they received a benefit for not having a parking stall.

3) If cash-in-lieu is to occur, it should be $10,000 for areas the City anticipates six stories or less (e.g. shoulder areas) and $15,000 in areas the City anticipates six stories or more (e.g. Core areas). There should be flexibility with this program.

We again thank Coquitlam staff for consulting with UDI on this matter and appreciate the opportunity to provide feedback. We look forward to continuing to work with the City on their transit-oriented development policies.

Sincerely,

Original signed by:

Anne McMullin  
President and CEO
Good Evening Mayor and Councillors

My name is Hildegard Richter of 597 Westley Ave. Coquitlam director of the Oakdale Neighbourhood Association.

Thanks for giving us the opportunity to comment on the parking issues that affect our streets in connection with the coming Evergreen Line to Burquitlam/Oakdale.

The City plans to allow the reduction of the parking spaces provided by builders of highrises and multiple housing from 1.5 spaces to 1.35 spaces for a two bedroom apartment for a payment of $ 20,000 to the City. This money will be used to provide parking facilities not necessarily in the area it has been collected.

Does this plan to finance parking facilities not indicate that parking places are needed?

The public Transit service of Coquitlam can not be compared with the one in Vancouver, where a lower car use has been registered. Vancouver has in addition to the already existing SkyTrain services a much more frequent bus service than we have in the suburbs. Here we have to rely on many shuttle buses that run only every half hour, the Evergreen Line will run paralell to the CPR Line - not touching the multiple housing area around Ungless and Guildford. Even the Coquitlam Rec Ctre has only half hourly bus service.

In the present day economy many people have to hold down not only one but two and three part-time jobs. For all these reasons cars are a necessity in the suburbs.

The lower the frequency of bus service the more people rely on their cars. And the bus fares are not cheap either. All these facts do not discourage the use of the car.

Some apartment buyers might choose to pay a lower price to purchase a two bedroom apartment with only one parking space even though two cars are owned by the family. This means that the second car is parked in the neighbourhood.
Already Oakdale is burdened with commuter parking and much higher density is planned for the future.

At the moment Coquitlam has no parking limits.

Without sidewalks on most of our streets pedestrians have to walk on the street past the cars parked by the curbs.

We need Time-limited parking and Resident Parking Only as practiced in other Cities to prevent the all-day parking of non-residents in front of residential properties. This would make walking safer, thorough street cleaning and snow plowing possible.

We ask the Council to bring in bylaws to make our neighbourhood safer and to keep them environmentally-friendly to make Coquitlam the City of Choice.

Hildegard Richter