



## **Mount Pleasant MPIC Meeting**

**Thursday, August 8, 2013**

**Mount Pleasant Community Centre**

**1 Kingsway**

**7:00 PM to 9:00 PM**

## **MEETING NOTES**

**Attendees:** Stuart Alcock, Stephen Bohus, Mike Wiebe, Grace Mackenzie, Alyssa Myshok, Leona Rothney, Lewis Villegas, Kay MacIntosh, Danielle Peacock, David Paterson (COV), Joyce Uyesugi (COV).

**Participant Observers:** Brendan Caron, Randy Chatterjee, Don Gardener.

**Regrets:** Michelle Sturino, Michelle Babiuk, Lucas Berube, Jocelyne Hamel, Robert Sutherland, Suzanne Goldberg, Lynn Warwick.

**Notes:** David Paterson

Meeting start time: 7:05 pm

### **1. Outlining Goals for the Meeting (Joyce Uyesugi)**

- JU: Would like to devote time to each of the 4 priority streams, Broadway East, Lower Main, Public Realm Plan, Public Benefits, with time at the end for Part 2 of LV's presentation [We only completed conversations on Broadway East and Lower Main sections]
- JU: Round the table approach suggested to make sure everyone inputs if they wish to do so.
- What is the version date for the posters?
  - These are from June 15 and 20, 2013. Date is below the boards' title; boards have not been revised since.

### **2. Broadway East**

- LV: Human scale is being exceeded. 4 storey not 6 storey street wall should be allowed. However, plan should talk in terms of feet/meters of height, rather than storeys of height.
- LV: There should be a 1:3 ratio of street-wall to fronting right-of-way. I.e. if right-of-way is 99', street-wall should be 33'.
- GM: Let's say up to six storeys, rather than generally up to six storeys.
- LV: Should ask for 100% retention of residential E Broadway buildings built before 1940.
  - JU: We are trying to strengthen heritage retention in the policy.
- AM: None of the maps indicate buildings with heritage or historical designation. Would be nice to see it.

- SA: Lewis’s concept of a ratio of street-wall to right-of-way never came up during the community plan process, explaining why it never made it to the plan. Feels the conversation was constrained to certain ideas only.
- SA: Much of what happens in Broadway East will depend on Kingsgate Mall and Rapid Transit on Broadway. We don’t know how they will develop.
  - JU: Agreed. Streetscape and road design will respond to transit. This will also be taken into account in the public realm plan sections.
- GM: Has been told that transit underground on Broadway is unlikely because of infrastructure already there.
- BC: What about the food coop in the Rize?
- LR: Don’t want to lose views from Broadway East looking north.
- LR: Traffic on side streets has escalated in recent years.
- SA: There needs to be attention paid to traffic calming on side streets, so they are not used when there is congestion on arterials.
- MW: Agrees that traffic is a huge concern.
- MW: Referring to Board 1 of Broadway East Revitalization, right side, bullet 3: “Assess how additional height beyond 6 storeys serves to trigger redevelopment and leads to improvements in site development and street character.” This sort of wording is troubling, since it only discusses potential positives of building heights beyond 6 storeys and does not present any possible reasons to not want to have taller buildings. This sort of leading language should be avoided as it is not neutral. Seeking buildings taller than 6 storeys was not a part of the community plan.
- RC: Language about storeys (i.e. 4 on the south and 6 on the north) will raise property values and speculation for Broadway East.
- RC: Design guidelines of 17 degree angle for sun was assumed to be a fact.
  - JU: 6 storeys on North and 4 storeys is in response to sun.
- LV: Building massing is not just about sun but also human experience of building and sky. The difference of 4 and 6 storeys is that one is human scaled and the other is not.
  - JU: We are seeking to create a vibrant healthy public realm in all places – whether the building is 4 storeys or more.
- MW: Should use number of feet rather than number of storeys
- KM: Density has only been explored in terms of adding height. Alternative ways to add density have not been considered.
- SB: Using the word “generally” when referring to height is troublesome language. Why not simply copy over the 13.8 m height limit from the C-2C zoning schedule?
- SB: The massing diagram should show the C-2C permitted massing.
- SB: Various elements, as well as some figures, that were not in the community plan have been added to the boards and are going too far.
- SB: Weaving initiative reference on the “Non-Physical” Board should be removed.
- LV: Have we specified sidewalk widths? Is it 20 ft?
  - JU: This will be addressed in the policy and Public Realm Plan; we are generally working with 5.5 m (18 ft) for shopping streets.
- JU: On the non-physical aspects of revitalization, we are suggesting ideas to help the community organizing itself, including the local newsletter project.

### 3. Lower Main (2nd to 7th)

- LV: Primary principles generally not different from neighbourhood to neighbourhood.
- SB: mid-block connector not recommended because the blocks are short, and the connector becomes an amorphous space. Strong street wall is preferable.
- SB: Note the IC-2 maximum massing including setbacks.
- SB: City should not be trying to maximize CACs as part of the plan.
- SB: Better to have symmetry of East and West side of the street-wall, not difference. One form of massing organization throughout.
- SB: Small frontage for stores desirable.
- SB (with agreement from others): there is not a rationale for additional massing at 2nd-3rd and Main. There doesn't need to be a gateway.
- SB: For city owned lot at 6th-7th and Main, what are the different options?
- SB: Please clarify the plan drawing with explicit setbacks according to IC-2.
- RC: The hilltown effect is meant for everyone to have a view looking north. Buildings should be higher at Broadway, and lower at 2nd. If buildings get taller at the North, building up to the view cone, you lose that effect.
- GM: Hilltown concept is well drawn on page 8 of the plan. This drawing should be copied, considering a slope down from #1 Kingsway. Also copy the text on page 9: "Recognize that its slopes are natural form-makers on which a low profile for residential and commercial properties helps keep the sense of hill intact."
- DanielleP: In the November 2012 boards for Lower Main, the idea for additional height at 2nd and Main and 7th and Main was introduced, but the boards (under "What the Plan says") do not fully represent both content of p. 27 and p. 30 of the Plan:
  - P. 27 states: "Allow up to 6 storeys for mixed-use developments along Main Street from 2nd to 7th Avenues; investigate permitting additional height during plan implementation (see Section 6.1c.)"
  - P. 30 states: "An example where a new planning program will be needed is the rezoning of Main 2nd to 7th Avenue. The community supports mixed-use development of up to 6 storeys in this area. They also expressed concerns about allowing buildings above 6 storeys at the intersections of Main Street with 2nd Avenue and with 7th Avenue. The concern is in recognition of potential impacts on views - especially at Main and 7th Ave. - and overshadowing of adjacent areas, along with changes to character of the street..."
- DanilleP: Where in the Plan are Main and 2nd and Main and 7th singled out, as the November 2012 boards suggest, as areas to include additional height? The way they are singled out is as areas where there are "concerns" about additional height. This kind of manipulation of the wording of the Plan has made it look like the new proposed developments fit the Plan when they don't.
  - JU: The issue seems to be in the interpretation of the Plan, which allows for the consideration of additional height beyond 6 storeys at 2<sup>nd</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup>. One interpretation is of a limit of 6 storeys. Another interpretation is to further explore additional heights at these locations.
- SA: Developers and COV are cherry picking from the plan with spot rezonings and opportunities (such as at 7th and Main) where 6 storeys can become 9 storeys. There is nothing in the plan about reaping CACs. Community is not initiating it. The open house boards' Q and A sections are distortions of community input.
- SA (and others): The process problems are institutional not personal towards staff.
- GM: Questions from the city are leading the conversation in certain directions, with only limited options for community input. The city needs to be neutral and open-minded. The information provided is not always correct.

- JU: Earlier in the process, questions were more open-ended. As the process moved forward, ideas were refined and further developed. Closed questions can allow for broader input, and can be analyzed quantitatively. There are pros and cons to each approach.
- BC: There was a statement by council that there would only be 3 high-rise towers in Mount Pleasant.
- AM: The boards state a desire to “foster unique identity” but that identity is not anywhere spelled out.
- AM: “Light industrial” is not conveyed in the urban design framework. We should spell out exactly what services/industries are needed here (e.g. auto repair, clothing manufacture, artist production, music studios, trades).
- AM: How can we ensure that light industrial uses will actually be included in new development?
  - JU: Compatibility of industry and residences needs to be considered in the version of mixed-use that will be developed here. We are drafting a policy that would set out a choice of use (retail/commercial or light industrial) on the ground floor.
  - JU: We have researched height requirements for light industrial use and they are comparable to those for commercial space. We can have a unique character here on Lower Main, with industry potentially fronting the lanes more, and retail fronting the street.
  - SA: Light industry in Lower Main becomes a city-wide amenity, not just for Mount Pleasant.
- DanielleP: Don’t need to create industrial space but retain what is existing. Newly built industrial spaces are more expensive than existing/older stock. So the rate of development is a concern for maintaining affordable industrial space. “You don’t build affordability. You retain affordability.”
- DanielleP: What fuels speculation should be considered.
  - SA: The plan implementation will fuel speculation in Lower Main.
  - JU: The Urban Design Framework is intended to provide more clarity on future development, thereby mitigating speculation.
- GM: Artists’ Spaces are a way to combine residences and industrial production.
- GM: The view-cone is a concern. On the Draft Urban Design Policies poster’s Q and A the figure of 116’ is given but this was not in the plan. Where did 116’ come from?
  - JU: We will clarify the view cone dimensions in the implementation policy.
- GM: Page 27 of the plan says allow up to 6 storeys at Main 2nd the 7th but the figure 9 storeys appears in the Q and A of June’s Draft Urban Design Policies.
- SB: along with height clarity, FSR of 2.5 or 3.0 should be made clear.
  - JU: yes, we will clarify heights and FSR, as well as history regarding the view-cone. History of the view-cone is somewhat complex.
- MW: The lack of parking in Lower Main has become really bad; businesses are losing customers because of it. We have lost some parking on 7th Ave. When we lose the parking lot at 7th and Main it will get worse. Underground parking lots are less desirable parking options for business clients.
- MW: Retail is not a great option for Main 2nd to 7th because the slope is harder for pedestrians. Main near Broadway is a better option as it is more pedestrian and transit friendly. Focus in Lower Main should be on industry and jobs. “Residential” shouldn’t be the first component listed.
  - SA: People living and working in Lower Main may still want lunch places/convenience store.
  - MW: Agreed, there should be some retail, but it should not be the primary thing that happens here.
- MW: 11 storeys does not make for a good community. See Fairview Slopes [near 6th and Laurel] as a better example of community development.
- MW: Buildings in Southeast False Creek make a wall blocking views previously had on Quebec and Main.
  - AM: Concerned that Southeast False Creek Buildings got a rezoning and then a re-rezoning for an even taller height.
  - SA: E.g. Rize could stick to 19 storeys and reduce the tower height.

#### 4. Quick comment from SB on Public Benefits Strategy [8:20-8:25]

- SB: Under Housing, should say “preserve existing rental stock.”
- SB: Under Housing/Draft Directions note that the City’s Secured Market Rental Housing Policy was a controversial policy.

#### 5. Part 2 of Debrief for MPIC self-directed workshop (Lewis Villegas)

- Lewis to create PDF of the presentation for inclusion with report from MPIC, along with covering letter for signatures of MPIC members who are in support
- JU: does the product of the workshop respect the Mount Pleasant Community Plan?
  - LV: Yes, where that plan had good principles. It also adds new principles where the Community Plan was lacking or not considering options
  - SA: The Community Plan was produced within/limited by certain existing parameters.
- JU: requesting link for the presentation.

#### 5. Updates and Next Meeting (Joyce Uyesugi)

- The Rize: September 23 rezoning hearing date has been delayed.
- The Rize Arts CAC (\$4.5million) process: Staff recently sent Council a memo outlining a process that seeks to use the funds to provide innovative capital contributions for locally-led proposals to retain and enhance existing space or develop new space for artist production in or serving Mount Pleasant. <http://vancouver.ca/files/cov/mount-pleasant-artist-production-space-council-memo-08062013.pdf>
- SB: Is there a CAC process laid out yet for the Rize’s \$1.75 M CAC for Affordable Housing?
  - JU: Staff will follow up on process and timing.
- What are the next steps for the Main and 7th site rezoning?
  - JU: Staff are preparing report to Council. Public hearing will be a few months away. There is typically about 1 month between referral and rezoning.
- GM: When can the MPIC provide input on the 2 rezonings?
  - JU: Now. Send it to the rezoning planner, Yan Zeng: yan.zeng@vancouver.ca
- SB: Shouldn’t plan implementation happen before referral?
- JU: Oct 9 is still the target for Plan Implementation and Aug 30 Aug is the due date for MPIC comments. MPIC comments will be included as an appendix.
- GM to other MPIC members: Ok to write individual letters, but requesting coordination.
- LV to other MPIC members: will send out his presentation in 1 week, expecting signatures 1 week later.
- JU distributes information on development costs from Aquilini (re: Main and 2<sup>nd</sup> rezoning enquiry), as requested by MPIC.
- Next MPIC meeting Sept 12: Review of draft implementation package.

Meeting Adjourned

(9:10 pm end)

# Costs of Development

\* Figures are approximate and based on industry averages using a theoretical Vancouver 17 storey concrete high-rise residential condominium building with 125 units averaging 800 sq. ft., 1.5 parking spaces per unit, and built over a 24 month construction period. The figures will vary given a specific neighborhood or site.

Expense	Cost
Land Costs	\$160.00 – 180.00 / Sq. Ft.
Soft Costs	\$115.00 - 135.00 / Sq. Ft.
Hard Costs	\$260.00 – 280.00 / Sq. Ft.
Government Charges (CACs, DCLs, DCCs etc.)	~\$95.00 / Sq. Ft.
Total	\$630.00 - \$680.00 / Sq. Ft.

→ Typical developer's profit: 15%

## Soft Costs

- Indirect costs associated with the construction of a development project
- Non-construction costs such as consultants, design fees, marketing, taxes, finance charges, insurance, interest payments, permits and general administration costs
- Mainly "intangible and invisible"

## Hard Costs

- Direct costs associated with the construction of a project
- Costs connected to building the development, including but not limited to: labor, materials, equipment, building services, envelope features, interior construction, fit-outs, mechanical services, electrical services and finishes
- Hard costs and soft costs are dependent on the other

