



Mount Pleasant MPIC Meeting
Thursday July 11th, 2013
Mount Pleasant Community Centre
1 Kingsway
7:00 PM to 9:00 PM

MEETING NOTES

Attendees: Stuart Alcock, Michelle Babiuk, Lucas Berube, Stephen Bohus, Mike Wiebe, Grace Mackenzie, Leona Rothney, Lewis Villegas, Heather Shea (COV), Harv Weidner (COV).

Participant Observers: Brendan Caron, Duncan Wlodarczak, Randy Chatterjee.

Regrets: Vanessa Brown, Jocelyne Hamel, Kay MacIntosh, Danielle Peacock, Michelle Sturino, Chris Vollan.

Notes: Heather Shea

1. Update: June 15/20 Open houses + next steps (Harv Weidner) (7:05pm start)

- Had 450 attendees, 91 surveys filled out.
- There was general support for all the pieces of the implementation work.
- Next steps: Council date is October 9th.
- The planning team is working through the summer, taking the comments received and modifying the draft implementation strategies as necessary.
- The draft will be shared with the MPIC in early September.
- However, the document will still be in internal review so there may be minor changes between that time and when it is forwarded to Council later in September.

2. Debrief: MPIC self-directed workshop (Lewis Villegas)

- Link to presentation: http://sunmountpleasant.wordpress.com/?attachment_id=510
- Took place Saturday June 22nd, with about 10 participants.
- Concept: What if Mount Pleasant built out at 4 storeys or less?
 - It's not just about density.
 - Put the heart back in the neighbourhood
 - Celebrate local history.
 - Create a hierarchy of place.
 - Have a people place in the centre.
- The project will continue to be refined.

Questions and Comments from MPIC members:

- Very conscious that the City doesn't use the winter solstice as a measure. It seems that in terms of light in the city, the critical measure is the winter solstice. I think this is a major error in assessment.
- As a participant, I wish we had a similar process to this for the development of the Community Plan; it stimulated my thinking in a number of areas e.g., putting transit in the middle of the road, street cars in the middle of the road. Why didn't we think about this during the Community Plan

development? The City needs to think very hard about how to facilitate better local planning ideas, and about incorporating international building ideas.

- Agree that a charrette is a better process for gathering information than how it was gathered for the plan.
- Like the middle lane transit idea and the idea of closing that block of Kingsway.
- Thought the design of everything looked great with the 4 storey buildings, but would like to be convinced that the economics work: that a developer would purchase all these single family homes and that it would be economical to do this kind of development.
 - Concern that 4 storey apartments on arterials would be very loud and that people wouldn't want to live there.
 - Is there enough incentive to add units in that way knowing that it's more challenging?

3. Review of implementation material presented at June Open Houses

- As we won't have time to get through all the material, this could spill over to the next meeting.
- Part of the mandate of the MPIC is to advise City staff/Council on plan implementation.
- Would like to make sure language respects the Plan.
- Are certain comments being left out of the notes?
 - Meeting notes are a summary record and are not meant to capture all comments verbatim.
- For Broadway East, are historical buildings noted?
 - Yes.
- Current and future transit conditions were discussed, including technology for the Millennium Line extension to UBC, alignment, and ridership.
- The future of transit on Broadway will affect the Broadway East revitalization strategy.
- Will the policy specify allowable FSR, or just height?
 - The current draft refers to a negotiated FSR based on urban design performance related to contextual compatibility
- Massing diagram for Broadway East was reviewed and discussed. It is meant to illustrate conceptual massing based on the draft policy.
 - In terms of FSR, for 6 storeys you'd be looking at over 3. Current project at Broadway and Carolina is 4/5 storeys and about 2.8 FSR.
 - The south side buildings should look a little smaller than what they are according to the plan. The buildings look like they would be at least 4 FSR. The buildings should be drawn differently.
 - Review the C-2 guidelines to convey how these buildings would look at the rear.
- Concern with the assumption that we are going to allow more height to get more density.
 - If we are going to allow height you are going to have people that have to build to that to afford the land.
- On page 2: page 29, doesn't say "generally up to 6 stories", it says "up to 6 stories". Consider removing the word "generally".
- Kingsgate mall: would like some more detail on transition to "uptown west".
- One of the characteristics that defines Mount Pleasant is diversity. Redevelopment is "gentrification" and puts those places at risk.
- The affordable rental stock needs to be preserved but also renewed
- People need the option of being able to come back into the community.
- Concern that the City is trying to implement the plan by considering CACs.
 - It needs to be affordable housing for people that live in the community.
 - The City needs to tell developers to build cheaper housing so that people can afford it, so that it doesn't increase land values and the cost to buy these spaces.
- Harv explained that most of the zoning for Mount Pleasant is not going to change
 - "Rate of Change" policy affects all rental buildings so that rental stock is maintained.
 - Also, if the project at 2nd and Main goes ahead, the developer will need to address the loss of the 21 units of rental housing there.

- Further, the Public Benefits Strategy will have an affordable housing component and a large amount of \$\$ directed toward pursuing housing affordability.
- Rate of change: should look at making sure the size of units being replaced is identical, not just the unit numbers themselves.
 - Is there a way to protect the price of the rental?
- There remains a huge concern about affordability, preserving space for newcomers, families and seniors. How do we do this?
- It is important to preserve the concrete and historical character of the neighbourhood.
- Maybe there should be a limit put on the amount of profit that the developers can obtain.
- It would help if we could review the developer's pro-forma
 - Staff will follow up with the developer on this request
- CMHC is taking back the subsidies for the co-op housing.
 - Subsidized people will get less. This is happening across the co-op sector.
 - It's another crisis in affordability
- Lower Mai, 2nd to 7th:
 - This diagram looks flat - can we show contours i.e. The slope of the street?
 - Maybe some clarity on the FSRs.
 - What about the massing here?
- Overview: transition block at Main and 2nd: 116 feet?
 - Staff are clarifying the dimensions of the Main Street view cone.
- Where is the mandate for site specific rezoning on Main 2nd-7th?
 - This has been explained and discussed a number of times at previous meetings, at the last open houses, and via email.
 - Please refer to the Lower Main Urban Design Framework board.
- Is the CAC that important? Isn't it better to produce affordable housing?
- Is there more scrutiny for development when it comes forward as a rezoning?
 - Yes, a rezoning goes through two processes: rezoning process with a public hearing and a separate development permit process. If a site is already rezoned, there is one review process.
- The concern about 4 storey apartments being viable on Main Street stems from the need for a lot of things to come together to make a project work: urban form, land economics and others.
- The CAC approach begs the question of what other cities do that don't collect CACs.
 - Some borrow against growth – tax increment financing.
- Lewis will forward the PDF of his presentation.
 - The group could consider putting their names on it and giving it to Council. Could discuss this.
- Staff will send out a link to the implementation boards on the City's website. MPIC members should review and prepare their comments for the next meeting.

4. Discussion: Draft guidelines for responding to developers (Harv Weidner)

- A revised draft of the MPIC response form was circulated.
- Once the implementation documents go to Council, staff will be moving on to other programs.
- Need to consider how early input is given to developers. What's proposed:
 - Request that developers host a meeting with the MPIC prior to formal application, which would be attended by City staff – likely a rezoning planner.
 - The developer would receive responses from the MPIC and consider making design changes before application.
 - After the application, members would input as any other group of citizens might: by attending open houses or sending in written responses.
 - It may be helpful for other community members to attend the rezoning enquiry meeting as well.
- Discussion of redrafted response form:
 - So what is this form for?

- For individual responses to developers, either separately or in addition to a group letter.
- Concern that we previously decided as a group that we wouldn't do the forms, we would do the letter.
- If we use forms at least everyone could see what everyone else is writing, and then we could use the response forms to draft a letter with majority/minority views.
- Concern that the letter writing has been a problem. We have not come to a resolution on the approach.
- Environmentalist is a vague term and would like to see this taken off the form.
- People's views will emerge in the written material.
- Should there be other people that can come to the meetings?
- Is there grant money we can apply for to cover the cost of meeting space in the future?
 - The developer would be responsible to fund the room for a rezoning enquiry meeting.

5. Next meeting (Harv Weidner)

- Staff will confirm date and location of the next meeting once holidays are confirmed.

Meeting Adjourned

(9:10 pm end)