



**Mount Pleasant (MP)
MPIC Meeting
Wednesday, September 26, 2012
Mount Pleasant Community Centre
Main and Kingsway (Art Room)
6:30 PM to 8:30 PM**

MEETING NOTES

Attendees: Stephen Bohus, Danielle Peacock, Grace Mackenzie, Alyssa Myshok, Leona Rothney, Michelle Sturino, Lynn Warwick, Mike Wiebe, Matt Shillito (COV), Harv Weidner (COV), Joyce Uyesugi (COV),

Regrets: Stuart Alcock, Jocelyne Hamel, Lewis Villegas, Chris Vollan,

Participant Observers: Julian Beckett, Randy Chattergee, Sylvia Holland

Meeting Notes: Jennifer White

1. Intro - Harv (6:40pm start)

Key objective of the meeting is to finalize the Terms of Reference.
No agenda items to add.

2. Terms of Reference (Section 4-10) - clarification, deliberation of clauses- Joyce

Staff sent out revised Terms of Reference early September. At the previous ToR meeting, we identified clauses for clarification and deliberation. We addressed Sections 1-3. Today we will address the remainder.

Sections Summary (Clauses) - identified at August 29th meeting

<i>Clarification</i>	<i>Deliberation</i>
1.4 (3)	
2.1 (3) 2.2 (3)	
	3.1 (5) 3.3 (2) 3.5 3.7 3.9
	4.0 (2)
6.1 (5)	6.3 (2) 6.6 6.7
	7.1

	7.2 (2)
9.1 9.6	9.0 (9.1 Clarification)
	10.5 (2) 10.6

Clauses for deliberation

Clause 3.1

- Lacking specific statement about the “Plan” being the basis behind everything that we do
- Role of MPIC not just to advise, prefer *collaborate*

Section 4.0 Role of City Staff

Clause 4.1

- mutually agreed-upon *by the City and MPIC as to the roles and...*

Clause 4.2

- Specify input from MPIC i.e., *MPIC reports or feedback forms consisting of options*

Clause 4.3

- City staff, *as well as the MPIC...*

Section 6.0 Composition of the MPIC

Clause 6.1

- Concerns about losing membership due to application process

Clause 6.2

- Members must live, own property or work in Mount Pleasant. ‘Work’ is interpreted as ‘paid or volunteer’
- *What is the intent in changing Clause 6.2?*
 - Assurance that who is on the committee has the community’s best interest at heart
- *What is the goal of developer representation?*
 - Need to further define
 - Skeptical about developers being on the committee
- own property *in your name*
 - Concerns that many big businesses in the area that are not property owners, have multiple property owners or are holding companies
 - Property owners should be invested in the community in some way. The conflict is the big developers not being invested in the community. *Come as an observer?*
 - If we exclude developers from the committee, MPBIA loses half of its members. *Why not include? Is it not better to have developers on the committee than not involved at all?*
 - Find a balance, not shut out, find a way that is going to work
 - Have to be genuine and representative of community
 - We want developers on this board, they can clean up properties
- *Do we allow proxies?* (specific to property ownership)
- Recommend proportional representatives - Proportionality of members on the committee
- Have the landowners come
 - Not realistic, let’s get on with it

Clause 6.3

- Concern about no less than 50% resident membership - should be more residents
- *Action: Staff will review membership matrix for current representation and identify gaps to bring to MPIC for discussion*

Section 7.0 Plan Implementation Outreach

Clause 7.1

- Meeting notices, *approved minutes* and records...

Section 9.0 Meeting Organization

Clause 9.1

- Concerns with chairing, rescheduling meetings, time, place, agenda and minutes
 - *What about a co-chair model?*
 - *How did City Plan work? Perhaps something similar to the City Plan Committees - chair from the community (elected or agreed upon). Staff took notes and posted on-line. Community also took notes*
- The City is open to a co-chair model. Community co-chair should be selected by the MPIC and should represent views of the MPIC, not only their individual views. He/she should be a neutral voice and be able to work collaboratively with the City. Practical reason for a City co-chair is in the preparation of materials and bringing updates to the group.
- Issue of agenda setting could be resolved through co-chair model
- In addition, the agenda for the next meeting should be drafted at the end of the current meeting, including priority and time allocation, noting that last minute items may arise and the agenda may have to adapt
- *Action: Staff will revise TOR to reflect co-chair model and guidelines for agenda setting.*

Clause 9.6

- Staff are currently working on web page design for neighbourhood planning sites. This will allow for the posting of meeting agendas, notes and materials.
- Meeting notes are not meant to be verbatim but rather should capture important content in meetings.
- MPIC members can provide input on meeting notes once they are distributed.

Section 10.0 Meeting Conduct

Clause 10.5

- Concerns about MPIC being a non-voting body
- Suggestion that in the case where consensus can't be reached, MPIC members develop majority/minority reports that include clear rationales for the different views

Clause 10.6

- Expected to *provide advice* and to make decisions that benefit...
- *Action: Staff will prepare a final version of the MPIC Terms of Reference. Thanks to all for their comments over the past several months.*

3. Developments on Main at 2nd and 7th updates & review of MPIC advice- Harv

Some MPIC members met on August 8th to discuss the Main 2nd to 7th proposals. In addition, staff have received 5 or 6 comment submissions from members by email. Another member also created a report.

Do we send out copies to the group? What is the preference in moving forward?

- Should be a more collective, unified voice
- The CLG documents focused on this area should be included

Review of MPIC advice carried over to next meeting

- *Staff will summarize feedback and bring back to MPIC for discussion in a structured session, addressing topics including Zoning, Height, Use, "Plan", View, Affordability*

4. Rize CAC allocation process- Joyce

There were concerns at the previous meeting that the public consultation for the landing of the "Rize" CAC was limited. The City is currently hiring a consultant to facilitate public consultation sessions in late October/November. More information will be available once the consultant is hired.

5. Other Items/Wrap-up & Next meeting- Joyce/ Harv

Next Meeting:

- Main 2nd / 7th developer review of MPIC advice
- Work Program for Implementation
 - Staff are also planning a public workshop for November, and working on a survey for local businesses in Broadway East

Other items:

- Identify set meeting dates
 - Agreed that meetings will be held the 2nd Thursday of the month. The next three meetings will be held:
 - October 11th
 - November 8th
 - December 13th
 - Agreed that meetings will be held from 7pm-9pm.
- A member requested that dates be provided for the MPNH Steering Committee meetings.
 - *The request will be taken back to the Mount Pleasant Neighbourhood House*
- Request by a member to have MPIC participants signed up to the Mount Pleasant Neighbourhood House list-serve for upcoming events.

Meeting Adjourned

(8:45pm end)