

Jonn Braman Manager, University  
Endowment Lands

Jan 19, 2020

Dear Mr. Braman-

This letter outlines requested feedback on the Area D plan presented to the CAC at the December 16<sup>th</sup> meeting. The CAC is pleased with the effort that the UEL has put into this comprehensive plan, and we are generally supportive of the seven goals of the Plan for Area D through 2050 indicated in section 3.2.

We recognize the UEL's desire to increase density in Area D through changes in land use designations (Section 4.3). However, **we recommend:**

- Changing the proposed Land Use Designation of the corner lot at **Acadia and Toronto to RMF-3 from RMF-4**. The adjacent lelem development was forced to reduce building heights from 18 storeys to 6 storeys towards this intersection. We believe other developers should be subject to the same restrictions. We support the application of 5.1.15 (transitions in scale) to this corner.
- Changing **Liberta's designation to RMF-3, RMF-4 or the proposed RMF-5**.
- Changing the current RMF-1 designation **along Toronto Road to RMF-3** in-line with neighbouring properties.
- Changing the current RMF-3 designation **along Wesbrook Mall to RMF-4 or RMF-5**.
- Changing the current RMF-3 designation **south of Toronto Rd to RMF-4**.
- Changing the IA designated parcel north of University Blvd (i.e. the Mennonite property) to a classification with a **3-storey maximum**, recognizing that the parcel is adjacent to single-family properties.
- Changing the sole proposed C designation to a **CR designation with a 4-storey maximum**.
- There is support for **reducing the maximum allowable height under RMF-4 from 18 storeys to 13 storeys**. Specifically, there is support for creating RMF-5 (18-storeys) for **taller buildings in the edges of Area D and away from the single-family area** (ie. for Liberta and along Wesbrook).
- We would like to continue to see a **diversity of forms throughout the neighbourhood**, including in commercial areas. We support section 5.1.16 that favours murals or vertical gardens over blank walls or walls of glass.

**We support the proposed bonusing approach for redevelopment applications.** We would like to see a clearer definition and prioritization of “public benefits” as well as a more rigorous formula for applying these benefits to bonusing. We believe this would be possible without prescriptive guidelines restricting potential changes in community priorities over the life of the Plan. It would also provide clarity for residents and developers alike. **We support the list of potential public benefits in Section 4.1, but highlight that parks, open spaces and green spaces are of particular interest to the UEL community both within and outside of Area D.**

**We are encouraged by the possibility of developing Community Amenity Charges/Development Cost Charges (DCCs).** We believe this would broaden the benefits of expected building redevelopment to the wider UEL community. However, we are concerned that the mechanism for these charges does not yet exist. **We strongly encourage the UEL to develop both the mechanism for DCCs and define how these charges would be determined and allocated before the Plan is finalized.**

**In all cases, we would encourage the final Plan to tie developments together through public realm investments in tree planting, green spaces, light standards and other means, providing consistency throughout Area D.** Ideally, this priority should be explicitly recognized through a clearer Community Amenity Charge/Density Bonusing schedule.

**The CAC is pleased with the emphasis on fostering housing diversity in Area D, including rental preservation** and protection for long-term renters (Section 5.2). Recognizing that increased protection for renters may also increase motivation for developers to push long-term renters out, **we suggest the UEL strengthen the language in this section,** along the lines of Schedule 16 of the existing bylaws, which allows the Manager to refuse an application for redevelopment if it appears that there has been an attempt to circumvent protection measures by lowering the quality of building services.

**We are supportive of efforts to calm traffic and encourage more pedestrian-friendly streets.** This could include making Dalhousie a one-way street between Allison and University Blvd and extending commercial use permissioning over the same stretch on the south side. In addition, if Kings Road is to transition to a pedestrian-priority street over time, we would suggest neighbouring developments encourage the discovery of this area through the addition of feeder paths, so that the area is accessed by the wider community.

The CAC supports all initiatives to improve building energy efficiency and GHG emission reduction, including on-site energy generation (Section 5.6). **We strongly support the adoption of BC Building Code Step 4 for all projects applying for higher densities, in tandem with the adoption of BCBC Step 3 to any redevelopment projects under existing zoning.** Along these same lines, we would like to see measures to encourage mass timber construction and higher embedded carbon in redevelopment.

With regard to transportation (Section 5.5), we highlight it is important to integrate transportation planning with redevelopment, particularly **with an emphasis on alternatives to cars** given the expected increase in the area's population.

**We support measures to “activate” Jim Everett Park.** We would encourage measures that do not change the fundamental character and design of the Park, however. This would exclude adding structures to the Park, including play structures. Temporary or periodic events (ie. weekend farmers' markets, food trucks) would be welcome.

We were also specifically asked to give feedback on the potential for **cannabis retailing at the UEL (Section 5.4.31)**. The CAC recommends:

- No more than one location be permitted
- That the location be as far away as possible from the two elementary and the secondary schools
- That operating hours be limited

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Plan. We look forward to continuing to participate in the Plan's finalization and any subsequent by-law discussions.

Community Advisory Council Claire Huxtable, Judie Glick, Mojan Nozari, Lynne Pomfret, Vanessa Young, Dan Johnstone Cc: The Honourable David Eby, M.L.A  
Vancouver Point Grey