

Advisory Planning Committee
Chancellor Place Neighbourhood

2001 Meeting Minutes



Campus Planning & Development

**Advisory Planning Committee
for the Theological Neighbourhood Plan**

Minutes

Date: Wednesday, May 2, 2001
Time: 5:30 – 7:30 PM
Venue: Gardenia Room, Ground Floor
UBC Campus Planning & Development
2210 West Mall, Vancouver BC V6T 1Z4

Present:

St. Andrews:	Jennifer Goddard-Sheppard
St. Marks:	Jim O'Neill
Carey Hall:	Rod Olson
University Endowment Lands:	Erica Crichton
UBC Director of Planning:	Fred Pritchard
UBC Properties President:	Al Poettcker
AMS Students:	Debra Erickson
Broader UBC Interests/Faculty of Arts:	Anne-Marie Fenger

Regrets:

Vancouver School of Theology: John Marsh

Staff/Other:

Bud Phillips, VST
Jan Timmer, JT Architecture
Paul Young, UBC Properties Trust
Joe Redmond, UBC Properties Trust
Carmen Rida, Campus Planning and Development

1.0 Introduction

- Fred Pritchard thanked Committee members for volunteering to sit on the Committee.
- Role of the Advisory Planning Committee (APC) is to provide insight and recommendations regarding the Neighbourhood Plan (NP).
- Campus Planning & Development (CP&D) will undertake any administrative work the APC needs.
- The APC process will start with an introductory meeting (this one) – Bud Phillips will outline the work that has been done on the Theological NP to date – then a follow-up meeting will be held for further information, questions and answers, and then the

Committee will deliberate and provide recommendations to the UBC/GVRD Joint Committee in late June.

- Members introduced themselves

2.0 Terms of Reference

- The Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Theological Neighbourhood APC are very similar to the ToR for Advisory Planning Committees of any municipality
- These ToR are also consistent with the ToR for the APC that dealt with the Comprehensive Community Plan (CCP)
- The APC is referenced in and has authority under a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between UBC and GVRD

3.0 Election of Chair

- Erica Crichton was nominated and elected Chair of the APC.

4.0 Neighbourhood Plan

Introduction - Bud Philips:

- Looking for member input and perspective
- For the first time, the different theological communities have a large project to work on together – supportive of OCP and Comprehensive Community Plan (CCP) goals, creating a lively community [in the theological precinct].
- An important aspect for the School of Theology: training for the Ministry makes sense in the context of a lively community – we want to ensure this community develops – in the Plan we recognize one another's presence, work together, have a commitment to the theological community as a whole – the Plan includes opening the theological properties to the rest of the university community, inviting them in.
- Second: looked at how the land can be used – good stewardship.
- Thirdly, we want the theological community to have the place they deserve in the university community – a partner in the neighbourhood.
- Ideals are grounded in long-term lease of the land – allows us to have a long-term vision.
- The Plan was created by working together (St. Marks, St. Andrews, VST, Carey Hall).
- The University also participates in this community.
- Have had to consider how to make an integrated community and be conscious of the adjacent residential community [UEL] and university community – trying to make the Theological Neighbourhood a meaningful one.
- Jan Timmer was chosen as the architect to put the Plan together

Jan Timmer presented the Theological Neighbourhood Plan [see Plan for details]:

- The Theological Neighbourhood (TN) is one of eight in the CCP.

- Densities delineated by OCP – for the TN, historical buildings considered important to retain, development should support theological education, so average density would be 1.2.
- The Plan conforms to the eight Principles for Physical Planning at UBC.
- Issues that had to be dealt with: leading factor was the Iona Building – lots of open space makes it magnificent, try to keep that; and lots of massive second-growth trees also on the property make the open spaces unique and important to keep.
- Leading theme is to make these open spaces (the entrance to VST, and areas in front and behind Iona Building) part of the community, build around the edges.
- The concept of “Woonerf” or Living Streets – pedestrian-oriented streets – designed as landscaped corridors that are shared by vehicles, bicyclists and pedestrians – is an important part of the Plan.
- Road pattern remains, trees retained, open space around Iona Building retained, water feature may be added.
- St. Mark’s elected to expand their facilities around the existing Chapel – would build duplexes facing onto Chancellor Boulevard.
- Along the perimeter of the TN there are height restrictions – buildings can be higher as you go further into the Neighbourhood – one high rise planned behind Iona; St. Andrews may also have one.
- Large open spaces.
- Some market housing; faculty, staff and student housing; as well as non-market rental and a seniors complex are all planned.

Bud Philips summarized:

- Schools and colleges in the Neighbourhood have their own missions – Carey Hall is anxious to rebuild more residences and market housing; St. Mark’s would build residences; St. Andrew’s have the option of building more student residences or market housing; VST would like to do all of what is possible, as well as some conference-type residence facility – so there could be a conglomerate of various types of accommodation.
- Issues of density are important, and height restrictions – careful to stay within the requirements of the OCP and CCP – keep as much open space as possible – the University has been cooperative with agreeing to proposed alterations to roadways, etc., that will be necessary to accommodate the Plan.
- Hope the TN can provide a place where people will like to live.
- Look forward to getting feedback.

Comments/Questions/Answers:

- Many UEL residents are wary of development, as it can bring negative impacts with crime, traffic, etc. The Plan looks good overall, integrated, but would like to see individual components in more detail.

- Jan has presented a demonstration plan – plans on each individual site have to follow Planning Principles and Design Guidelines
- Major part of parking has to be underground – this adds enormous cost to the project, but it has the benefit of providing much more open space.
- More details are in Book 2 of the Plan – Map P7 is broken down into Maps P-7a to P-7j which show enlargements of each parcel and details of what could happen in each parcel – and Book 2 (Appendices) gives further details and illustrations on what could be done.
- There should be no noticeable change in traffic – many residents will be walking and cycling around the area – Iona Road and Theology Mall will stay as-is – there will be a great deal of emphasis on creating pedestrian linkages, links with adjacent neighbourhoods, and there will be a shuttle bus system (campus-wide, as part of UBC’s overall Transportation Plan network).
- *Q: How many parking spaces will be provided?*
- A: One for every four students; for market housing, 1½ stalls per unit.
- *Q: Will Military Road be opened up as a driveway?*
- A: Only for local traffic, for access to neighbourhood buildings, but not as a connector or through road, and there may be traffic calming used to prevent speeding.
- All buildings will have underground parking.
- There is existing surface parking on Military Road which serves Housing & Conferences and Gage Towers – the Plan will not remove this parking, but will change the character of the street so that it will look different.
- There is quite a bit of surface parking throughout the neighbourhood, which is necessary for this community with its chapels and the functions going on in the theological buildings – very much like Granville Island, with cars allowed but subservient to pedestrians.
- *Q: Will the shuttle service be 24 hours?*
- A: There will be a guaranteed ride system – the evening/night-time security shuttle bus system will be available so anyone can get a shuttle ride at night.
- *Q: Where is commercial?*
- A: Most commercial development will be in the nearby University Boulevard Neighbourhood – but as the Theological Neighbourhood community grows, there is the possibility for a small operation like a convenience store, or coffee shop, could be located in the proposed plaza on Military Road (north of the Parkade).
- *Q: Will there be trading of density among the different sites?*
- A: Some areas (eg. St. Andrews) may be able to absorb more density than areas that cannot (eg. St. Marks) – St. Marks built the new chapel and now can’t build as high density as others – so St. Marks can trade some of this density to the other sites and be compensated – the details haven’t been worked out yet, but as long as overall density is what is allowed under the OCP, then it can be done.
- *Q: Besides additional housing, what other features will there be as part of the larger university community?*

- A: There is an opportunity to relate VST to UBC on the south-side of the Neighbourhood – maybe with a coffee shop or gallery – and the open space around the Iona Building could be treated as an inviting space, one that invites people into the school – maybe there could be a library – whole idea is to engage the neighbourhood – there will be a senior's complex which will be university-related – it can be a centre for many activities that the University can use – also, all proceeds derived from market rental housing must be re-invested in academic activities on campus, as the intent of market rental housing is to serve the University – and anyone who builds here will have to make an amenity contribution which will go toward infrastructure, open space, a community centre, etc. for all the campus (not just in this neighbourhood).
- Q: How does community building fit into this Plan?
- A: A community-building mission has been initiated through Campus Planning & Development – working with the UEL, local schools, RCMP, campus departments and organizations, etc., to provide resources and facilities – UBC has made a commitment to help develop many aspects of community life – so the social side is being dealt with along with the physical planning.
- There will be meeting places in the buildings and programs to encourage this – an important part of the legacy of this Plan.
- Market housing provides more stability in the community, more permanence, so this will play a factor too [in community building].

5.0 Other Business

- A second meeting has been set for May 15, 2001 – Committee members should study the Theological Neighbourhood Plan, note any issues to be addressed, and provide recommendations at next meeting that will be taken to the UBC/GVRD Joint Committee in June.
- Final draft of CCP was handed out for information [discusses impacts on adjacent neighbourhoods].

Meeting was adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Carmen Rida



THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Campus Planning & Development

Advisory Planning Committee for the Theological Neighbourhood Plan

Minutes

Date: Wednesday, May 15, 2001
Time: 5:30 – 7:30 PM
Venue: Gardenia Room, Ground Floor
 UBC Campus Planning & Development
 2210 West Mall, Vancouver BC V6T 1Z4

Present:

St. Andrews:	Jennifer Goddard-Sheppard
St. Marks:	Jim O'Neill
Carey Hall:	Rod Olson
University Endowment Lands:	Erica Crichton
UBC Director of Planning:	Fred Pritchard
UBC Properties President:	Al Poettcker
AMS Students:	Debra Erickson
Vancouver School of Theology:	John Marsh

Regrets:

Broader UBC Interests/Faculty of Arts: Anne-Marie Fenger

Staff/Other:

Bud Phillips, VST
 Jan Timmer, JT Architecture
 Paul Young, UBC Properties Trust
 Joe Redmond, UBC Properties Trust
 Gisela Haarbrucker, Campus Planning and Development

1.0 Review of Draft Theological Neighbourhood Plan, dated April 20, 2001. Clarify issues, set priorities, identify issues requiring more attention

Comments, Questions and Answers:

Q: Policing is not included in the plan. Are there plans for enlarging the police force?

A: Policing at UBC is through the RCMP detachment; their responsibility is not limited to UBC, but also includes the UEL. UBC has Campus Security department as additional service. Currently there are 12 RCMP officers. We expect a requirement for staff increases as the population increases.

Q: Landscaping should be an integral part of the development. Clarification on old growth stand of trees behind Iona Building requested.

A: Landscaping will demonstrate how the theological area wants to be seen relative to the campus. The trees on the land have been surveyed; they were recorded, marked and labeled according to age and health. Sick trees will have to go when they pose a danger.

Illustrations of landscaping concepts are requested.

Q: Do large shrubs and bushes pose a security problem?

A: Yes, they can. There are discussions around hedges vs. fences. "Eyes on the street" concept.

Lighting needs to be part of the landscape plan as well. All aspects need to be integrated.

Q: How can St. Andrews development be 4 to 15 storeys? That's a big difference.

A: This statement is from an older plan. A high-rise would shift the current arrangements considerably. Integration is very important.

Traffic:

Concerns around the traffic flow onto Iona Drive and how it will change.

Jan Timmer explained how it should work. There will be traffic-calming measures, as well as restricted access strictly for local traffic.

Discussion about the intersection of Chancellor Boulevard and Wesbrook. Islands would possibly be eliminated/turned into green spaces to make the intersection more pedestrian friendly. The pros and cons of stop signs were discussed. Create true stop signs for all lanes (especially right turn lane off Wesbrook) to enforce safety. Committee members in favour of stop signs, concern about increase in noise level (buses and cars cranking up) though.

Discussion about the likelihood of drivers cutting through St. Andrews parking lot, especially if gate 4 gets closed.

East Mall access will be limited. University Boulevard access via Wesbrook.

Military Road will not be a thru road but will be used for access to the high-rise.

Interest was expressed in historical data about the traffic flow increase on Chancellor Boulevard.

The total increase in the number of market units will be about 600.

The intent of the development is to decrease the number of commuters. The Strategic Transportation Plan asks for a 20% decrease in single occupancy vehicles from 1997 levels.

Buildings

Advantages and disadvantages of low and high-rise buildings were discussed in respect to "leaky condos" and cost efficiency (4 storeys being economically the worst height for concrete, costing 15-20% more, but being conducive to community building).

VST is interested in 4-storey, family oriented buildings and townhouses as well as high-rise for attractive market housing (view). A mix is desired. The landscaping around the ground floors helps define the impact a high-rise may have.

Bud Phillips explained the funding situation of the theological neighbourhood. The schools need to build up endowment and need to use the land to maximize it. Current funding is insufficient even for upkeep of existing buildings. UBC has been very supportive.

UBC/Theological Neighbourhood Relationship

Q: How does the development of the theological neighbourhood benefit UBC?

A: UBC feels that the theological area is important in many ways, e.g. by housing non-theological students, supporting community, and supporting the UBC mission—standard of excellence. The theological neighbourhood is distinctive and unique and will be an integral part of the “University Town” —our vision to create a complete community. Fred Pritchard referred to the statement “the vision must be greater than its parts” and sees this Neighbourhood plan as a partnership that has opportunity to affect other parts of UBC.

It was confirmed that there is no priority list for residents, students will have access to all housing developments.

UBC is not asking for a share of revenue.

Lease arrangements will be the same as currently used at Hampton Place.

Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)

Q: How are differences (between theological partners) going to be resolved?

A: There are two representatives for each partner, regular meetings have been and are being held. All parties are developing a draft MOU explaining what will be done and how differences will be resolved. This theological MOU will be based on the UBC/GVRD MOU and will be signed off by the theological partners. Also every building will need a development permit, there will be a design panel and a development permit board, as well as a neighbourhood association. The draft MOU will be circulated.

Q: What is the total number of units and of residents?

A: 618 units, 1500 residents

The buildings are to be self-supporting. The schools have to borrow start-up funds/mortgage.

Q: Who will be responsible for maintenance?

A: Roads will be dedicated. University will probably maintain as in Hampton Place. Explained fire, police, school, health. UBC will maintain landscape. Neighbourhood Association will take care of some local issues, generally help improve the neighbourhood. Services modeled closely after municipalities.

Environmental Impact/Sustainability

Q: About underground parking development—is there a fault that would affect the gully at Wreck Beach?

A: A geological study will be done.

There will be a new storm sewer outfall reducing the risk of another flood around the spiral drain area. Drain has already been surveyed; installation could start in spring 2002, which fits with the development timelines.

The increase of buildings doesn't have a huge effect on storm water.

A flow-monitoring program has been set up. The water quality will be monitored to see if the development affects it.

Q: Interest in alternative energy supplies. Who will take care of that?

A: UBC uses A/C only in computer labs. We have advantage of climate. Small apartments are inexpensive to heat, use a fraction of energy needed to heat a house. An important sustainability feature is to keep people from commuting. We are also looking at geo-thermal sources that are used in some US subdivisions, which could reduce heating costs by 75%, but is initially still very expensive to develop and will take 7-10 years to pay off.

It was commented that windows in new developments should open as well as provide soundproofing.

Many of the details are left to the developers. We cannot plan for everything.

Comment: There is nothing listed under the heading "Design guidelines for public buildings." If nothing comes up it will be tossed out.

Next Steps

Fred commented that this neighbourhood plan has a lot more detail in it than usual to help identify issues. After the 2 APC meetings there will be amendments to the plan to include the issues, comments and recommendations of the APC. The amended draft will be presented at the next APC meeting and sent out to committee members 1 week before.

2.0 Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held June 5, 2001 at 6:15 p.m. in the Gardenia Room, Campus Planning & Development, 2210 West Mall.

Meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Gisela Haarbrucker



Campus Planning & Development

**Advisory Planning Committee for the Theological
Neighbourhood Plan**

Minutes

Date: Monday, June 18, 2001
Time: 5:30 – 7:30 PM
Venue: Gardenia Room, Ground Floor
UBC Campus Planning & Development
2210 West Mall, Vancouver BC V6T 1Z4

Present:

St. Andrews:	Jennifer Goddard-Sheppard
St. Marks:	Jim O'Neill
University Endowment Lands:	Erica Crichton
UBC Director of Planning:	Fred Pritchard
UBC Properties President:	Al Poettcker
AMS Students:	Debra Erickson
Vancouver School of Theology:	John Marsh
Broader UBC Interests/Faculty of Arts:	Anne-Marie Fenger

Regrets:

Carey Hall:	Rod Olson
-------------	-----------

Staff/Other:

Jim Carruthers, Manager of Development Services CP & D
Jan Timmer, JT Architecture
Paul Young, UBC Properties Trust

1.0 Review of Draft Theological Neighbourhood Plan, dated May 18, 2001. Clarify issues, set priorities, identify issues requiring more attention

- Erica Crichton opened the meeting to discuss the minutes from the previous meeting. There were no comments.
- Jan Timmer presented changes made to the previous draft after the last meeting three weeks ago with the GVRD. Points discussed were:
 1. Additional clarification.
 2. Less detail, more general information.
- Added coloured building, height and zoning plan to the drawing.
- Added coloured approximate building massing drawing with green space around and with storeys indicated on the buildings.

- Added neighbourhood open space and connections P-10 includes pathways and bikeways.
- Referred also to P-7, open space content drawing.
- GVRD wants further definition of private and semi-private space.
- Referred to the Illustrative Plan P-11 showing what open spaces were programmed for.
- Land Use plan was presented.
- It was presented and explained as shown in Table 4. The overall land use, density calculations and type of units for the Theological Neighbourhood Plan, dated June 2001. Made consistent with the CCP.
- Paul Young explained the points that were made by the GVRD:
- The GVRD is happy with the level of detail in the new draft.
- They wanted more explanations on how the open space will function. (Although it appears well thought out).
- Jan Timmer refers to page 1, the categories of open space. Want more of an explanation of public open space.
- Paul Young explained how they also want more reference to Pacific Spirit Park; other facilities and how they tie into the Neighbourhood Plan; how the Theological Neighbourhood residents will be able to use it.
- It was also stated how they want to see more reference to wider range of services beyond recreation or culture.
- Neighbourhood Association will run the Community Center 30k. The Neighbourhood Association will also extend services such as Nitobe Gardens & playing fields.
- Also need to know how to access the facilities.
- This is a 25-year program, so there is incentive to deal with these needs. The Neighbourhood Association document is available and will be distributed by Paul.
- The kids are saying that they don't have enough to do on campus. This is a new phenomenon because older students are now bringing older children to live with them on campus.
- Fred Pritchard added that a university youth task force is now working on university youth initiatives. The kids will help design programs and activities to be offered to youth at UBC during the summer holidays.
- Jan Timmer explained how the GVRD wants us to be very specific about open space programming.
- The GVRD requires reduction of single occupancy vehicle (SOV) numbers. How will we reduce numbers and how will parking standards contribute to that?
- One issue is that you can reduce the parking spots and people will park on the street initially. Often people eventually get rid of their second car. Overall Hampton has hundreds of empty spaces.
- The other provisions of the OCP are geared to reduce SOV's. People will park.
- We need to be clearer about the setback on Chancellor Blvd.
- The setback on the north side is 60 ft. and only 25 ft. on the south side. This inconsistency may be controversial.
- Jan Timmer stated that 25 ft. is fairly normal.

- Entrapment is suggested. Part of the MOU, not part of the Neighbourhood Plan, and can still be discussed.
- Building heights on both sides of Chancellor and Wesbrook will be the same.
- The only setbacks on the Chancellor and Wesbrook side will be in the Neighbourhood Plan. The rest will be in the MOU.

Q: **Policing:** Shouldn't policing be included in the Neighbourhood Plan?

A: It would be unusual, but it is important.

- More police are needed as the community grows.
- University Endowment Land taxes do not cover police costs right now. Although police have stated that we have a very low crime rate.
- UBC is not pushing for more police.
- UBC wants to be part of the case made to the Province.
- UBC has security staff of 60 and doesn't depend on the RCMP for security, except for special events.
- UBC staff may be inadequately trained.
- Gordon Campbell will probably move toward a regional police force.

Q: Is the existing system the best of both worlds?

A; Al Poettcker agrees that the GVRD won't want police in the Neighbourhood Plan but must find a way to keep the police issue front and center.

The Advisory Planning Committee showed a need for a coordinated response.

- The buildings need to be designed for security and the GVRD wants us to respond to that.
- In Hampton Place locker theft was shown to be an inside job that was resolved operationally.
- If we want police in the neighbourhood we should have them.
- Public transit has brought more crime to Westside of Vancouver.
- Although the real problem is in Metrotown and New Westminster.
- We would like to see the public transit crime issue be given due consideration.
- Could add a section 6.3 Community Services as distinct from his community facilities. E.g. could discuss services of services such as library services provided off-campus.
- Jan Timmer said that they would add that section.
- The University has engaged the idea of engaging the community. Looking to engage the UEL as a neighbour.

Q: Has the Theological MOU been developed?

A: Most of the components are done as part of Book 2 and will be attached to the agreement between UBC and the four colleges. The committee has the first draft.

Q: Are there areas we can develop into recommendations for the Joint Committee?

Has the spiral drain been addressed carefully?

A: We have a consultant's proposal for a second outfall at the north-end of the campus.

Q: How much additional outflow will there be due to this Neighbourhood Plan development?

A: We are presently assuming that no additional outflow will occur.

AI stated that as UBC upgrades its services potential for increased flow would likely increase. New berm should prevent more overflows at the north end.

Q: What recommendations are there for the July 6 Joint Committee meeting?

Can we say that this plan is supported if there are modifications made?

Can we support parking stadiums the same as in Vancouver?

- There were also concerns about the footprints of the buildings, some land uses, etc.
- There appeared to be no other issues for St. Marks.

Q: Page 12 drawing: Has the Iona building cost estimate been done?

A: Yes. We will soon be working on the detailed plans. Everyone wants it to stay.

Q: How to reconcile the process between the pro-development and the anti development interests?

A: Pursuant to the OCP and the CCP, subject to the addition of section 6.3 Community Services, the committee finds the Theological Neighbourhood Plan, dated June 2001, to be acceptable and is prepared to recommend approval by the Joint Committee.

- Six out of the nine members present adopted the plan.
- The next step now is that this will go to the Joint Committee meeting in September.
- The GVRD will have an indication of their own.
- The committee should review the changes indicated by the Task Force at the July 6 meeting with the changes indicated. Their chair will decide whether they will need another meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 7:25 pm.

Minutes submitted by Deborah Mac Donald.



Campus Planning & Development

Advisory Planning Committee for the Theological Neighbourhood Plan

Minutes

Date: Tuesday, Sept 4, 2001
Time: 5:30 – 7:30 p.m.
Venue: Gardenia Room, Ground Floor
UBC Campus Planning & Development
2210 West Mall, Vancouver BC V6T 1Z4

Present: Erica Crichton, Fred Pritchard, Debra Erickson, John Marsh, Anne-Marie Fenger, Rod Olson, University Endowment Lands, UBC Director of Planning, AMS Students, Vancouver School of Theology, Broader UBC Interests/Faculty of Arts, Carey Hall
Regrets: Jennifer Goddard-Sheppard, Jim O'Neill, Al Poettcker, St. Andrews, St. Marks, UBC Properties President:
Staff/Other: Bud Phillips, Jim Carruthers, Jan Timmer, Paul Young, Ian Turner, VST Property Management, Manager of Development Services, CP&D, JT Architecture, UBC Properties Trust

1.0 Review of minutes and business arising from the meeting of June 18, 2001

Debra Erickson was not at the previous meeting. The minutes were adopted with correction also on page 2, line 3, the private and public space.

2.0 Presentation on changes made to previous draft leading to preparation of current draft

Fred Pritchard summarized what happened since the last APC meeting.

At the Joint Committee meeting of the following items were discussed:

- The outline of status
Plan stated to be virtually complete
The clarification to open space
Received as information
The report by GVRD staff said that the plan was substantially complete, only some editorial changes were needed

- The next meeting of the Joint Committee is on October 15, 2001
- It is proposed that the NP go to the Board of Governors (Sept 24) for approval in principle
- GVRD staff will probably recommend that the NP proceed to AA and EAC and the GVRD Board
- The Open House will be held on Monday, September 10, 2001

3.0 Committee comments

Erica Crichton stated that she did not have a copy of the BOG report.

Fred informed that it has not been completed yet and still needs signoff by the President. Al Poettcker, Terry Summer and Fred Pritchard will sign off and will summarize the APC recommendations. Will summarize where we are relative to GVRD staff.

The Safety section was added as per APC recommendations

Erica stated that she would have liked to see the BOG report before it proceeded to check for consistency.

Some committee members would like to see the report. Fred responded that a summary could be distributed to the APC members with a restatement of the resolution, but also an explanatory paragraph on what has happened. He did not believe that there were any changes to the NP except for what the APC had requested.

The GVRD asked for a few changes, particularly the sustainability issues. Changes were that a new section was added so that UBC would be able to adopt the LEED system, using points for buildings for sustainability. This was seen as a marketing advantage.

What would the points be? There would be a series of measurable items to apply to any building. There are 6 categories: air quality, reduce waste, save water, etc. Developers can choose based on market research. We don't want a series of requirements; a system of incentives will be more effective.

This will be the only additional item that changes the report.

The commitment to adopt the LEED system allows it to change over time, because the LEED incentives will develop over time.

Every measure of the proposal can be measured against LEED. At the Development Permit application stage it will be assessed whether the developer achieves a bronze or silver star building.

The question of where it would occur in the Neighbourhood Plan was asked. (Some of the members had NP dated June 12/01 not June 27/01)

There were 3 pages of suggested changes that were handed out for the sustainability issues, available to absent members upon request.

Trying to balance the parking against the GVRD wanting lower ratios and the market wanting more.

More spaces don't necessarily mean more driving. In false Creek there is a shortage of parking.

This could lead to shared cars.

Are these 3 sustainability pages going to be included in the Neighbourhood Plan?

Yes. It has been included in the Mid Campus NP and Jan Timmer is reviewing if it should be included in Theological NP.

It may be a bit of a stretch to achieve a complete community in the Theological Neighbourhood Plan alone. It would be achieved within the whole campus.

Paul mentioned that there would be garden plots somewhere on campus; Jan added that there is a space for it in the Theological Neighbourhood. The GVRD will review this proposal before it goes into the plan.

The committee agreed that there is no change to the recommendations from June 18.

It is assumed that the committees' work is complete for now; the revised plan and a package of reports will be mailed out after Board of Governors' sign off in November.

Bud Philips would like to host a gathering in November, December or January for all who worked on the plan to explain next steps. Will probably proceed soon on one of the housing developments.

Meeting adjourned at 6:45 p.m.