

## Key Informant Interview Worksheet

**Interviewee:** Elizabeth Borek, Tom Galimberti, Barbara Raponi, Terry Cormier

**Date & Time:** Dec 13<sup>th</sup> at 2pm

**Interviewer:** Vince Verlaan, Odete Pinho

**Group:** Cadboro Bay RA

---

4 documents attached for review with notes. Prepared summaries provided by the Cadboro Bay Residents' Association in 1) "Talking Points" and 2) "Information Important to the CARSA Consultation Process Conducted by HB Lanarc". Additional background information: 3) "Schedule C – Review of UVic's Consultation Process" and 4) "Draft Mandate and Terms of Reference".

President of the CBRA, opened with a number of observations about the **essential criteria for the consultation** process to be successful, beginning with a Mandate and Terms of Reference (see attachments 1 and 2 for details). CBRA President noted the need to establish a well defined process with clear timelines and flow chart of the process. The process should be open, transparent and fair. Participants should have access to information including raw data. The process must maximize attendance at all public meetings through extensive media notices and by notifying residents associations well in advance to facilitate notice to members. All major stakeholders to be involved.

Feedback from those neighbors/groups most impacted should have the greatest weight in shaping the development. Best results achieved if consultation takes comprehensive and international/global excellence perspective.

CBRA has established a Parkade/CARSA Committee to ensure that the community is aware of and consulted about the project. For consultations to be meaningful they need to take place at the beginning of a process. Need a statement from UVic that proposals currently presented for CARSA are off the table.

Worried about the timeframe of the consultation. Do not want it to be rushed (two working days to develop response to September 8, 2011 Open House).

Important to weigh the feedback of interviewees. Neighbours most affected should have the greatest weighting.

UVic needs to look broader outside of the insular community. Want SmartGrowth. Many students want to be downtown. All housing and classrooms should not just be regarded on campus. Students want to be downtown.

### **1. Discussion on Previous consultation efforts**

See broken public trust. Requires redo of CARSA project even with complex design, siting and scale issues. Redo to start this right in 2012.

UVic has yet to acknowledge any of the contributions, questions and suggestions CBRA has made with respect to the Parkade/CARSA and Queenswood projects. Want to involve CA's much more meaningfully before proposals are developed.

Concerned with distribution of key informant interviews. CA's should be more heavily represented. More import should be placed on CA's and neighbours who are most affected. Students are more transient and less affected by these decisions.

Concern with 'stacking up' meetings. Suspicion with using CanAssist as a face for the project, when really a small part of it.

If we are intending to create better relationships, CA's want to be able to comment on our recommended engagement principles and actions before it goes as a report to UVIC. Want to be co-creating a process map with the consultation. Understand this is an extra step and might be outside of current scope but suggest that this may offer a means to build necessary trust. – allows CA to have a better understanding

Believe that UVic has "done this before" – rushed process, narrow scope and refusal to acknowledge community's views. Reflects disrespect (their perspective) Community's voice and issues must be treated with respect.

Referenced Connelly quote in Newspaper article re "we will be holding Open House and taking revised application back to council in spring" – implies a done deal?

Feels that rushed timelines now make this process seem too rushed and unprofessional (Elizabeth)

Another reason for this suspicion – previous times Neil received comments and said they would respond and they did not.

Parking prices are low per month (less than \$20/month for student in residence; less than \$40/month for general parking. – this undervalues parking at the university and thus pass costs onto local communities.

Need to see BC transit involvement in this process from the beginning as such issues demand a broader transportation understanding and perspective - higher standards.

TDM study should be revisited because patterns are changing.

Feeling UVic is improperly ramming CARSA through while BC transit planning going on that should be more integrated

## **2. What issues does the next round of CARSA consultation need to address?**

- Parkade and CARSA structures size, siting. Buildings are ugly. This is a prominent public location and deserves to be an architecturally creative building. This is the gateway to Cadboro Bay and a main entrance to UVic. Don't want to be looking at this ugly parkade structure. Would like a better design ie. Idea of Architectural design competition.
- In its September 12, 2011 response to UVic's September 8, 2011 Open House, even without the parkade the proposed complex would be massive and sited only 30 m from McKenzie. UVic is attempting to build too much in the available space. Where are the plans for the "Future Aquatics Centre"? The new South Tower Residence, the newest six storey building on campus is over 100 m from McKenzie. This is appropriate for a complex of the size of CARSA.
- Uses. A "charette" should be used to develop plans for this site. Siting. UVic has many other options, including Parking Lots 4 and 8, for the siting of these facilities which offer significant advantages to both the university and community.
- Heritage structures war hut from WWII. UVic should announce and put in place firm plans for the heritage designation of the remaining WWII structures.
- Values of First Nations – still disputed lands. Should be a shared understanding sustainability, shared involvement.
- Transit – bus terminal at overcapacity. Public transit to UVic is inadequate. Proposal should include a significant investment in improving public transit.
- Cycling. Not a single dedicated bike path on campus so cyclists are competing with trucks, cars and pedestrians, not adequate secure and covered storage /lock up areas. Investment in pedestrians, cycling, public transit is required. Before investing \$17 million in stacking cars, UVic should make a serious commitment to infrastructure for bicycles and pedestrians.

- Do they have reports that show the need for this structure? Have the traffic consultants looked at other progressive European developments. Look for emerging best practices. Long-range impacts and consider longer term including future of Queenswood. There are not many stoplights – don't want to have many lights – this is a semi rural nature in the area.
- Concerned at traffic on McKenzie – dangerous walking, biking, transportation upgrades. Consider existing background traffic issues McKenzie and on Sinclair and access roads. Take a broad view particularly of the traffic issue.
- Royal Astronomical society – light pollution.
- Removal of 94 mature chestnut trees. Urban Forest Strategy.
- Need full renderings, 3D models, visual assessments, street angle views- available at public meetings, website.
- University has squashed public discussion and internal university discussion. CBRA encourages an open discussion by all members of the university community. In terms of community, we are the neighbours who would be most impacted by the proposal. Many Cadboro Bay residents walk, bike, drive or take public transit along McKenzie every day. Want to see hard data – hydrology reports for Parking Lots 2, 3, 4, 8, engineering reports, certified arborist's inventory of trees, "statement of significance for S-Hut.
- Don't want to see billboards on the road shown on the parkade.

### **3. What would a successful consultation look like from your point of view?**

Include meaningful input from the those who are most impacted, i.e. those that live nearby and who would have to deal with any negative traffic, environmental, negative visual impacts.

Include meaningful input from the Saanich Advisory Design Panel which is acted upon.

Include meaningful consultation with Saanich Heritage Foundation which is acted upon.

A proposal which respects the integrity of McKenzie Avenue and preserves this avenue as an attractive entrance to Cadboro Bay.

A proposal which does not export parking, traffic and "negative visual impacts" to the neighbouring community.

A proposal which provides a welcoming entrance to UVic for pedestrians, cyclists, automobiles, and public transport.

#### **4. What would a failed consultation look like?**

There is a complete lack of trust. UVic staff work in silos. There is a management problem. They lack project management skills. Not convinced that the parking can't go underground. The CARSA project appears to have different project management teams (that would be a problem).

#### **5. Successes to build on in other planning efforts or relationships?**

#### **6. Who to engage in future planning efforts? Have we missed anyone whose opinions need to be considered?**

BC Transit, Saanich Heritage Foundation, Saanich Advisory Design Panel, Canadian military authorities, cyclists. CBRA expressed the view that these perspectives are essential and asked that they be included in the initial scan/scoping round of consultations.

#### **7. How to engage in future planning efforts – formats and tools?**

If the University is really interested in creating a partnership with its neighbours based on the principle of mutual respect, so that its neighbours can provide meaningful input into the management of its lands, so that the University's management actions do not have a negative impact on its neighbours, then to be successful, any future consultation process by the University with its neighbours must be open and transparent. The University must also ensure that it closes the loop in any consultation process with respect to all of its neighbours concerns.

CBRA respectfully requests that the University appraise it of the 25 stakeholders who were consulted during this phase of the consultation process and provide CBRA with the final minutes that came out of HB LANARC discussions with them. As well, CBRA also requests that HB LANARC provide them with a draft of their final report to UVic so that CRBA can have time to read it and then make comments on it before it is submitted to UVic.

CBRA expects that HB LANARC will incorporate CBRA's suggestions and proposals in their final report to UVic and identify those changes as coming from CBRA. As well, CBRA expects that HB LANARC will also identify, in a backgrounder to the Report, the proposed CBRA changes that were not incorporated into their final report and most importantly, with an explanation as to why.

CBRA expressed its concern about inadequate time to register all its concerns and asked for a further meeting.

## 8. Do you have any other comments about UVic's past consultation processes?

- Queenswood – UVic, approached this with “I don't care what you think – this is what we are going to do”. Had meetings with Queenswood advisory, but they were closed meetings. Concerns about transparency.
- Insufficient time for feedback.
- UVic issued misleading press releases

( <http://communications.uvic.ca/releases/tip.php?date=17032011>

<http://ring.uvic.ca/notices/queenswood-rezoning-proposal-update> )

In both articles, UVic only mentions the reduction in height and the increase in setbacks. They fail to mention that the limitation on lot coverage in the original proposal was removed, which means the potential lot coverage increased from 50% to 75%. In addition, the two green protected areas in the original proposal have disappeared.

- – initial proposal height of 30 metres. 2<sup>nd</sup> proposal reduced height to 30 m but flattened widened, increased footprint. Using PR rather than genuine communications. False information to the press – UVic quoted many times “have done extensive consultations” UVic press releases misleading.
- UVic liaison committee – they only meet every quarter. That is not enough. The scale and impact was not discussed. The liaison committee structure is not effective.
- Initially, Queenswood reaction of purchase was good. Mayor later said “I was dismayed when UVic bought Queenswood. We like the university, there is an appreciation of the intellectual energy. It has to fit into the ‘semi-rural’ community.
- We have a lot of smart people in Cadboro bay. The University does not appreciate us and try to engage us.
- The University has lost public trust. We are concerned with anyone UVic hires. University has stacked us before and given us information that is false. Not opposed to investment in new athletics and recreation facilities, but not these buildings in the proposed location.