

Sean Orr, COPE, March 5th 2025

Question #1 - Future of the Elected Park Board

The City has had an elected Park board for over 130 years, but this Council has voted to ask the Province to amend the Vancouver Charter to eliminate the elected Park Board mid-term.

Do you support an independent elected Park Board? (Yes/No) *Yes!*

Do you support the City requesting the province to amend the Vancouver Charter to eliminate the elected Park Board? (Y/N) *No!*

And what would you do on this issue if elected? *Fight Ken Sim and his bullies!*

Question #2 - Infrastructure & BC Zoning Bills

The BC zoning bills 44, 46 & 47 passed by the province last year, proposed massive increases for development while reducing the City's ability to raise the needed resources for related infrastructure demand. This is everything from utilities to parks and recreation facilities.

Do you agree with the City being complicit with implementing the BC zoning bills? (Y/N) *While I think we need to be hitting our housing targets, it can't be in lockstep with displacement.*

Implementing vacancy control and closing the loopholes that allow landlords to jack up rents will be my focus. We really missed an opportunity to buy up land around transit for public housing on public land. As Jean Swanson says, "I'm in favour of density around transit, but I want people who ride the bus to be able to afford to live there".

How do you plan to provide the required infrastructure for this growth and/or what would you do differently if elected?

Ken Sim has raised our taxes the fastest of any mayor, while simultaneously cutting our services. He closed the renters office, cut green-bin pick-up, is closing pools, and can barely keep the roads ice free. Where is the money going? His personal budget is \$1.5 million! We have increased the police budget by \$100 million! Does anyone feel safer? We need to re-direct that money to the public good, like infrastructure.

Question #3 - Jericho Lands

The Jericho Lands are 90 acres in West Point Grey with proposed development to potentially over triple the population of the existing neighbourhood, with towers of up to 50 storeys.

Do you support this scale of development for this site? (Y/N) *Yes*

Would you consider alternatives that are more ground oriented and sustainable such as suggested by the Jericho Coalition <https://jerichocoalition.org/> ? *I would consider it yes, in consultation with First Nations.*

And what would you do differently, if anything, if elected? *As I said at the debate, I don't think we should be demanding how First Nations develop their land. The renderings I've seen look beautiful.*

Question #4 - Broadway Plan

The Broadway Plan is resulting in massive land speculation, demoviction of tenants from older more affordable rentals, and tower blockbusting on side streets without local context. If the UBCx is approved, it would do the same to Kits and WPG.

Do you agree with the Broadway Plan? (Y/N) *No, it falls short. I was proud that previous COPE councillor, Jean Swanson voted against it.*

Would you consider a pause to the Broadway Plan? (Y/N) *I don't what a pause will do to stop this same kind of displacement that is happening all across our city. Even if we pause the broadway plan, landlords can still jack up rents unfairly between tenants or when a roommate moves out. Even if we pause the broadway plan, unfair demovictions across the city will continue. It's not enough. I'd take a look at the specific motion and see what it can do for tenants, but I don't think pausing one plan here or one plan there on the margins will fix our housing system.*

Right now tenants have the Right of First Refusal to return to their units when they're displaced by demoviction. But we know there aren't appropriate swing sites to house people in the

meantime in their neighbourhoods and near the community they depend on, and that often the units offered when tenants return will be much smaller or otherwise inappropriate or inaccessible for families, folks with disabilities, and seniors.

That's why COPE supports using city-owned land to build non-market housing including "swings sites" so people can be accommodated in their communities if they have to be temporarily displaced.

And what would you do differently, if anything, if elected? *See above.*

Question #5 - Vancouver Plan ODP

The Vancouver Plan has been approved by the current and previous Council. It is currently being turned into the Official Development Plan (ODP) to be approved as required by the Province in June 2026. This growth of towers across the city is being justified by the idea that there is a lack of housing development and that more density would create more affordability.

Since the 1970's the City has tripled the number of housing units, more than any other centre city in North America, yet we have the most expensive housing, not the least.

Do you agree with the Vancouver Plan? (Y/N) *I love that you used Patrick Condon's data here. He was a former COPE mayoral candidate. I love his work on land value capture. The Vancouver plan needs to include this.*

Would you continue to implement it? (Y/N) *I would try to amend it.*

And if not, what would you do differently to provide growth and affordability? *The Vancouver Plan the last council adopted also included the option of implementing the Right of First Refusal for the City to purchase threatened rental buildings into non-market ownership to protect tenants. Montreal has this power, and have saved hundreds of units of affordable housing with it. I will bring a motion to Council to ask that Vancouver be granted the Right of First Refusal on any private rental building that goes up for sale – this will damp down speculation and it will give the City the power to help tenants stay in their homes and to maximize permanently affordable housing units if they are redeveloped.*

Question #6 - Tower Corridors Citywide

The City is currently proposing wide corridors of 20 storey social housing projects across the city in every neighbourhood, without public hearings.

Do you agree with this proposal? (Y/N) *I'm against removing view cones! They are part of what makes Vancouver special. This is a developer land grab and will exacerbate displacement.*

Why or why not? *See above.*

What would you do differently, if anything? *Reinstate view cone protections!*