



## MINUTES

### MANUFACTURED HOME PARK STAKEHOLDER GROUP

June 18, 2025, 10:00 am - 12:00 pm

---

Attendees:

**Dave Eaton**, Deerwood Estates

**Brian Snyder (chair)**, Sharman Manufactured Home Park

**Daniel Vaillancourt**, Crest Group Holdings 1

**Gloria Wells**, Valley Oak Estates

Staff:

**Lisa Brinkman**, Manager Community Planning

**Brooke Euloth**, Planning Student

**Warren Mann**, Property Services Agent

**Will Volpe**, Urban Matters

**Matt Thompson**, Urban Matters

---

**Brian-** Opened the meeting with the Manufactured Home Community (MHC) stakeholder groups intentions for the meeting and their advocacy for drafting a new policy. Brian expressed their points of view and concerns and thanked the City and Urban Matters (UM) presenting a printed copy of their ideas.

**Lisa-** Expressed gratitude for the work that had been done by the MHC stakeholder group and opened the meeting.

**\*\*UM Presentation\*\***

**Brian-** Comments on the presentation where it is speaking to a developer's perspective.

**UM-** Explained their process in conducting a development proforma and gaining insights through scenarios and modelling to determine the implications for a developer if the MHC group's asks were in place.

*\*UM continued presentation\**

**UM-** Explained finding the sweet spot, as the goal of the analysis is to not deter redevelopment and protect residents.

**Brian-** Asked questions about analysis approach.

**UM-** Discussed that after costing, the next phase is to test the policy levers, including tenant protection for MHC residents. These scenarios are provided to City staff to make informed decisions about what can reasonably be asked of a developer, without impeding development or housing supply, while balancing the protections and needs of existing MHC residents.

**Brian-** Asked questions to UM about the analysis method.

**Lisa-** Informed that UM has a copy of the MHC recommendation and will look at the viability of that, the bare minimum requirements set by the province, and potentially a third option.

**Warren-** Asked UM if the BC minimum compensation is included in the hard costs?

**UM-** Responded that they are finalizing base line scenarios for the modular homes and will ensure that they build in the minimum asks as part of the “non-negotiable” items. Furthermore, they want to ensure they are developing proformas in a way that the development community understands. They stated that they intend to interview several developers to gather costs and to understand the development context in Nanaimo.

**Dave-** Questioned whether land costs are best considered as a hard cost. He drew an example of how a developer could consider the costs of the development, including tenant/homeowner compensation, as the hard costs, and that the land cost would then become the variable, not the compensation.

**UM-** Discussed that it is one of the conversations they’ve been having with the City around site selection. One of the challenges is that with MHCs, the assessed value of the assets on the land is not always factored into the land cost itself. They want to be careful in their modelling to try and capture these costs.

**Gloria-** Questioned the computing of the “sweet spot” and over how many years it is computed in terms of the profit margin for the developer, because those costs are considered when a modular homeowner must leave their current home. It will be another 10-15 years in which the homeowner has to pay a differential in terms of their home ownership/rental costs, so how many years does it take to determine what the sweet spot is?

**UM-** Answered that it depends on the development. In a rental scenario where they develop a purpose-built rental building, typically cash flows are cost out over 10 to 20 years to break even. In the context of townhome or condominiums being sold off in a strata situation, then the developer is looking to make that profit over the course of the few years of the development and then of course the sale of the unit, so they have a shorter time frame.

**Brian-** Made a suggestion for UM’s presentation that their slide stating highest and best use of land should instead start from the premise of highest and best use of the people, then to work back to find a solution.

**UM-** Agreed and stated that they are trying to incorporate this into the analysis because they recognize that the development is one component, an important component that the province is putting a lot of pressure on, but it is one component in the overall housing story. Good policy is about balancing the need for that additional supply, with the existing needs of the community.

Their next step will be testing the policy implications of the stakeholder group's ask and understanding where that is situated in the context of development viability.

*\*\*\*UM end presentation\*\*\**

**Daniel-** Asked if one of UM's scenarios includes a people-first scenario where compensation works into more of the hard costs.

**UM-** Answered that one of their scenarios will be using the recommendations on compensation from the MHC stakeholders' report to see where it lands in terms of project viability.

*Discussion regarding test site selection A.*

**UM-** Stated that they have some sites in mind and can take any recommendations from this committee to look at specific sites and take that under advisement.

**Brian-** Discussed that UM had mentioned a policy from Coquitlam, in 2006 there were seven home parks and today there are three, with one slated for redevelopment, so were these policies effective? We don't know what ended up in the homeowner's hands.

**UM-** Thanked Brian and stated that they will be reaching out to a planner there to ask questions about the effectiveness of their policy. They are looking at other municipalities with policies in place and where there has been success.

*Provincial Tenant Protections discussed*

**Warren-** Discussed the MHC stakeholder group's desire to change terminology regarding residents of MHCs, and his concern about moving too far away from being classified as a "tenant", because provincial residential tenancy protections are in place to benefit "tenants".

**Brian-** Referred to protections that are in place under the *Manufactured Home Park Tenancy Act* (MHPTA) although he pointed out that the protections are weak. The MHPTA does restrict annual rental increases. Brian also noted that the problem with the language is that it infers that as a "tenant" the landlord is in control and the tenant has very little power.

**Gloria-** Discussed that there are other laws that classify manufactured homes as "real property" and that this should relate to an outlay of "hard costs" for a developer. Tenants are not usually due compensation for real property. She further discussed that the home is owned by the residents with significant real property investment, therefore the rights are much more aligned with people who own their homes, opposed to the people that rent where they are living.

*Recommendations from the stakeholder group, Brian speaks to the compensation evaluation they have considered.*

**Daniel-** Read definitions from the *Expropriation Act*. He discussed the legal process involved in an expropriation of real property and that it should be a baseline for compensation and a hard cost, a priority on the pyramid.

**Warren-** Agreed with the idea that compensation should be a hard cost but calculating it as a hard cost is difficult when including things like emotional compensation, as just compensation is subjective. He further suggested that a developer may try to avoid dealing with policies that include hard to measure variables.

**Daniel-** Suggested that it is a minor portion of the compensation, but an element that should be up for discussion.

**Warren-** Recommended that to make compensation fair it should be a formula that can be applied to everyone equally.

**Daniel-** Agreed that it is up for discussion and should be a fixed cost that is lower on the pyramid for a buyout.

**Warren-** Discussed expropriation procedure and compensation basis.

**Daniel-** Discussed further that the *Expropriation Act* uses appraised value and that the use of assessed value should be for a base number that can be built upon to achieve fair compensation.

**Dave-** Referred again to the “sweet spot” discussion, where a developer looks at all the other hard costs first and then what’s left over is what is used to calculate the homeowners’ compensation.

**UM-** Thanked Dave for making that point and stated that their task involves triangulating the building costs based on multiple discussions with different developers. The modelling that they are doing isn’t for the City to ask for a development proforma from the developer, but inform the policy based on UM’s analysis after concluding that developers should have “X” left over profit that can be funneled towards compensation, other amenities, etc.

**Brian-** Continued presenting stakeholder group recommendations. He discussed Mission’s policy item 1(c) “a commitment to hire a qualified professional to assist tenants impacted by the rezoning application”. He stated that he was not sure what the qualifications of this person would be. They would need to make decisions on variables in a formula that included emotional disturbances. They could make a proper assessment of the impacts on each person and their compensation.

**Lisa-** Offered that in many of the policies that exist, the position is called Tenant Relocation Coordinator. In the City of Naniamo’s policy, there could be criteria for the individual’s qualifications. The person would be paid for by the developer. There could be an option for the homeowner to choose a payout or assistance that would come out of the payout option, but the homeowner would be getting the assistance that they need.

**Daniel-** Suggest that the simpler the process, the easier it would be to plug in the numbers for every variable, and the less expensive it would be for the developer.

**Lisa-** Stated that once there is a draft policy, there would be a legal review. The policy proposal would go to Council for approval, and Council has discretion to say no to a rezoning application.

**Brian-** Suggested that UM look into the two properties in Surrey currently being closed, Crispin Bay and Bear Creek.

**UM-** Said that they have been in touch with Surrey to understand where they have found success, and where they have not.

**Lisa-** Thanked the stakeholder group for their recommendations and indicated that Staff are reading it and reviewing all the points made throughout the report.

**Warren-** Read from page 5 of the stakeholder's policy recommendations report, "The City appoints one staff member to manage the entire process, this staff member will initiate organize and document". He expressed his view that much of this work needs to be on the developer, not the City.

**Lisa-** Answered that the City typically requires developers to clearly demonstrate how they've followed the policy. This often includes providing documentation such as meeting minutes, letters sent to homeowners, and invitations for City staff to attend meetings as observers. These materials help verify that the required steps were taken.

**Daniel-** Asked who that goes to.

**Lisa-** Answered that there will be City staff managing the rezoning file, and that is usually a Planner.

**Brian-** Stated that he worries because in a lot of the existing policies there are steps for the applicant, steps for the developer, but you can't rely on them to follow through. Further, he said that we need to have extreme oversight and state that the development will not proceed if the policies are not followed to the letter.

**Lisa-** Pointed out that a rezoning application does not proceed to Council if a developer has not met the policy obligations.

**Brian-** Stated that it is important to be sure that the compensation obligation is adhered to.

**Lisa-** Agreed and stated that this is what the policy will support, and that it is to be a clear road map for the developer, staff, and residents, on how to be successful.

**Daniel-** Stated that they do not want to stand in the way of progress; that they want to be able to support it.

**Lisa-** Said that the City puts a lot on a developer to do. As part of a rezoning application, the developer is obligated to host a public meeting. They are to host it, although the City supports them in that process. This is the work a Planner is already doing. The City can build clearly into the policy what the developers are expected to do. City staff want the policy to be a very clear road map that goes far enough in explaining expectations. This will also help City staff. Lisa asked, regarding page 10 of the report, "the developer will provide a maximum of 5 years to vacate the site", if it is meant to mean "minimum" or "maximum"?

**Brian-** Clarified that "maximum" is the intent because they want to be sure that the developer doesn't hold residents in limbo for an extended period.

**Dave-** Asked about the reasonability of asking for 80% compensation up front within 30 days of receipt, so that the homeowner can go out shopping for themselves.

**Lisa-** Indicated that there would need to be further discussions around this.

**Brian-** Said that a resident in a Surrey MHC stated, “We will get 90% of the funds paid upon notice to vacant, balance of 10% after vacating the site”. But until they get notification, they are stuck.

**Warren-** Observed that this may be where the recommended use of a “maximum” could come in.

*Compensation discussion continues*

**Lisa-** Asked UM to request from the City of Surrey when the developer provides security, and when payouts are being given to the residents, and if that is working. It would be good to find out what the ratio is. Where they are recommending 80% and 20% with the move, how is that working? From the City’s perspective, has that been successful?

**Dave-** Requested consideration that where funds are not paid up front, there is some sort of bonding, so if the developer goes broke and the whole thing is done, the residents are not left dry.

**Lisa-** Questioned, “Is the City securing that prior to final reading of the zoning application and how is that working”?

**UM-** Replied that they think it is negotiated on a case-by-case basis so there’s no understanding up front, and in a lot of cases it seems that the developer meets with the residents before they go to the City, negotiate to a place of agreement, and then the City is actually not involved at all. It is kind of opposite, where there are no clear expectations from the City as it is done through external negotiations.

**UM-** We will reach out to Surrey and confirm that.

*General discussion on next steps.*

**\*\*End of meeting\*\***