



## **MINUTES**

### **PLANNING & TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING**

Wednesday, 2015-MAY-27 at 5:00 p.m.,  
Boardroom, 411 Dunsmuir Street, Nanaimo, BC

---

**PRESENT:** Mr. Doug Kalcsics  
Mr. Bill Forbes  
Mr. Mike Plavetic  
Mr. Bill McKay  
Mr. Jim Kipp  
Mr. Jerry Hong

**STAFF:** Mr. Dale Lindsay, Director, Community Development Department  
Mr. Bruce Anderson, Manager, Planning & Design Section  
Mr. Geoff Goodall, Director, Engineering & Public Works  
Mr. Gordon Foy, Transportation Manager, Engineering Services Section  
Ms. Sheila Herrera, Planner, Planning & Design Section  
Mr. Dave Stewart, Planner, Planning & Design Section  
Ms. Karin Kronstal, Planner, Planning & Design Section  
Ms. Penny Masse, Planning Clerk, Planning & Design Section

#### **Call to Order:**

The meeting was called to order at 5:00 pm

#### **1. Introduction**

Mr. Anderson gave an introduction to the role of the Planning & Transportation Advisory Committee (PTAC) and introduced Staff and PTAC members. It was noted that one of the first orders of business of PTAC is to elect a Chair. The main role of PTAC is to advise Council and make recommendations on matters referred to its Committee members. The Committee will be reviewing Official Community Plan (OCP), Transportation Master Plan (TMP) and Zoning Bylaw amendment applications. The next PTAC meeting will have a full membership as Council will be ratifying three additional members prior to that meeting date. All PTAC meetings will be open to the public; however, the meeting does not function as a Public Hearing. Staff will typically introduce the applications in the order of how they appear on the agenda, the applicant will present to the Committee and then the Committee will deliberate and discuss the application. Then the committee provides a formal recommendation to Council regarding the application, which is presented to Council through a Staff report. Neighbourhood Association members will be invited to sit at the PTAC table to provide their input on Official Community Plan amendment applications. The Committee agreed that the Mr. Bill McKay will chair this inaugural PTAC meeting and that a Chair will be elected at the next regularly scheduled PTAC meeting.

## 2. Adoption of Minutes

It was moved and seconded that the minutes of the 2015-MAR-17 APC meeting be approved.

## 3. Approval of Agenda

Mr. McKay requested to amend this evening's agenda by adding New Business of a review of parking standards and a consideration of late comer fees on development applications.

It was moved and seconded to adopt the amended Agenda to include the New Business items. The motion was carried

Mr. Hong requested that PTAC agendas be paginated and numbered.

## 4. New Business

a) *Official Community Plan Amendment Application No. OCP00078 and Rezoning Application No. RA000345 – 601 & 609 Bruce Avenue*

Ms. Herrera gave a brief introduction of the application.

Applicant Presentation: Mr. Steven Wagner – Applicant Representative

- Applicant owns the property adjacent to the subject property; they have received several expressions of interest for possible commercial uses on the property. Plans are to develop stand-alone commercial uses of the same scale of existing commercial uses in the area. No big box commercial is proposed for the site. This proposal meets the requirements of the Official Community Plan (OCP) and the Harewood Neighbourhood Plan.
- Believes the CC3 zoning is important as it permits the widest range of leasing options. The buildings will relate to the street and will draw to the sidewalk; they are striving for a Mainstreet design, as noted in the Neighbourhood Plan. The proposal would be pedestrian friendly; mass transit and many amenities are nearby. The site plan would work with heritage features, including heritage trees.
- The community contribution would include public art, benches, stamped concrete and moving art installations.
- Parking would be kept on the interior of the site. A traffic assessment concluded that the proposal would not create an undue burden on traffic function.

Mr. Hong asked why access is off of Shepherd Avenue and not Fifth Street?

Mr. Wagner noted that through dialogue with Planning & Design staff it was decided that the existing roadway into University Village has to be set back from major intersections as it could cause dangerous traffic flow; this proposal aligns with the existing driveway.

Mr. Hong noted his concern that Shepherd Avenue is small and that 90 parking stalls of vehicles is excessive.

Mr. Forbes asked whether or not the Neighbourhood Association had been consulted.

Mr. Wagner noted that he attended the Harewood Neighbourhood Association meeting six weeks ago; 20 members of the public attended the meeting.

Mr. Kalcsics asked for clarification regarding the mandate of PTAC versus Staff and the Design Advisory Plan Panel; is it PTAC's job to discuss height and access or is it in regard to policy change amendments?

Mr. Anderson confirmed the role of PTAC is to focus on policy implementation related to the Official Community Plan (OCP), the Transportation Master Plan (TMP) and the Zoning Bylaw. Form and character, site planning, and related issues are dealt with further on in the development approval process.

Members of the Harewood Neighbourhood Association were invited to the table. Ms. Heather Campbell, Ms. Carolyn Isles and Mr. Tim McGrath joined the Committee.

Mr. Kipp asked for clarification on what type of buffering would be provided in the proposal.

Mr. Wagner noted that buffering plans include flanking planting on both sides of the proposal and staggered fencing with landscaping to reduce headlight intrusion and vehicular noise.

Mr. Kalcsics asked if there are good reasons as to why the Official Community Plan (OCP) should be amended as it sets a direction and precedent, particularly in this neighbourhood. The Official Community Plan (OCP) and Neighbourhood Plan was adopted after long and detailed discussion; changing it should be carefully considered. The Staff report notes that the proposed zoning reflects existing land uses; however, there is no existing land use.

Mr. Wagner noted that commercial proposals with residential on the second floor would entail significant costs.

Mr. Kalcsics noted there are existing and successful examples of this type of development.

Mr. Wagner noted that it is a busy intersection; commercial with residential on the second floor might work a couple of blocks away, but not on the subject property, he would not want to live at such a busy intersection.

Mr. Kalcsics asked if the Official Community Plan (OCP) designation is then incorrect for this area.

Mr. Wagner noted the site is incorrect for the Official Community Plan (OCP) designation.

Mr. Kalcsics asked about the properties beside and kitty-corner from the subject property; where do you draw the line on challenging the well thought out principles of the Official Community Plan (OCP).

Mr. Wagner noted that it comes down to timing; given the density, adding residential does not make sense. According to the market study residential would work in the future, but not now.

Mr. McKay asked when road layouts would be decided upon.

Mr. Wagner noted that implications of land use and circulation systems are a part of the discussion going forward. Recommendations from traffic engineers will consider those future implications.

Mr. McKay noted his belief that bicycle tracks should be placed inside the proposal, believes the Harewood neighbourhood would embrace bicycle tracks.

Mr. McKay invited the Harewood Neighbourhood Association members to provide comment on the proposal.

Ms. Campbell noted the intent of the Plan was to include residential into commercial proposals; however, the costs are too high at this time. She lives directly across from the subject property and she will be impacted. Believes the layout and landscaping will suit the area.

Mr. Kalcsics asked if it is possible to recommend to Council that the proposal be zoned to CC2 versus CC3.

Mr. Anderson noted that Council considers applications as they are presented; PTAC can offer direction, but not amend the stated proposal.

It was moved and seconded to recommend that Council approve Official Community Plan Amendment Application No. OCP00078 and Rezoning Application No. RA000345. The motion was carried.

Opposed: Mr. Kalcsics and Mr. Bill Forbes.

*b) Rezoning Application No. RA000348 – 306 Hillcrest Avenue / 525 Third Street / 305, 311 & 321 Watfield Avenue*

Ms. Herrera gave a brief street introduction of the application. Noted that the lane dedication is not a properly built lane and is a part of a land exchange process. It will be a consolidated parcel.

Applicant Presentation: Mr. Gunter Yost and Mr. Daryoush Firouzli – Applicant Representatives

- Proposal was designed to be in compliance with the Official Community Plan (OCP) and the Harewood Neighbourhood Plan and includes retail, rental apartments, town homes and student housing. It is close to the university and many other amenities. All required guidelines and policies have been met.
- No variances to height or parking will be required.
- Townhomes would be located on the edge of the property, adjacent to existing residential uses. Commercial on main floor with two storeys of residential above. Public space will be provided in between the three buildings. Road dedication will create a centre boulevard and will include parking, bike stalls and a wide sidewalk and landscape area.
- Student housing will have above ground parking but all other parking will be underground.

- The proposal is for a total of 215 units in 6 buildings and 6 town homes and it will be a three-phase development.
- Traffic assessment indicated no significant impacts to the area.

Mr. Kalcsics noted he is pleased with the project; it fits the Official Community Plan (OCP) and Neighbourhood Plan and is laudable.

It was moved and seconded that Council approve Rezoning Application No. RA000348. The motion was carried.

c) *Rezoning Application No. RA000349 – 3425 Uplands Drive*

Mr. Stewart gave a brief introduction of the application.

Applicant Presentation: Mr. John Jessup and Mr. Randy Humchink – Applicant Representatives

- Subject property has an existing single family dwelling. A day program has been operating on the site for 12 developmentally disabled young adults; it is a home-like atmosphere.
- All units would be identical; 500-550ft<sup>2</sup>, one bedroom units designed for single person occupancy. Proposal is for single storey town homes, at grade, with 22 units completed in Phase I. Located on Uplands due to accessibility. 24 units in apartment form would occur in Phase II (5-6 years in the future). All fire department requirements have been met.
- All tenants are capable of independent living and no support staff will be on site. Most, if not all, tenants do not have driver's licenses; parking should not be an issue, although a parking variance may be required and should be able to be justified.

Mr. Kalcsics asked how visitor parking would be accommodated.

Mr. Jessup indicated the parking ratio would need to be met and visitor parking would be accommodated through that.

Mr. Kalcsics asked where the closest amenities would be located.

Mr. Jessup noted the Country Club Mall is the closest amenities.

Mr. Kalcsics asked what the distance would be to Country Club Mall.

Mr. Jessup noted that Country Club Mall is approximately 1.5 km from the subject property.

- A neighbourhood consultation meeting was undertaken with many invitations being distributed; only two people attended. One attendee was in favour and one was opposed to the proposal. They are open to discuss the proposal with neighbours; they realize it is a major change to the area and they want to be good neighbours.

Mr. Plavetic asked if there are other similar developments in Nanaimo.

Mr. Jessup noted that there are no other similar developments in Nanaimo; however, there are 6 home share arrangements in Nanaimo that assist 70 adults.

Mr. Kalcsics asked Staff for clarification regarding any other zoning of this density in the subject area.

Mr. Stewart noted the property beside the subject property is zoned R10, which allows for 16 units per hectare. This proposal is for 30 units per hectare; the Official Community Plan (OCP) recommends 10-50 units per hectare, which this proposal is well below.

Mr. Kalcsics noted that the proposal states a requirement for 23 units of personal care use; however, no care is being given to the tenants other than off site.

Mr. Stewart noted the use is based on the tenancy being provided and noted the term derives from a parking report: personal care facility ratio for parking based on tenancy. These tenants tend not to drive; therefore, the ratio is appropriate.

Mr. Kalcsics noted this is an opportune time to consider looking into a conceptual plan for this area. Should not develop on a one-off basis.

Mr. Kipp noted he is support of the proposal as it creates a mix of affordable housing and he supports the Nanaimo Association for Community Living (NACL).

Mr. Hong noted he also supports the Nanaimo Association for Community Living (NACL); however, he is concerned about low income housing being combined with assisted living as low income housing brings a lower quality of tenant.

Mr. Forbes noted his preference that the entire property be used for assisted living as it is obvious more assisted living is needed in Nanaimo.

Mr. Jessup corrected that this proposal is not intended as assisted living; it is independent living. Nanaimo Association for Community Living (NACL) has had success with mixed income, affordable housing development in the past.

Mr. Forbes noted he is not comfortable with an apartment style development at Phase II; it is an older, established neighbourhood of single family dwellings and it is a very busy road.

It was moved and seconded to recommend that Council approve Rezoning Application No. RA000349.

The motion was carried.

Mr. McKay put on notice for New Business at the next PTAC meeting: Parking and late comer fees.

Mr. Anderson noted a Parking review is currently underway.

Mr. McKay commented there is a tremendous amount of infill occurring, which can affect one property owner while others get the benefit. When improvements are undertaken for a property should it extend farther than the subject property? One developer pays for the first of many projects in an area and the following developers get the improvements for free. We should consider late comer fees to get some of the investment back to the initial investor.

**5. Next meeting**

The next regular meeting of the PTAC is scheduled for 2015-JUN-16.

**6. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 7:20 p.m.