



**MINUTES**  
**NANAIMO ADVISORY PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**TUESDAY, 2014-MAY-20 AT 5:00 PM**  
**BOARD ROOM, SARC, 411 DUNSMUIR STREET**

---

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Fred Pattje, Chair  
Brian Anderson  
Chris Cross  
Jim Goldsack  
Darwin Mahlum

Ted Greves  
Michael Harrison  
Jim Kipp  
Randall Taylor

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Carey Avender

**STAFF PRESENT:**

Dale Lindsay, Director, Community Development  
Bruce Anderson, Manager, Planning & Design  
Deborah Jensen, Community Development Planner

Sheila Herrera, Planner  
Penny Masse, Recording Secretary

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

John Steil, Principal, Stantec  
Derek Lee, PWL Partnership  
Members of the Public: 3

Brian Henning, Williamson & Associates

**1. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 5:01 pm.

**2. Adoption of Minutes**

It was moved and seconded that the Minutes from 2014-MAR-18 be adopted.  
The motion was carried.

**3. Approval of Agenda and Late Items**

The agenda was approved as presented.

**4. Correspondence**

Letter of resignation received from S. Boyd, APC Youth representative. D. Jensen confirmed this position will be advertised with the next round of appointments to the Committee.

## 5. Information Items

- a. OCP00077 / RA000331 – 1044 and 1048 Old Victoria Road  
D. Jensen advised that the APC recommended approval of the application for a recycling facility on 2013-MAR-18. A Public Hearing was held on 2013-MAY-01, and Council denied the bylaw on 2014-MAY-12.

A Committee member inquired as to why Council denied the bylaw for the proposed recycling facility.

Councillor Pattje noted that although the applicants did a good job, he based his denial on the discrepancy between the OCP and the neighbourhood plan as well as the process behind the redesignation of the subject property during the 2008 OCP review. He added he hopes the applicants will reapply for the recycling depot at a new location in the south end.

## 6. Old Business

None.

## 7. New Business

- a. Official Community Plan Amendment Applications

D. Jensen advised no OCP amendment applications were received for the 2014-MAY-01 intake.

- b. Rezoning Applications

- i. RA000331 – 10 and 28 Front Street.

To allow for a hotel.

S. Herrera introduced the application. Some of the comments were:

- Proposal is for a site specific amendment to the DT5 zone, increasing allowable height and Floor Area Ratio.
- The application is posted on the City website and a public open house was held by the applicants on 2014-MAY-15.
- The proposed hotel height is 32 storeys from Front Street and 35 storeys from the waterfront, including mechanical and screening.
- The OCP Downtown Centre Urban Node Designation, the Nanaimo Downtown Plan and the Downtown Design Guidelines all apply to this proposal.
- A lane surrounding the subject properties does form part of the proposal.

M. Harrison asked if the laneway is proposed to be purchased from the City by the proponents.

S. Herrera confirmed the proponents plan on purchasing the laneway.

J. Steil and D. Lee gave a presentation for the proposal. Some of the comments were:

- Proposed hotel will be an iconic and impressive addition to the skyline. Virtually no view corridors will be affected.
- Floor layouts were presented. A six storey podium will be the base for the hotel tower. The tower is sited as far away from Pacifica as possible.
- The landscape plan includes extensive improvements and additions to the waterfront. Undulating setbacks on Front Street will allow for pedestrian connectivity and ocean viewpoint opportunities.

#### Committee Comments

Committee members inquired how a loading dock could serve as a view point, whether any negative comments had been received at the public open house, and how overflow parking would be managed.

D. Lee noted the loading dock would be in use only once or twice per day; the area will act as public open space when it is not being used as a loading dock.

J. Steil noted that there were approximately 210 attendees at the open house. Concerns included the proposed height and massing of the tower, view corridor impacts, and how the hotel would be operated. Parking would likely be dealt with via valet parking; the proponent is considering purchasing an additional lot to deal with overflow parking off-site. He added that many hotel guests will be on charters and will not be driving a vehicle.

Councillor Kipp arrived at 5:20 pm.

A Committee member inquired if a business plan or economic feasibility assessment had been completed for the application seeing as this is not the only hotel proposed for downtown Nanaimo.

J. Steil commented that the Hilton is generally very thorough with their review and feasibility. Intent is to create additional market demands, increase tourism and not compete with existing hotels.

A Committee member asked if the applicants had met with the Nanaimo Old City Association (NOCA), and requested further clarification regarding pedestrian accessibility.

J. Steil confirmed that the applicants have attempted to set up a meeting with NOCA, but have not been successful to date. They did meet with the Newcastle and Brechin associations. Added that views will not be significantly impacted.

D. Lee noted the Pacifica development egress points are not accessible, do not connect to the water very well and one egress is sloped. Pacifica egress to the waterfront will be addressed with a stair connection and does form part of this proposal. Pedestrian flow on Front Street will be aided by wider, undulating setbacks, as well as retail components.

A member of the public asked if the existing waterfront lagoon, beach and bridge would be affected by the proposal.

D. Lee confirmed the existing waterfront lagoon, beach and bridge areas would not be affected by the proposal.

A Committee member stated they would not support the proposal as the tower is too tall and the massing is too big; added that view corridors would be drastically affected, including the view of the heritage court house from the waterfront.

C. Cross and D. Mahlum declared a conflict of interest and that they would not be voting on the motion due to the fact they are involved professionally on this project.

It was moved and seconded to recommend that Council approve RA000335. The motion was carried.

## **8. Presentations**

Riparian Policy (R. Larance, Environmental Planner, Parks, Recreation & Environment)

R. Lawrance gave a presentation on the riparian setback policy review currently under consideration by Council.

### **Committee Comments**

Committee members asked for clarification on whether there is a designated creek from Terminal Park to Walnut Creek, and what percentages of applications received by the City are to vary a watercourse.

R. Lawrance stated he would check Schedule C of the OCP regarding the watercourse, adding there are likely fragments of dedicated and protected creeks throughout the city. He noted the policy review clarified there are relatively few watercourse variance applications received. The value of the review is to assess and better process those applications, as many other municipalities are currently doing. The pre-application meeting is an important result of the review; a brochure has been created and is available online which explains the process.

A Committee member noted his concern that the pre-application meeting could lengthen an already lengthy development process.

R. Lawrance stated the pre-application meeting in most cases saves time and streamlines the process. The pre-application meeting can ascertain if variances are in fact needed and address any other concerns at an early stage.

Councillor Kipp confirmed pre-application meetings are a result of recommendations from the Development Process Review Committee, and they have been successful in ensuring all parties understand what is needed for any given application.

**9. Next Meeting**

The next regular meeting of the APC is scheduled for 2014-JUN-17.

**10. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 6:03 pm.

File: 0360-20-P07-02

g:\commplan\advisory committees\apc\agendas minutes\2014\minutes\2014 05 20 apc minutes.doc

Draft