NOTES DEVELOPMENT PROCESS REVIEW COMMITTEE TUESDAY, 2012-JUL-10 AT 11:30 A.M. BOARD ROOM, CITY HALL, 455 WALLACE STREET



These are informal notes taken at the meeting, as there was no quorum.

PRESENT:

Committee Members: Absent:

Councillor Bill McKay, Acting Chair Councillor Bill Bestwick

Councillor Jim Kipp Greg Constable, Island West Coast Developments

Maureen Pilcher, Maureen Pilcher & Assoc. Ian Niamath, Ian Niamath Architects

Rod Smith, Newcastle Engineering Bob Wall, RW Wall Ltd

Byron Gallant, President, Canadian Home Builders'

Association - CVI

Guest Speaker:

Ron van Wachem, President, Nanaimo Shipyard Group

City Staff:

Ted Swabey, GM, Community Safety & Development Andrew Tucker, Director of Planning Toby Seward, Director of Development Bruce Anderson, Manager, Community Planning Holly Pirozzini, Administrative Assistant

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 11:40 a.m.

2. ADOPTION OF MINUTES (2012-May-22)

The minutes will be adopted at the next regular meeting.

3. Building Permit Fees – Toby Seward

Staff made a powerpoint presentation and compared the existing fee structure with the 1% "all in" and a modified fee structure for building permit fees as follows:

Existing Fee Structure		
\$0 to \$500	\$40	
\$501 to \$1000	\$65	
\$1,000.01 to \$100,000	\$10/1000	
\$100,000.01 to \$500,000	\$7/1000	
\$500,000.01 and up	\$4.5/1000	
•		

1% "all in"		
\$0 to \$1000	\$100	
\$1000.01 to \$100,000	1%+\$100 (max \$1000)	
\$100,000.01 and up	1% on first \$3m .5% on balance	

❖ Modified Fee Structure		
\$0 to \$1000	\$105	
\$1,000.01 to \$100,000	\$10/1000	
\$100,000.01 and up	\$7/1000	
No fee increase for permits with a construction value of \$500,000 and less		

The following recommendations will impact the larger projects and not the average homeowner.

Recommendations:

- that the 'modified' building permit fee structure be recommended (plus increases for existing secondary suites to \$500 and fee increases for re-inspections and demolitions);
- that the revised fee schedule be implemented on 2013-JAN-01; and
- that a review of the revised fee structure be completed 18 months following adoption.

The Committee endorsed the recommendations as presented and it was suggested that an increase to the \$500 fee for existing secondary suites and for re-inspections be considered in future.

4. Presentation by Ron van Wachem, President, Nanaimo Shipyard Group Re: Neighbourhood Planning Process

Mr. van Wachem made the following comments regarding the Brechin/Newcastle Neighbourhood planning process:

- The planning process was flawed because he was not given the opportunity to speak.
- Residents in the area were allowed to have a lot of input into this process. They
 lobbied Council and attended public meetings to misinform the public, which
 railroaded the process.
- At a Plan Nanaimo Advisory Committee (PNAC) meeting, there were 10 people presenting the same negative/incorrect information and I was not given the opportunity to speak to the Committee.
- People throughout the city need to have a say in the Neighbourhood Plan; not just residents in the area.

- The City needs to engage the development industry more in the neighbourhood planning process and discuss all of the issues (e.g. environmental, CO₂ footprint, green space, and the waterfront walkway).
- Brechin area residents did not want to discuss increased height for new development (more than four storeys) for the waterfront vision.
- Look at the waterfront from a sustainability perspective; more people should be able to walk to work.
- Density needs to be encouraged in the downtown and my vision is a bridge to Newcastle Island.
- A lot of time and money was spent on this Neighbourhood Plan, which should have led to a much better Plan, but staff's hands were tied during the process (let the Planners plan).
- City Planners need to have the power in the end to choose a preferred solution. Eight+ storeys was agreed upon by Newcastle representatives and Stewart Avenue representatives, but the Brechin neighbourhood didn't accept this. The issue went to Council and Council listened to those with the loudest voices, which was not the correct information.
- The City should have had a Communications Officer to provide the correct information to the public.
- There needs to be an opportunity for discussion about the Plan <u>after</u> adoption, to improve future neighbourhood planning processes.
- There is <u>not</u> a lot of undeveloped property in the downtown area, other than the Shipyard.
- Want to sell the shipyard because it's not conducive to operate an industrial business near a hotel and residential.
- The Shipyard has large environmental issues. Hundreds of thousands of dollars have been spent for cleanup, but more still needs to be done.
- This Neighbourhood Plan discourages development on the Shipyard property. Now a rezoning is required for it to be developed as a high rise.
- It is difficult to get financing from a bank for a project unless 80 90% of the units are pre-sold.
- Frustrated because I have a bigger vision for the Brechin/Newcastle neighbourhood.

Committee's comments:

- The steering committee was composed of three landowners from Stewart Avenue, plus three from the Brechin Neighbourhood Association, and three from the Newcastle Neighbourhood Association. The point of contention was that the Brechin representatives thought that Stewart Avenue businesses should not have been included in the process.
- Newcastle/Brechin Neighbourhood Planning process may have been flawed from the beginning; it was an anomaly because the Brechin residents were strong and sophisticated and overtook the process. It was not staff's fault that those with the loudest voices were heard.

Councillor Kipp left the meeting at 12:35 p.m.

Staff's comments:

• The Brechin/Newcastle neighbourhood is unique in its mix of density, uses and scale.

- Not supportive of advocating for staff to have all the power in making decisions respecting neighbourhood planning, instead of Council.
- The central issue for Mr. van Wachem is that the Plan limits building height to four storeys.

The Committee thanked Ron van Wachem for his presentation.

5. <u>Information Only - Harewood Neighbourhood Plan</u>

Staff provided a brochure for the Harewood Neighbourhood planning process for information. Council approved the development of the Harewood Neighbourhood Plan on 2012-Mar-26 and the first Open House will be held in September, 2012.

6. Information Only - Council Policy for Housing Legacy Reserve

Copies of the *Housing Legacy Reserve – Funding Allocation Criteria* policy were distributed for information.

7. <u>Information Only – Corridor Zoning</u>

Copies of a letter from Rick Jones, Urban Design, dated 2012-May-10, and a response from Andrew Tucker, dated 2012-May-16, respecting Corridor Zones were distributed for information. Staff's correspondence reiterated that corridor zones were primarily developed to encourage high density residential development along major arterials and that Corridor zoning should not be used for development of a shopping centre, as Commercial Centre zones are better suited for this.

8. Verbal Update of Reports:

- a) Amenity Contributions Council received a report from the Chair of the Development Process Review Committee on 2012-Jun-25.
- b) Residential Guide Council received a report from the Chair of the Development Process Review Committee on 2012-Jun-25.
- c) Chamber of Commerce Zoning Review staff have received approximately a dozen phone calls since the Chamber sent out the notices of the Zoning Bylaw review, which will lead to a recommendation for housekeeping amendments going to Council in the fall. The Chamber is hosting monthly meetings to hear concerns about the new bylaw.

9. <u>Contractor Storage Container</u> – Ted Swabey

Council adopted "ZONING AMENDMENT BYLAW 2012 NO. 4500.017" (Sec. 6.2.1.4) on 2012-Jun-11. Staff recommended that the intent of the bylaw be clarified for construction sites, to not restrict the number of temporary containers and to allow them to be located in the setbacks.

Staff noted that there may be numerous trades and sub-trades on site, each requiring secure storage for their tools and materials. The intent is not to limit the number of containers on active construction sites. Staff's recommendation was supported by the Committee. Staff will provide a report to Council to clarify this issue and it will be noted that there was no quorum at this meeting.

Rod Smith questioned how long a project can be inactive? Staff note that a Development Permit and/or Building Permit is valid for a period of two years and may be renewed.

10. Request to Address the Committee:

Councillor McKay advised that Bob Moore, Lamont Land Inc., would like to address the Committee to discuss signage, as well as the process to allow construction of homes, prior to registration of the subdivision.

Mr. Moore will be invited to attend the next meeting to be held on Tuesday, 2012-Sep-11.

11. <u>Design Guidelines for Corridors</u>

Staff was asked about the status of this issue and the response was that it will not be addressed until 2013.

12. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting will be held on Tuesday, 2012-Sep-11, at 11:30 a.m. in the Board Room (there will be no meeting in August).

13. <u>ADJOURNMENT</u>

The meeting adjourned at 1:15 p.m.

/hp

G:2012 Files\Dev Process Review Committee(0360-20)\Minutes\DPRC120710M