



**MINUTES**  
**planNANAIMO ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**MEETING HELD TUESDAY, 2012-JAN-17 AT 5:00 PM**  
**BOARD ROOM, CITY HALL, 455 WALLACE STREET**

---

**PRESENT:**

Brian Anderson, Acting Chair  
Chris Cross  
Shirley Lance  
Ralph Meyerhoff  
Meg Savory  
Randall Taylor

Sarah Boyd  
John Hofman  
Darwin Mahlum  
Fred Pattje  
Nadine Schwager

**REGRETS:**

Carey Avender  
Michael Harrison  
Jim Kipp  
Clem Trombley

Ted Greves  
Ric Kelm  
Pete Sabo

**STAFF:**

Deborah Jensen, Community Development Planner  
Chris Sholberg, Community/Heritage Planner  
Thomas Knight, Manager of Current Planning  
Sheila Herrera, Planner, Current Planning  
Dave Stewart, Planner, Current Planning  
Cindy Hall, Recording Secretary

**OTHERS:**

Doug Bromage  
Laurence Rieper  
Andrea Blakeman  
Jim Routledge

**1. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 5:00 pm by Acting Chair B. Anderson. He advised the new Council appointments to the Committee are Councillors Pattje, Kipp and Greves.

**2. Interim Election of Chair**

D. Jensen advised that PNAC will elect a new Chair at their April meeting as per the Advisory Committee Terms of Reference adopted in 2010. F. Pattje commented that the PNAC agenda should have made that clear.

**3. Adoption of Minutes from 2011-NOV-15**

MOVED by S. Lance, SECONDED by F. Pattje that the Minutes from 2011-NOV-15 be adopted.  
CARRIED

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

The agenda was approved as presented.

**5. Correspondence**

None.

**6. Presentations**

None.

**7. Information Items**

None.

**8. Old Business**

None.

**9. New Business****a. Zoning Amendments****i. RA286 – 2046 Boxwood Road**

To allow for 'Food and Beverage Processing' (brewery).

S. Herrera introduced the application.

D. Bromage, applicant, advised that what was permitted on this property in the previous Zoning Bylaw was to still be permitted in the new Zoning Bylaw, but this is not the case. The owner wants to retain the permitted uses he previously had.

**Committee Comments**

The Committee inquired whether the neighbours had been contacted, and whether both uses are existing.

The owner advised that many of the neighbours had been contacted and no feedback had been received. D. Bromage commented that the tow truck business is existing, but they now want to include a brewery for the Longwood Brew Pub into the building as well.

MOVED by R. Meyerhoff, SECONDED by S. Lance to recommend that Council approve RA286. CARRIED

(C. Cross and D. Mahlum abstained from voting because of a perceived conflict of interest.)

S. Herrera left the meeting.

**ii. Bylaw 4500 – Old City R1 Zone**

C. Sholberg introduced the item, and advised it came about as a result of residents in the Old City being concerned that the neighbourhood's character would be adversely affected if its zoning was changed through the adoption of Bylaw No. 4500. Three specific areas of concern were minimum lot area,

accessory building height, and duplexes being permitted on corner lots. Staff were directed by Council to discuss the issues with the Nanaimo Old City Association (NOCA) and to report back to Council. Staff sent out a survey to residents in the area, and results indicated support to revert back to what was in the previous Zoning Bylaw on all three of the issues. An Open House was held to share the survey results with the community, and to present a further question as to whether an Intensive Residential development permit area should be considered for the area. Open house attendees were in support of that proposal.

D. Stewart advised that through the new Zoning Bylaw process, staff looked at existing lot sizes in the area and how the new zone would affect subdivision potential. It was found to have the most impact on laneways, in that 26 additional lots could be provided by reducing the lot size, frontage and depth of lots abutting laneways. One of staff's recommendations is to continue with the existing allowable lot size, but eliminate the laneway reductions. The new Zoning Bylaw also increased the allowable height of accessory buildings to accommodate coach houses. If the maximum height were reduced, the neighbourhood's concerns over accessory buildings could be reviewed under design guidelines. An objective of the OCP is to allow density, and one way to do that is to permit duplexes on corner lots. This does not fit in with the neighbourhood plan for the area, but it does meet the policies of the OCP.

C. Sholberg concurred that the overarching policy in the neighbourhood plan, which preceded the OCP, provides direction that the area remain single family residential. The question now is whether to retain existing zoning regulations, find a middle ground, or adopt NOCA's proposal.

#### Committee Comments

The Committee inquired whether secondary suites in 7.0 metre high accessory buildings would be the only way to accomplish densification in the Old City neighbourhood, whether the number of duplexes on corner lots that will now be permitted will be a disruption in the neighbourhood, and if this neighbourhood is given an exception, could other neighbourhoods request one also.

D. Stewart noted that the issue is height, not density. Secondary suites would still be permitted in a single storey house. With respect to other neighbourhoods possibly requesting an exception, that would be a completely different situation as their request would be received after adoption of the new Zoning Bylaw. NOCA's request was received prior to adoption of Bylaw No. 4500.

C. Sholberg advised that the density ratio would not be drastically affected by any new duplexes built on corner lots, but that NOCA would still consider it a disruption.

A Committee member advised that the Advisory Committee on Environmental Sustainability clearly supports small lots.

Another member questioned how the City would protect the heritage character of a neighbourhood with a “one size fits all” approach, and that there is quite a difference between this neighbourhood and other areas.

C. Sholberg advised that an Intensive Residential Development Permit area would address that concern.

L. Rieper, a resident of the Old City neighbourhood, advised that they “just want what they had”. He noted the neighbourhood is a unique area and is all that is left of the old city of Nanaimo. They are not concerned about building footprints, but are concerned about accessory buildings being built that are taller than some of the houses. NOCA would be okay with Recommendation No. 2 on the Staff Report.

A. Blakeman, a resident of the Old City neighbourhood, added that the neighbourhood is concerned about height of accessory buildings, and not about carriage houses being added to the neighbourhood. Many residents have secondary suites, so are not opposed to densification.

J. Routledge noted it is the form and character of the neighbourhood that residents of the Old City are trying to preserve. The Zoning Bylaw’s purpose is to manage growth of a neighbourhood and city as a whole, so it is an inappropriate tool with respect to design; but efforts to increase density should be supported. There are more appropriate ways to manage it.

C. Sholberg advised that Intensive Residential development permits provide for development permit and design review processes intended to ensure infill developments, such as new infill single family residential and detached secondary suite developments, fit the context of existing neighbourhoods.

#### Committee Comments

The Committee inquired whether an Intensive Residential development permit area would be a good tool to control the size of an accessory building, and noted that if tall accessory buildings are already being noticed in the neighbourhood, creating another process might take too long to deter them. Another concern is that even with a development permit area, the neighbourhood could end up with inappropriate sized accessory buildings.

C. Sholberg replied that development permit areas are basically used to influence design, whereas building size is dealt with through the zoning bylaw. There would be some cost associated with obtaining the permit, and some “fine-tuning” could be done to the development permit area to provide some exemptions.

MOVED by S. Lance, SECONDED by F. Pattje to recommend that Council approve Option No. 2 in the Staff report to PNAC dated 2012-JAN-17.

CARRIED

MOVED by R. Meyerhoff, SECONDED by M. Savory to recommend to Council that duplexes be permitted on corner lots in the Old City neighbourhood.

CARRIED

iii. Bylaw 4500 - General Amendments

MOVED by F. Pattje, SECONDED by S. Lance to recommend that Council approve the proposed general amendments.

D. Stewart explained each of the proposed 20 revisions.

Committee Comments

The Committee inquired how the proposed 20 metre setback on the Parkway would affect properties that have been granted a relaxed setback, and how the extension of Boxwood Road would be affected.

D. Stewart advised that those properties would continue under previous approvals, so nothing would change. With regard to Boxwood Road, any issues can be addressed through a variance process.

The motion carried.

**10. Next Meeting**

The next regular meeting of PNAC is scheduled for 2011-FEB-21.

**11. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 6:20 pm.