

**AMENDED MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC HEARING HELD PURSUANT TO THE
LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT, IN THE VANCOUVER ISLAND CONFERENCE CENTRE,
SHAW AUDITORIUM, 101 GORDON STREET, NANAIMO, BC,
ON THURSDAY, 2011-APR-14, TO CONSIDER AMENDMENTS TO
THE CITY OF NANAIMO "ZONING BYLAW 1993 NO. 4000"**

PRESENT: His Worship Mayor J.R. Ruttan, Chair
Councillor W.L. Bestwick
Councillor G.E. Greves
Councillor W.J. Holdom
Councillor D.K. Johnstone
Councillor J.A. Kipp
Councillor J.F. Pattje
Councillor L.J. Sherry
Councillor M.W. Unger

STAFF: A. Tucker, Director of Planning
J. Holm, Manager, Planning Section
J. Horn, Social Planner, Community Planning Section
S. Herrera, Planner, Planning Section
P. Masse, Planning Clerk, Planning Section

PUBLIC: There were approximately 300 members of the public present.

CALL TO ORDER:

Mayor Ruttan called the meeting to order at 7:06pm and advised that members of City Council, as established by provincial case law, cannot accept any further submissions or comments from the public following the close of a Public Hearing. Mr. Holm explained the required procedures in conducting a Public Hearing and the regulations contained within Section 892 of the *Local Government Act*. He advised that this is the final opportunity to provide input to Council before consideration of Third Reading of Bylaws No. 4000.497, 4000.499, 4000.501, 4000.502, 4000.503, 4000.504, 4000.505, 4000.507, 4000.508, 4000.506 and a covenant amendment at the Council meeting of 2011-MAY-02.

1. BYLAW NO. 4000.497:

RA261 – 6001 Pine Ridge Crescent

This bylaw, if adopted, will rezone the subject property from Single Family Residential Zone (RS-1) to Residential Duplex Zone (RM-1) in order to facilitate subdivision and construction of two duplex lots. The subject property is legally described as LOT 15, DISTRICT LOT 30, WELLINGTON DISTRICT, PLAN 22185 (6001 Pine Ridge Crescent).

Mr. Steve Halliday, 6001 Pine Ridge Crescent – Applicant Representative

- Hopes to rezone the subject property from Single Family Residential (RS-1) Zone to Residential Duplex (RM-1) Zone in order to facilitate the construction of two duplex lots. Purpose is to strata the duplexes and create four new homes, none of which would contain secondary suites. Will live on the property.

Mr. Geoffrey Spooner, 6031 Pine Ridge Crescent - Opposed

- Primary concerns are increases in traffic and parking; to date there have been 146 complaints lodged regarding street parking on Pine Ridge Crescent.
- Children are at danger, as are the patrons of the church, which is located at the end of the cul-de-sac.
- Believes the proposal should contain one duplex, as he fears two duplexes could turn into fourplexes, which would create a dangerous increase in vehicles for the street.

Councillor Holdom asked for clarification regarding whether or not the subject property could be subdivided to provide for two single family homes, each with a secondary suite, under existing zoning.

Mr. Holm confirmed that two single family homes with secondary suites could be proposed under existing zoning.

Councillor Holdom asked for confirmation that the rezoning application does not increase the density of what is currently permitted on the subject property.

Mr. Holm confirmed the rezoning application does not increase the density of what is currently permitted on the subject property.

Mayor Ruttan asked if concerns regarding parking have been addressed by Staff.

Mr. Holm noted that the proposed parking meets Parking Bylaw requirements.

There were two written (attached as "Attachment A – Submissions for Bylaw No. 4000.497") and two verbal submissions received for this application.

2. BYLAW NO. 4000.499:***RA262 – Part of 2469 Labieux Road and 2368 Barclay Road***

This bylaw, if adopted, will rezone the subject properties from Single Family Residential Zone (RS-1) and Single Family Mobile Home Residential Zone (RS-3) to Low Density Multiple Family Residential (Townhouse) Zone (RM-3) in order to facilitate construction of a multiple family residential development. The subject properties are legally described as part of LOT A, SECTION 19, RANGE 6, MOUNTAIN DISTRICT, PLAN 21603 (part of 2469 Labieux Road); and LOT G, SECTION 19, RANGE 6, MOUNTAIN DISTRICT, PLAN 25481, MHR AD0034 (2368 Barclay Road).

Ms. Maureen Pilcher, Maureen Pilcher & Associates Ltd. – Applicant Representative

- Ms. Pilcher's presentation is attached as a part of "Attachment B – Submissions for Bylaw No. 4000.499".

Mayor Ruttan noted he had some previous concerns regarding access and egress for the subject property but has been reassured due to Fire Department approval of the plan.

Councillor Sherry asked for clarification regarding the intention of the road construction and whether or not it will continue through to Labieux Road.

Ms. Pilcher noted that the road construction would continue through to Labieux Road to allow traffic to exit there.

Ms. Judy Nelson, 2356 Barclay Road – Opposed

- Ms. Nelson's presentation is attached as a part of "Attachment B – Submissions for Bylaw No. 4000.499".

Mr. Craig Noshkin, 2374 Barclay Road – Opposed

- Does not like the idea of five families overlooking his fence and does not want a two-storey building near him or his neighbours. Believes there would be too many families in a small area.

Ms. Pilcher noted that the density of the project meets the goals and objectives of the OCP and is within the Neighbourhood designation density limitations. The Fire Department has vetted the application and access requirements for emergency vehicles have been met. Privacy fencing would be constructed at a height to the maximum of what is permitted. Invites to the public information meeting were forwarded to all residents along Barclay Road.

There were three written (see Attachment B) and three verbal submissions received for this application.

3. BYLAW NO. 4000.501:

RA256 – 6470 Metral Drive

This bylaw, if adopted, will rezone the subject property from Rural Agricultural / Residential Zone (A-2) to Regional Shopping Town Centre Commercial Zone (C-21) in order to facilitate development of commercial buildings. The subject property is legally described as THAT PART OF SECTION 12, WELLINGTON DISTRICT AS SHOWN ON STATUTORY RIGHT OF WAY PLAN VIP 79074 (6470 Metral Drive).

Mr. Eric Ching, Urban Design Group Architects Ltd. – Applicant Representative

- Property is located in a growing and established commercial corridor. Property is vacant and has been for quite a long time. Looking to establish a commercial development comprised of approximately 6,500ft² of multi-tenant, retail space within two buildings. Project will offer a variety of retail options within an essential commercial hub. Proposal is compatible with Official Community Plan and the proposed new Zoning Bylaw.

Mayor Ruttan asked if parking requirements have been met in the proposal.

Mr. Ching noted that the proposal provides for 26 parking stalls, which would provide two stalls above parking requirements.

There were no written and one verbal submission received for this application.

4. BYLAW NO. 4000.502:***RA268 – Part of 5494 Godfrey Road***

This bylaw, if adopted, will rezone part of the subject property from Single Family Residential Zone (RS-1) to Single Family Residential Small Lot Zone (RS-6) in order to facilitate a single family small-lot subdivision. The subject property is legally described as part of LOT 4, DISTRICT LOT 16, WELLINGTON DISTRICT, PLAN 2007, EXCEPT THOSE PARTS IN PLANS 22993, 35141 AND 38019 (Part of 5494 Godfrey Road).

Mr. Holm noted it was recommended in the Staff report to Council regarding this application that security of a covenant for road dedication and roadworks were required as a condition of rezoning. Upon further consultation with the Subdivision Approving Officer, it was identified that the roadworks can be secured through the subdivision process. In trying to alleviate some financial burden and increase the efficiency of processing, Staff would like to remove the covenant requirement from the conditions of rezoning approval.

Mr. Ken Grewal, 2090 Skaha Drive - Owner Representative

- Noted the existing house will remain on the single family lot with two Residential Small Lot (RS-6) Zone lots on either side. Due to the shape of the land the road portion of the property is in excess of 10,000ft²; therefore, the proposed single family lots are smaller than normal single family lots. The proposed lots will be in keeping with similar sized properties in the neighbourhood. Each lot will provide for ample parking.

Councillor Sherry asked if the applicant would be requesting any variances to any of the lots.

Mr. Grewal noted that no variances would be required for this proposal.

There were no written and one verbal submission received for this application.

5. BYLAW NO. 4000.503:***RA274 – 952 Wentworth Street***

This bylaw, if adopted, will rezone the subject property from Single Family Residential Zone (RS-1) to Single Family Residential Small Lot Zone (RS-6) in order to facilitate a two lot subdivision. The subject property is legally described as SECTION B, LOT 1, BLOCK S, SECTION 1, NANAIMO DISTRICT, PLAN 584 (952 Wentworth Street).

Mr. Ivan Plavetic, Lantzville, BC - Applicant

- Existing home would remain on property. However, if the home were moved or demolished plans are in place to widen the lane. Lots are relatively large.

Mr. Lawrence Rieper, 990 Campbell Street – Opposed

- Mr. Rieper's presentation, including a petition of opposition (155 Signatures), is attached as a part of "Attachment C - Submissions for Bylaw No. 4000.503".

Mr. Jim Routledge, 5858 Shadow Mountain Road – In Favour

- Effective application that is in line with the OCP and its sustainability goals, if we do not allow density of this nature then tax bills will continue to grow. Encouraged Council to respect the planning and work that has gone into the OCP by supporting applications like this.

Mr. Colin Cruikshank, 25 Gillespie Street - In Favour

- Believes the proposal will enhance the existing neighbourhood.

Mr. Wouter Bouman, 1001 Roxboro Place – Opposed

- Does not live in the neighbourhood but believes the developer is out to make fast money and destroy the existing neighbourhood.

Ms. Andrea Blakeman, 66 Kennedy Street – Opposed

- Lives in the neighbourhood and has invested time, money and energy into her property. Does not like the precedent this application could set if approved. The Old City Quarter is a special part of Nanaimo; she does not like infill and does not believe it fits the neighbourhood.

Ms. Heather Cooper, 629 Wentworth Street – Opposed

- Requested that her name be added to the petition of opposition for the proposal. Believes the heritage and character of the neighbourhood would be disrupted if the application were approved. Opposed to the subdivision as well. Believes the intent of the application is to make money.

Mr. Randy Aitken, 250 Pine Street – Opposed

- Concerned about available parking with an increase to densification; street parking in the neighbourhood is already a problem.

Ms. Michelle Sparks, 845 St. Andrews Street – Opposed

- Her father owned the subject property for 40 years; she grew up in the neighbourhood. Believes the heritage and family-orientated feel of the neighbourhood would be compromised if the application were to be approved. Will set a negative precedent.

Mr. Dean Forsyth, 48 Kennedy Street - Opposed

- Subject property is beautiful and he would not like to see it split, believes it would create access issues. Believes the lot is not suited for subdivision.

There were three written (see Attachment C) and ten verbal submissions received for this application.

6. BYLAW NO. 4000.504:

RA277 – 368 Hillcrest Drive

This bylaw, if adopted, will rezone the subject property from Single Family Residential Zone (RS-1) to Residential Duplex Zone (RM-1) in order to facilitate subdivision and construction of two duplex lots. The subject property is legally described as THAT PART OF SECTION 30, RANGE 5, SECTION 1, NANAIMO DISTRICT, PLAN 630, OUTLINED IN RED ON PLAN 461-R, EXCEPT PART IN PLANS 17699, 23894, 28966 AND 30286 (368 Hillcrest Avenue).

Mr. Keith Brown & Associates, 5102 Somerset - Applicant Representative

- Mr. Brown's presentation is attached as a part of "Attachment D - Submissions for Bylaw No. 4000.504".

Councillor Pattje asked how the changes in the application were communicated to the area residents and how it was received.

Mr. Brown noted that the neighbours directly across the street are still opposed to the proposal, even with the changes.

Ms. Barb Farkus, 363 Hillcrest Avenue – Opposed

- Submitted a petition of opposition (27 signatures). Believes this proposal is better than the previous application. Believes the quality of life will be diminished in the neighbourhood.

Ms. Hanne Maltesen, 391 Hillcrest Avenue – Opposed

- Ms. Maltesen's presentation is attached as a part of "Attachment D - Submissions for Bylaw No. 4000.504".

Mr. Richard Clarke, 367 Hillcrest Avenue – Opposed

- Does not want to see duplexes in the neighbourhood. Parking and traffic concerns remain.

Ms. Kara Arnold, 621 Foster Street – Opposed

- Duplexes would not fit into or compliment the neighbourhood.

Mr. Ole Maltesen, 391 Hillcrest Avenue – Opposed

- Asked for clarification regarding the subdivision of the subject property and why the plans indicate that it has already been subdivided.

Mr. Holm noted that the Subdivision Approving Officer has approved Preliminary Layout Acceptance (PLA); however, to the best of his knowledge the final subdivision has not been approved. Added that the plans noted are not an official document.

Ms. Natasha Clarke, 367 Hillcrest Avenue – Opposed

- Lives directly across the street from the subject property. Has concerns regarding the developers and the safety of fencing proposed. Believes there are already on-going concerns in the area and this would only make them worse.

Mr. Keith Brown & Associates, 5102 Somerset - Applicant Representative – Redress

- Noted that an active PLA approval has been given to the subdivision. The plan was revised due to previous input from the community indicating there is enough rental opportunities in the neighbourhood, which is why single family dwellings with secondary rental suites were not proposed.

There were two written (see Attachment D) and seven verbal submissions received for this application.

7. BYLAW NO. 4000.505:

RA269 – 5650 Hammond Bay Road

This bylaw, if adopted, will rezone the subject property from Single Family Residential Zone (RS-1) to Residential Triplex and Quadruplex Zone (RM-2) in order to facilitate construction of a multiple family residential development (4 units). The subject property is legally described as LOT 10, DISTRICT LOT 40, WELLINGTON DISTRICT, PLAN EPP9730 (5650 Hammond Bay Road).

Ms. Maureen Pilcher, Maureen Pilcher & Associates Ltd. – Applicant Representative

- Ms. Pilcher's presentation is attached as a part of "Attachment E – Submissions for Bylaw No. 4000.505".

There was one written (see Attachment E) and one verbal submission received for this application.

8. BYLAW NO. 4000.507:***RA276 – Part of 6414 Portsmouth Road***

This bylaw, if adopted, will rezone part of the subject property from Single Family Residential Zone (RS-1) to Residential Triplex and Quadruplex Zone (RM-2) in order to facilitate construction of a triplex. The subject property is legally described as part of LOT 65, DISTRICT LOT 28, WELLINGTON DISTRICT, PLAN 26689 (Part of 6414 Portsmouth Road).

Mr. Gur Manhas, Satgur Development Ltd. – Applicant Representative

- Mr. Manhas' presentation (including a petition of support (15 signatures) is attached as a part of "Attachment F – Submissions for Bylaw No. 4000.507".

Mayor Ruttan asked if a comprehensive survey of the neighbourhood was completed to ascertain if there is support for the proposal.

Mr. Manhas noted that the neighbour directly across the street is still opposed to the proposal but that the majority of the feedback was positive.

Mr. James Farkas, 6417 Portsmouth Road - Opposed

- Does not believe the subject property is suitable for multiple family housing. Traffic is dangerous now, does not want to add to it. Believes property values will decrease and the neighbourhood was designed for single family dwellings only.

Mr. Wayne Erickson, 6423 Southampton Road – Opposed

- Stated that he was not approached by the developer to ascertain if he is opposed or in favour of the proposal.
- Likes his privacy and would like it to remain as is. Traffic in the area is very busy already. Believes the neighbourhood should remain as single family dwellings as duplexes in the area are "undesirable".

Ms. Nadine Bombardir, 6420 Portsmouth Road – Opposed

- Stated that she was not approached by the developer to ascertain if he is opposed or in favour of the proposal.
- Ms. Bombardir's presentation, including a petition of opposition (15 signatures), are attached as a part of "Attachment F – Submissions for Bylaw No. 4000.507".

Councillor Unger asked for confirmation that the speaker had no contact or communication with the developer since the previous Public Hearing.

Ms. Bombardir stated that she has had no contact from the developer.

Mr. Gur Manhas, Satgur Development Ltd. – Applicant Representative - Redress

- Noted that this is an area of Nanaimo in transition; this is a new style of home that compliments what the OCP requires. Portsmouth Road is a major collector road in the Corridor area. The lots are larger in this area and this proposal attempts density in the spirit of OCP requirements. As much of the landscaping as possible will be preserved. Stated that he left a letter, including his contact information, at every neighbour residence and he cannot help it if they do not contact him in return. These will be strata units for sale that will be governed by the development permit, which would receive City approval before a building permit can be issued. There are three units proposed for the subject property.

There were four written (see Attachment F) and four verbal submissions received for this application.

9. BYLAW NO. 4000.508:

RA273 – 3440 Shenton Road

This bylaw, if adopted, will permit 'Automotive Sales and Rentals' as a site specific use within the Light Industrial Zone (I-2) at the subject property. The subject property is legally described as LOT 1, SECTION 3, WELLINGTON DISTRICT, PLAN 39277 (3440 Shenton Road)

Mr. Wouter Bouman, 1001 Roxboro Place – Opposed

- Asked why this application is being considered, as there has been a car rental business on the subject property for several months; asked if the use has been illegal during that time.

Mr. Holm noted that a car rental agency has been operating on the subject property; they have submitted a rezoning application to avoid enforcement action by the City pending the outcome of the application, as per Council direction.

There were no written and one verbal submission received for this application.

10. COVENANT AMENDMENT:

RA272 – 6700 Island Highway North - Costco

This application, if approved, will allow for an amendment to an existing covenant and add the use of 'Optical and Hearing Aid Sales and Services' to the list of permitted uses at the subject property (Costco). The subject property is legally described as LOT B, DISTRICT LOT 28, WELLINGTON DISTRICT, PLAN VIP55187 (6700 Island Highway North).

Mr. David Rogers, Costco Wholesale, USA – Applicant

- Mr. Rogers' presentation is attached as a part of "Attachment G – Submissions for Costco Covenant Amendment".

Councillor Holdom noted that several submissions regarding the application suggest that Costco is receiving preferential tax treatment on the subject property. Asked for current zoning confirmation.

Mr. Holm noted that the current zoning of the subject property is Woodgrove Regional Shopping Centre Town Centre Commercial (C-21) Zone, which applies to the majority of the land within the Woodgrove area.

Councillor Holdom asked for confirmation that there is no preferential tax treatment on the subject property and that Costco is being taxed as a retailer, not a wholesaler.

Mr. Holm stated that the commercial tax rate is applied to the subject property.

Mr. Rogers stated that he is unaware of any preferential tax treatment being applied to the Costco property.

Councillor Unger asked Staff for clarification on whether or not any other big retailers have similar covenants on their business.

Mr. Holm confirmed that no other big retailers have a similar covenant applied to their business; adding it is unusual to have this type of restriction on a big box retailer.

Mayor Ruttan asked if any big retailers in Nanaimo are currently offering hearing or optical services.

Mr. Holm noted that Superstore has an optical outlet; however, it is not under their branding, and WalMart offers optical services. He is not aware of any big box retailers offering hearing services.

Councillor Sherry noted that Costco was originally zoned 'warehouse' and there were concerns raised at that time that resulted in Costco agreeing via covenant that optical or hearing services would not be offered to their members .

Mr. Rogers stated that Costco had applied at the time to allow for pharmacy, optical and hearing services. There was opposition to the optical services; it was a business decision at the time to concentrate on pharmacy services; therefore, it was agreed via covenant to opt out of optical and hearing services.

Councillor Sherry asked for clarification on the zoning of the subject property versus the surrounding area; Woodgrove is under a Land Use Contract, which could be the reason different tax rates are used.

Mr. Holm confirmed that Staff would further clarify what tax implications are in relation to zoning for this and surrounding properties; however, it is his understanding that the subject property is commercially zoned and is therefore taxed at the appropriate commercial rate.

Ms. Valerie Fulford, 1382 Rose Ann Drive – In Favour

- Has worked at Costco for 24 years, 14 of which in Nanaimo.
- Submitted a petition of support with over 10,000 signatures (original, hard copy petition is located in the Legislative Services Department at City Hall).
- Nanaimo members do not understand why these services are not offered; all other Costco locations have optical and most offer hearing services.

- Members have to travel to Langford or Courtenay for these services; she would like to see those dollars spent locally. This should not affect local, smaller businesses; big box retailers already offer them and Costco would offer a somewhat more limited selection than existing, smaller providers, which can sometimes fulfil aspects within that model that Costco does not provide.

Dr. Michael Callum, 3138 Meadow Drive – Opposed

- Practicing Optometrist in Nanaimo for 23 years. Has attended previous meetings for similar applications from Costco. When they purchased the land it was zoned industrial; therefore, they did not have to purchase land with the same tax rate or expectations as when he purchased land.
- His staff is well-trained and well-paid, including benefits, and they are also very committed to supporting the community.
- Costco should have purchased land in a zone that permitted the services they are applying for. Then they would have had to pay what he had to pay in those zones, including taxes.
- Not afraid of the competition, he believes he can stand up to Costco on product, services and prices. Does not believe it is fair that a big company is not required to provide the landscaping or building requirements that he has provided to the City.

Councillor Unger noted that industrial lands are taxed higher than commercial lands.

Ms. Phyllis Slatnik, 2485 Rosstown Road – In Favour

- Member of Costco for 18 years since she moved from Red Deer, AB, which does offer hearing and optical services. Red Deer is comparable to Nanaimo in size. The elderly and persons on a pension should be offered these services at a price that they can afford.

Ms. Deborah Provencher, 2627 Starlight Trail – In Favour

- Believes there is an unfair prejudice against big box retailers suggesting they do not contribute to the community, when in fact they exceed the contributions of smaller businesses.
- Vancouver Island Vocational Rehabilitation Services has had a working relationship with Costco for 15 years; they employ and create specific jobs for the disabled of the community. No one else in Nanaimo employs as many people with significant disabilities as Costco does.

Mr. David Thompson, 6718 Medd Road – Opposed

- This application has been before Council twice previously. When does “no” mean “no”?
- Tax rate versus taxes; the building was built in the early 1990’s as a warehouse store at a significantly lower assessment.
- The building was not built to the standards of other commercial properties. They did not need to have quality street buildings, such as other existing big box retailers.
- Concerned that a large American corporation is not held to the same standards as other smaller or big box retailers.

Ms. Sarah Toms, 5360 - 32nd Avenue, Port Alberni – Opposed

- Former resident of Nanaimo, represents one of the five hearing care clinics that presently occupy the city.
- Concerned about the continued quality of health care provision for the hearing-impaired population; does not believe Costco is not a suitable environment to ensure a medical-based service. Hearing care clinics do not only sell hearing aids they providing hearing health care, using communication with physicians and ear, nose and throat doctors, not just selling products. She provides hearing solutions for her clients.
- Wants Council to be aware that hearing care clinics are committed to the communities they work within. The services are provided without being restricted to a membership.
- There is a large tourist market on the island; often tourists will request repairs to hearing aids purchased at Costco from another city. Costco is the only provider of hearing care, which will not share its programming software with other clinics.
- The hearing clinics of Nanaimo work hard to ensure that if a client is eligible to be covered by Veterans Affairs Canada, First Nations Health or Work Safe BC, funding is sought for these clients. They cannot compete with a company as large or powerful as Costco but, wants Council to know she is committed to the hearing health care of Vancouver Island.
- Dismayed to see there is no public health audiology health provision for adults in BC. There is an existing network with physicians and doctors under the provision of the BC licensing board for hearing health care providers, there is constant communication, which does not involve sales.

Councillor Unger asked what the professional qualification requirements for hearing care clinic employees are.

Ms. Toms noted that there are two qualifications, Masters of Audiology which would make you a Certified Audiologist or Registered Member of the Hearing Instrument Specialist Board of BC.

Councillor Unger asked if these qualifications require university training.

Ms. Toms noted that both qualifications require a two-year university program.

Mr. David Hahn, 6217 Cosgrove Crescent – General Manager, Costco Nanaimo

- Has been employed with Costco for 21 years, recently moved to Nanaimo in September after being promoted. Costco employs 260 Nanaimo residents and has a payroll of over \$7,000,000 annually. Contributes a lot to the community. The optical and hearing services would abide by the regulations and policies of the governing bodies of BC. Costco provides excellent customer service and will continue to do so.

Dr. Dave Merfield, 143 Commercial Street / 1500 Waddington – Opposed

- Owns and operates four clinics on Vancouver Island. Currently lives in Qualicum Beach and is a previous resident of Nanaimo.
- Does not believe all Costco profits remain in Canada. Private practitioners are invested in Nanaimo, have built buildings that improve the quality of the city and provide on-going care of their patients.
- Believes that professionals that work for someone else tend to be transient.

- There are several retail outlets in Nanaimo that provide discounted services or products, and most clinics offer a range of services and products that can fit every budget.
- Believes people were pressured to sign the petition of approval.

Mr. Fred Taylor, 204 Emery Way – In Favour

- Costco should be able to offer hearing and optical services and products just as the other big retailers in town are able to offer them.

Mr. Wouter Bouman, 1001 Roxboro Place – In Favour

- Has been a member of Costco for 18 years, they always provide quality products and services.
- Believes private practitioners make much more money than professionals working at Costco do. Believes a discounted service should be available to senior citizens.

Ms. Jacqueline Forrester, #9 – 1630 Crescent View Drive – In Favour

- Mother has been a Costco employee for 11 years; they are supportive of their workers and their members are happy. They always provide excellent customer service. Believes they should be allowed to alter the covenant, the neighbourhood and area has changed so should their restrictions.

Ms. Michelle Catley, 2165 Nictash Place – Opposed

- Believes the covenant was agreed upon and should remain intact. Discussion should revolve around the covenant only.

Ms. Tracy Williams, 450 Diamond Boulevard – Costco Representative

- Noted that the covenant was registered in 1993; change is a positive thing and Nanaimo is moving forward. Costco has the right and opportunity to bring this application forward.

Councillor Pattje asked for clarification regarding the statement made regarding Costco being unwilling to share software.

Ms. Williams noted that she is unsure of the validity of the statement.

Mr. Tucker noted that the statement may be in reference to patient confidentiality; because the information is not on a centralized system and each audiology clinic operates independently, there is an issue of privacy. Staff will investigate further and advise Council.

Mr. Stephen Lupton, 2725 Country Club Drive – In Favour

- Has lived in Nanaimo for 41 years. Believes residents should be able to choose where they want to shop for products or services. Costco does a lot for the community.

Mr. Ken Galusha – #312 - 1633 Dufferin Crescent – Opposed

- Does not agree with having to pay a membership fee to shop.

There were 28 written (see Attachment G) and 16 verbal submissions received for this application.

The Hearing continued to 11:06pm when the Mayor recessed the Public Hearing. The above agenda items are now closed Public Hearing items. The minutes and report for Bylaw 4000.506 (RA270 / 1406 Bowen Road) will be brought forward at a later date following the close of the Public Hearing for that item.

Certified Correct:

Jeremy Holm
Manager, Planning Section
Community Safety & Development

/pm
Council: 2011-MAY-02
G:\Devplan\Files\Admin\0575\2011\Minutes\2011Apr14 PH Minutes.doc