



MINUTES
planNANAIMO ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING HELD TUESDAY, 2011-MAR-15 AT 5:00 PM
BOARD ROOM, CITY HALL, 455 WALLACE STREET

PRESENT:

Bill Holdom, Chair
Sarah Boyd
Chris Erb
Ric Kelm
Ralph Meyerhoff
Nadine Schwager
Clem Trombley

Brian Anderson
Allan Davidson
John Hofman
Darwin Mahlum
Meg Savory
Randall Taylor

REGRETS:

Carey Avender
Shirley Lance

Michael Harrison
Pete Sabo

STAFF:

Deborah Jensen, Community Development Planner
Sheila Herrera, Planner, Current Planning
John Horn, Social Planner
Dave Stewart, Planner, Current Planning
Cindy Hall, Recording Secretary

OTHER:

G. Constable, Broad Commercial Management Inc.
W. Melville, deline design consultants ltd.
J. Gorosh, The John Gorosh Co. Ltd.
G. Minhas, Satgur Development Inc.
8 members of the public

1. Call to Order

Chair Holdom called the meeting to order at 5:00 pm.

2. Adoption of Minutes from 2011-FEB-15

MOVED by C. Erb, SECONDED by A. Davidson that the Minutes from 2011-Feb-15 be adopted. CARRIED

3. Approval of Agenda and Late Items

MOVED by B. Anderson, SECONDED by R. Meyerhoff that the Agenda be approved as presented. CARRIED

4. Correspondence

5. Presentations

6. Information Items

7. Old Business

8. New Business

a. Rezoning Applications

i. RA269 – 5650 Hammond Bay Road

To allow for a multi-family residential development (four detached units).

S. Herrera introduced the application.

W. Melville stated that the proposed development would be a good fit with the Neighbourhood designation of the OCP. Four detached units with square footages of between 1100 and 1300 are proposed to be sold. The configuration qualifies as infill, has a courtyard, and will not differ significantly from existing homes in the single family neighbourhood. The cluster configuration is innovative and will appeal to a broad demographic.

G. Constable advised that the neighbourhood was canvassed, and the residents that would be most impacted by the proposed development supported it.

W. Melville added that it is Mr. Constable's everyday practice to build green.

Committee Comments

The Committee inquired about the affordability of the units, whether they would be strata, and about potential parking problems.

W. Melville responded that there is economy in building small, and that the detached units would be more affordable than if they built a fourplex. With respect to parking, there will be two spots allocated to each unit, and onstreet parking will also be available.

G. Constable advised that the development would be a land strata.

MOVED by B. Anderson, SECONDED by C. Erb to recommend that Council approve RA269. CARRIED

G. Constable and W. Melville left the meeting.

ii. RA270 – 1406 Bowen Road

To allow for a 35-unit supportive housing project.

S. Herrera introduced the application.

J. Horn advised that in 2008, City Council commissioned an action plan to address the need for affordable housing in Nanaimo and to deal with homelessness. They subsequently adopted "Nanaimo's Response to Homelessness Action Plan", entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with

BC Housing, and agreed to partner in the construction of 160 units of affordable housing to house the homeless and those at risk of homelessness. The City will provide the land for the projects, and pay the development cost charges out of the Housing Legacy Fund. BC Housing will pay for construction and staffing of the projects.

The project planned for 1406 Bowen Road will be a standard apartment building with 300 ft² self contained bachelor apartments. The ground floor will be devoted to the non-profit society that will manage the building, which will be staffed 24/7. The project will be in line with density along Bowen Road, and once developed, will provide one parking spot for every 10 units. Most of the traffic to and from the site will be generated by the staff of the building. A small residual parcel will be subdivided off and made available to the private sector for development. The project will be built by BC Housing to LEED standards, and will have a high level of environmental sensitivity.

Committee Comments

The Committee inquired about access to the property, and questioned the distribution of the supportive housing projects, as two appear to be close together and near a school.

J. Horn advised that there will be pedestrian access to the front of the project off of Bowen Road, and vehicular access off of White Street at the rear.

Regarding the supportive housing sites, J. Horn advised that these sites will be distributed throughout the community. For the two sites in question, he advised that BC Housing chose the sites from ones suggested by the City. Originally 105 units were planned for the two sites, but in response to concerns from residents in the area, the City suggested to BC Housing that 35 of those units be situated in the north end.

The Committee inquired whether potential traffic had been considered, and questioned access configuration from White Street for the main site and the piece being subdivided if the driveways are not done in conjunction. They also stated that there needs to be reassurance that supportive housing is not also built on the piece being subdivided off.

J. Horn advised that a traffic impact study was done for the proposed project and it was determined that impact will be minimal. It is not expected that the residents will have cars, so traffic will be generated mainly by staff. He stated that the private sector does not typically build supportive housing, and that staff would note the Committee's concern about access to the two pieces.

Public Comments

Members of the public in attendance asked PNAC to consider the OCP, and to listen to the neighbourhood voice. They advised that businesses in the neighbourhood are opposed to this rezoning, and questioned whether City staff expected the market to buy the piece being subdivided off when it would be next to low barrier housing.

Committee Comments

The Committee inquired what would happen to the funding if this rezoning did not proceed, and whether it is possible to move proposed projects to different sites.

J. Horn replied that the entire initiative could collapse if the City does not adhere to its obligations under the Memorandum of Understanding with BC Housing. The City does not know whether BC Housing would approve moving projects to different properties, but are awaiting a reply from them with respect to adding a property.

MOVED by R. Meyerhoff, SECONDED by D. Mahlum to recommend that Council approve RA270.

MOVED by R. Meyerhoff, SECONDED by R. Taylor that the motion be tabled.
CARRIED

MOVED by A. Davidson, SECONDED by D. Mahlum that the motion be lifted from the table.
CARRIED

The motion carried.

MOVED by R. Meyerhoff, SECONDED by C. Trombley to recommend that the project have a cap of 36 units, and that a covenant be placed on the site that no further social housing be built on it.

Committee Comments

The Committee inquired whether a covenant could also be placed on the piece of property being subdivided off.

J. Horn replied that because social housing is built by the government, and not the market, that would not be necessary.

The motion carried.

iii. RA273 – 3440 Shenton Road

To allow for an automobile/truck rental facility.

S. Herrera introduced the application.

J. Gorosh advised that the businesses surrounding his property are primarily automotive, and that the proposed use is supported by the OCP.

Committee Comments

The Committee inquired whether permitting this text amendment is actually increasing non industrial use of industrial land.

S. Herrera replied that this application is site specific.

MOVED by N. Schwager, SECONDED by C. Trombley to recommend that Council approve RA273. CARRIED

iv. RA276 – 6414 Portsmouth Road

To allow for a triplex.

S. Herrera introduced the application. She noted that Council previously rejected the applicant's request for five units, so he is now proposing three units. Although three units is below the Corridor range of density, staff is supportive of the proposal.

G. Minhas advised the development has been scaled down, will have no variances, and will include green features.

MOVED by M. Savory, SECONDED by R. Taylor to recommend that Council approve RA276. CARRIED

b. Zoning Bylaw Review

D. Stewart proceeded with a review of the sections contained in the proposed new Zoning Bylaw (overview attached).

Committee Comments

The Committee inquired whether the Zoning Bylaw would include a definition of 'Development Cost Charges'. D. Stewart advised the Zoning Bylaw does not refer to DCCs, and that such definition would be included in the Development Cost Charge Bylaw. The Committee disagreed with such definition only being in the DCC bylaw because if the use is found in another zone, the greater amount must be paid (for example, commercial vs. industrial).

The Chair inquired what zones will permit rooming houses. D. Stewart replied they will be permitted in most multi-family zones and some commercial zones.

The Committee inquired whether consideration had been given to regulating urban food gardens as a percentage of lot size, rather than size. D. Stewart advised that had been considered but there was concern about larger pieces of land generating more noise. Also, smaller pieces of property would have difficulty meeting certain percentages.

The Committee discussed urban food gardens at length and suggested that on site sales be permitted, as well as the ability to bring composting items to the site.

M. Savory advised that she would take the proposed regulations regarding urban food gardens back to ACES for review.

Allowable sizes of accessory buildings were discussed, and D. Stewart stated that staff would consider requiring the allowable size to be smaller than the principle building on the site, rather than the current total allowable gross floor area of 70m².

R. Meyerhoff left the meeting.

Decreasing minimum lot sizes in Residential zones was discussed. D. Stewart advised that residents in the Westwood area were opposed to a reduction in minimum lot size in their area, so staff are considering the addition of an R1-A zone. They are also considering having that zone available to other areas if requested.

The Committee inquired whether staff would do the same in the future if a zone does not fit an area, or if the area would have to comply. Other comments were that such an exception should only be done for a very good reason; whether all neighbourhoods should have the opportunity; whether it is appropriate for certain areas to be exempt from the minimum lot size; that small lots may not be appropriate "across the board", but the opportunity should exist to rezone them to a smaller size; and that form and character needs to be retained in neighbourhoods.

M. Savory noted that ACES supports small lot sizes.

C. Trombley left the meeting.

The review of the proposed new Zoning Bylaw sections will continue at the next meeting.

9. Next Meeting

The next regular meeting of PNAC is scheduled for 2011-APR-19.

10. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:03 pm.