



MINUTES
planNANAIMO ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING HELD TUESDAY, 2009-JUN-16 AT 5:00 PM
BOARD ROOM, CITY HALL, 455 WALLACE STREET

PRESENT:

Bill Holdom, Chair
Carey Avender
Michael Harrison
Ric Kelm
Ralph Meyerhoff
Nadine Schwager
Joan Wagner

Brian Anderson
Allan Davidson
John Hofman
Darwin Mahlum
Michael Schellinck
Gord Turgeon

REGRETS:

Ryan Brown
Jane Gregory

Chris Erb
Shirley Lance

STAFF:

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

OTHER:

Rob Parker, Applicant
Maureen Pilcher, Applicant
Will Melville, Delinea Design Consultants Ltd.
Chris Lundy, Applicant
Leif Rosvold, Applicant
Bill Lawson, Applicant
Fred Pattje, City Councillor
Diana Johnstone, City Councillor

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 5:00 pm.

2. Adoption of Minutes from 2009-MAY-19

MOVED by G. Turgeon, SECONDED by R. Meyerhoff that the Minutes from
2009-MAY-19 be adopted. CARRIED

3. Approval of Agenda and Late Items

MOVED by M. Harrison, SECONDED by J. Wagner that the Agenda be approved with
the addition of the following item under New Business:

- Sequence of when PNAC reviews rezoning applications. CARRIED

4. Correspondence

None.

5. Presentations

a. City Statistics

J. Horn presented neighbourhood statistics on population, housing, rental housing, income, family structure, recent immigration, immigration, visible minorities/aboriginal identity, and educational attainment. Maps provided a visual example of demographic information and trends throughout Nanaimo, and consisted of information from a variety of sources including 2006 Census Canada statistics. Some points noted were:

Population

- The highest density area is Townsite – the lowest is Chase River.
- There is no apparent ghettoization across the city.

Rental Housing

- There is a minimal amount of row housing in Nanaimo.
- There is a higher number of single family dwellings in Nanaimo than most cities.
- Hammond Bay has the highest number of single family homes.
- The most balanced area of single-family and multi-family is Townsite.

Rental Housing vs Home Ownership

- Townsite is 50/50 (rental/ownership).
- Hammond Bay has 90% home ownership, which means it is not accessible to all. Basement suites will alleviate that somewhat, opening it to a range of income levels.
- Harewood is 68/32 (rental/ownership).
- The average rent ranges from \$825/mo in Hammond Bay to \$675/mo in Harewood. That is not a very large difference. Therefore, if your income is \$23,000/yr, it will be a struggle to live anywhere in Nanaimo.

Income

- Income levels rise as you go north – there is a huge difference in household income from one end of the city to the other (i.e. \$100,000/yr in Hammond Bay, and \$44,000/yr in Harewood). However, the larger homes in Hammond Bay may house more people, reflecting the higher household income.

Family Structure

- There are more homes in the north with four to five people in their households than in Harewood, which has more two-person households.
- 80% of lone parents are women.

Immigration

- Southeast Asians are most predominant.
- Aboriginal people are disinclined to live in the north end of the city.

Educational Attainment

- There is a balance of “white collar” and “blue collar” workers across the city.

John was thanked for his presentation and left the meeting.

6. Information Items

a. Neighbourhood Area Planning

D. Jensen advised that staff have initiated the South End and Newcastle Neighbourhood planning processes. It is anticipated that preliminary information will be provided to PNAC at their October meeting.

7. Old Business

None.

8. New Business

a. Rezoning Applications

i. 1910 and 1920 East Wellington Road (RA217)

S. Herrera introduced this application which is for a site specific text amendment to the Light Industrial Zone (I-2) in order to permit the use of 'Boat and Marine Equipment Sales, Service and Rentals'.

Rob Parker, applicant, advised that he was previously granted a temporary use permit to occupy the site, and as that has now expired, he is applying to rezone the property for permanent use. An issue he is facing is the amount of space remaining for storage if he adheres to the required buffer. As he is struggling with a theft issue, he is trying to balance what is best for the city but not totally blocking off a view to the site. The natural buffer inside the property line cuts use of the property down by 60% and does not give him room to put boats on the outside of it. He does not have the revenue to reforest the whole side of the property.

S. Herrera clarified the buffer referred to by the applicant is the Parkway buffer, and that the property is located within a DP area.

PNAC Comments

B. Holdom noted that City staff are of the opinion that the application complies with the intent of the OCP.

MOVED by R. Meyerhoff, SECONDED by J. Wagner to recommend that Council approve RA217. CARRIED

Mr. Parker left the meeting.

ii. 5220 Metral Drive (RA218)

S. Herrera introduced this application, which proposes to rezone from Single Family Residential Zone (RS-1) to Comprehensive Development Zone (CD-6) in order to facilitate the construction of a mixed-use development.

M. Pilcher read out a prepared brief and displayed diagrams of the proposed development. They are striving to achieve a balance of residential and corridor activity, consisting of a mix of residential and commercial uses. A traffic study calculated to 2020 has been submitted to the City, as well as a tree management plan. A landscape plan will be submitted at the development permit stage. They expect to use energy conservation methods, on-site storm water management, and oil/water separators for parking lot drainage. Public consultation was held and concerns noted were regarding increased traffic and parking along Metral Drive. The developer proposes to incorporate a bus shelter and deceleration lane into the frontage which should deter parking along that stretch of road.

PNAC Comments

The Committee inquired about the impact on the Mostar/Metral intersection, and what is meant by “innovative design” when referring to proposed sustainable features of the development.

M. Pilcher replied that the City’s Engineering Department gave the developer a list of parameters to consider when preparing the traffic study, and the intersection at Mostar/Metral was not included in those.

She advised that the developer is a proponent of LEED design. Mr. Lundy noted that they would incorporate the highest level of environmentally conscious design that the consumers would be willing to pay for in order to make the development marketable, and would endeavour to reach a built green standard.

When asked what community contribution the developer will provide, Ms. Pilcher stated that the City’s requirements will be met, but the developer would like it to be used to enhance the neighbourhood area. The Committee encouraged staff to request a significant community contribution.

S. Herrera responded that staff would consider the applicant’s proposal, but will look at what has been contributed by other developments in order to be consistent. An option that has been considered for other developments is to have green features included in the development as the community contribution.

Discussion ensued regarding the development’s proposed on-site storm water management, and why DCC’s still have to be paid if theoretically, there is no infrastructure demand.

MOVED by M. Schellinck, SECONDED by N. Schwager that the applicant be encouraged to pursue green design elements, and that PNAC recommend that Council approve RA218. CARRIED

iii. 6057 Doumont Road (RA221)

S. Herrera introduced this application, which proposes to rezone the above-noted property from Single Family Residential Zone (RS-1) to Medium Density Multiple Family Residential (Suburban) Zone (RM-5) in order to facilitate the construction of a multi-family residential development.

The Applicant advised that the proposed development would fit in with the Corridor designation, that it is well under the height restriction and maximum density allowed, that there would be no on-street parking, and that the ALR

property owner nearby is in favour of it. Their suggestion for use of their community contribution would be for enhancements to the park across the road.

PNAC Comments

The Committee inquired about the proposed lot coverage, whether green or sustainable features were going to be incorporated into the development, and what the surrounding uses are.

The Applicant replied that the proposed lot coverage is 40%. They are not yet at the stage of determining whether green features will be used, but will work towards that. The surrounding properties are the Kingdom Hall and several parcels of approximately one-acre lots.

The Committee also asked how wide the 'Corridor' was, and whether there is going to be more community consultation. Comments were made that the development appears too dense and bulky, and out of context with the surrounding neighbourhood.

D. Jensen advised that this property is on the edge of the Corridor designation. The applicant noted that the public hearing will be the public's next chance to comment, and with respect to the Committee's density concerns, there are already multi-family developments and mobile home parks nearby.

MOVED by M. Schellinck, SECONDED by J. Wagner to recommend that Council reject RA221. DEFEATED

MOVED by B. Anderson, SECONDED by M. Schellinck to recommend that the application be approved by Council subject to consultation with neighbours and substantial design work being done on the buildings prior to it proceeding to Council. CARRIED

Mr. Rosvold and Mr. Lawson left the meeting.

b. Rezoning Application Timeline

The Chair voiced concerns about rezoning applications coming before PNAC at different stages. He asked the Committee whether it would be better for them to review the applications early in the process so that they could give staff reactive feedback, or after referral comments have been received by staff.

PNAC Comments

The Committee thought it was imperative that the affected neighbourhood be consulted prior to an application coming before PNAC, and that those comments be in the staff report that PNAC receives. They questioned whether the roles of PNAC and the previous Rezoning Advisory Committee are cohesive.

D. Jensen noted that PNAC's official role is to manage the OCP, and with regard to rezoning applications, look at whether the proposed development complies with the OCP and ties in with the neighbourhood. She reiterated that the applications could come before PNAC after referral comments have been received back by City staff.

The Chair noted that simply considering whether a development adheres to the OCP is too mechanistic. Developments should be considered site by site as to their context and whether they fit in with the neighbourhood and future neighbourhood. What needs to be decided is where in the process does PNAC want to be?

MOVED by J. Wagner, SECONDED by G. Turgeon that rezoning applicants be required to bring forth input from the community surrounding their proposed developments, to City staff prior to the application coming before PNAC. CARRIED

c. Regional Growth Strategy Review

Consideration of the following remaining RGS backgrounders was deferred to the next meeting.

9. Next Meeting

The next regular meeting of PNAC is scheduled for 2009-JUL-21.

10. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:10 pm.

File: 0360-20-P07-02

g:\commplan\pnac\agendas minutes\2009\agendas\2009 06 16 pnac minutes.doc

APPROVED:

Chair

Date