

**MINUTES OF THE PLAN NANAIMO ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD ON TUESDAY, 2008-FEB-19 AT 5:00 P.M., IN THE
BOARD ROOM, CITY HALL, 455 WALLACE STREET**

Present:

Councillor Bill Holdom	David Hill-Turner
Gail Adrienne	Shirley Lance
Brian Anderson	Darwin Mahlum
Jolyon Brown	Ralph Meyerhoff
Bill Forbes	Gord Turgeon
Jane Gregory	Nadine Schwager

Staff:

Jerry Berry, City Manager
Ted Swabey, General Manager, Development Services
Andrew Tucker, Director, Planning & Development
Bruce Anderson, Manager, Community Planning
Deborah Jensen, Community Development Planner
Fran Grant (Recording Secretary)

Regrets:

Carey Avender	Michael Geselbracht
Chris Erb	Michael Schellinck

1. Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order by Chair B. Holdom at 5:05 p.m.

2. Adoption of Minutes for 2008-JAN-15:

MOVED by S. Lance, SECONDED by B. Forbes, that the minutes of 2008-JAN-15 be adopted as presented.

CARRIED

3. Approval of Agenda and Late Items:

A revised agenda with a new item 7 a) Revised UCB, was distributed.

Late Items:

- a) Throne Speech – potential mental health facilities in OCP (B Holdom)
- b) DCCs (Brian Anderson)

MOVED by B. Forbes, SECONDED by D. Hill-Turner, that the revised Agenda be approved with the addition of two late items.

CARRIED

4. Correspondence:

No correspondence.

5. **Presentations:**

Chair B. Holdom gave a brief update on the staff report to Council on 2008-FEB-18:

- Staff presented revised UCB to Council.
- Previous option presented to Council recommended the UCB be extended to City limits.
- Has now been revised with some inclusions/exclusions.
- Council has referred the issue of UCB location to PNAC.

J. Berry gave a presentation on the revised UCB option and noted:

- Trying to reconcile growth with the environment.
- Met with Smart Growth BC to discuss the UCB options.
- Different type of sprawl on Vancouver Island than other areas of the province.
- Had meeting with the RDN and other local municipalities about the UCB. Each has a different meaning for their UCB.
- The City recognized what municipalities are doing, so are focusing on a modified UCB and locating some lands outside the UCB, as shown in the new Option 2.
- Lands proposed for outside the UCB include, for example, DL 56, Brannen Lake area, ALR lands, and Buttertubs.
- UCBs don't stop development or protect from development.
- New option more accurately describes what we intend, and identifies lands we don't see developing in the near future, but doesn't change the level of protection.

Maps showing Option 1, Option 2, and the UCB Through Time were distributed. A. Tucker gave an overview of each map and noted:

- UCB Through Time shows location of UCB from three previous OCPs.
- Option 1 shows UCB at City boundary.
- Option 2 shows UCB with some changes from current location:
 - ALR lands around Brannen Lake and the Correction Centre moved outside UCB.
 - DL 56 has been moved outside UCB.
 - ALR lands in the Millstone Valley, including Buttertubs Marsh, moved outside UCB.
 - Jingle Pot area has been included inside the UCB, and identified with an Urban Reserve designation.
 - Federal and Provincial lands are located outside the UCB, as well as Colliery Dam Park and the Greater Nanaimo Water District lands.
 - Nanaimo Estuary (which is mostly ALR and ESAs) is located outside UCB.
 - Properties not noted above would be included inside the UCB.
 - When UCB was set at the City boundary, 5500 acres would have been included; with option 2, that has been reduced to 2344 acres.
- Linley Valley and Jingle Pot area are now designated Urban Reserve, with a policy requiring a comprehensive plan be developed for each area. This would more specifically consider land use and provision of services for the area.

Bruce Anderson added that those lands set outside the UCB in Option 2 are also meant to form a green buffer zone outside the City.

J. Berry spoke about servicing and noted:

- Issue about where the core of the city is.
- Current policies are about managing growth.
- Now need to stop sprawl and move density into the city.
- Now cheaper to live outside the City, but setting costs on a gradient scale would solve this problem. This would look at who is paying for services, more efficient use of those services and the costs of environmental impacts, etc.
- Need to make it advantageous to build environmentally sensitive structures.

J. Berry gave the following answers to questions from the Committee:

- Hesitant to move all parks outside the UCB, other than Colliery Dam, Buttertubs Marsh and Westwood Lake, as there are other ways to protect them. Moving all parks outside the UCB might prevent any building in parks, such as recreation centres. Newcastle Island is in partnership with SFN.
- There are social and environmental costs to large lot development outside the City limits. Those property owners don't pay for soft city services such as use of recreational facilities. Don't want to stop people from building there, but would like them to pay their way.
- Cable Bay will develop in some form in the future; the choice is whether we want to see very low density or high density.

PNAC commented:

- Changes to DCCs will add additional charges for three and fourplex developments. This type of building has been a good form of affordable housing but the additional cost will now make them less affordable.
- Have to look at reducing cost of living in the core area; a range of incomes are present in this area.
- Some of the rural areas are not just used for homes but for business owners who need storage for their machinery and business equipment.
- Our downtown may end up being the more desirable place to live.
- Disturbed at last meeting about moving UCB without any input from PNAC. UCB is important and the purpose of it is to keep growth focused inside UCB. Think that somehow we, as a group and a community, along with elected officials, need to work with the RDN or provincial government on what is happening outside our communities. Pleased that UCB is being reconsidered with input from PNAC.
- One of the goals of Plan Nanaimo is education and that is something that PNAC should take on.
- Nanaimo has a high percentage of park land per capita so we should be taking some of the cash-in-lieu for parks and putting it into affordable housing.
- Taxes may be based on wrong criteria. Taxes on number of people per acre could be incentive to densify.
- Find it problematic that there are still of areas in RDN that don't require permits. This is a real stumbling block.

T. Swabey noted:

- Park zoning is being worked on. Issue of whether parks are inside or outside the UCB doesn't matter to the City.
- Crown land at Westwood is being left outside UCB, as well as some owned by Island Timberlands, which we want to protect for future.
- Council had initially given direction to move the UCB to the City boundary; staff then sent a report to Council with another alternative for the UCB.
- Need to get the draft Plan out to public as soon as we can.
- Council looking for input from PNAC. Staff is recommending Option 2.

PNAC commented:

- Think PNAC already agreed there should be a park zone.
- If all parks are placed in a park zone, could any council who decided to, sell a park? Think there should be a rule that the sale of any park land goes to referendum for citizens to decide.
- Don't think parks being inside or outside the UCB makes any difference.
- Think the Plan should go out to the public and see which option they prefer.

- Feel it is extremely important to protect Westwood as in this new option. Westwood is one of the nicest spots in the city.
- For Buttertubs and Colliery Dam, some members of the public might want to know why these parks are not inside the UCB. These are also natural parks. Want to be consistent with what we take forward.
- Think Buttertubs should be outside the UCB because it is part of the watershed and the green corridor for Millstone River.
- Thank you to Councillors who decided to again include PNAC in the UCB discussion.

MOVED by D. Mahlum, SECONDED by G Turgeon, that PNAC recommend acceptance of Option 2 to Council.

CARRIED

6. Information Items:

a) Cable Bay Lands – Update

A. Tucker advised that:

- 1st and 2nd Readings were given 2008-JAN-28.
- Council passed a resolution to make application to the Province for boundary extension, which is about 20% of the site.
- There is a process that has to be followed which includes a referral to the RDN. That was made a few weeks ago and City is awaiting response from the RDN. Application is then sent to Province for consideration. A Public Hearing for the OCP application won't be scheduled until the boundary extension issue is finalized.

A. Tucker gave the following answers to questions from PNAC:

- Boundary extension doesn't automatically mean the Cable Bay project will be approved.
- Proceeding on basis of legal advice. Have to use the rules set by the Province on this issue.
- There is an OCP for Electoral Area 'A' and it designates the property as Resource land with a minimum 50 hectare parcel size.

B. Holdom advised:

- Council can still turn down an OCP application or rezoning even if extension is granted. RDN did evaluation against the goals of the RGS.
- RDN Board has input on the application but does not make the decision; that is up to the Province to make the final decision.

PNAC commented:

- Hearing from a lot of people that they don't want to see the Cable Bay project go ahead. Perception is that it is a done deal with boundary extension application.
- Seemed more honest to have in draft plan so people know this is what could happen.
- Should take the Cable Bay property and move it outside the City boundary instead of extending the boundary to accommodate it.

b) Regional Growth Strategy (RGS)

B. Holdom noted:

- The Regional Growth Strategy Committee was advised of PNAC's interest in participating in the RGS process.
- Suggested that a member of the Regional Growth Strategy Committee be invited to give a presentation to PNAC.

PNAC commented:

- Would be interested in hearing an RGS presentation as long as PNAC's participation in the process is not considered a token participation

J. Berry advised

- Has spoken to Carol Mason, the RDN CAO, and she supports PNAC participating in the RGS process. Municipal participants on urban forest lands being protected are also on board.
- Need to work with the Electoral Directors on the Regional Board to look at planning on a regional basis.

Staff distributed copies of RGS to the Committee.

The Committee agreed that they would like RDN staff to give a presentation on the RGS.

Bruce Anderson will arrange for regional staff to speak to PNAC, giving an update on work plan, strategy review and numerous reports on the update process. Will ask for presentation to be at next PNAC meeting.

7. Old Business:

- a) OCP - Urban Containment Boundary referral from Council

Discussed under Item 5.

8. New Business:

- b) OCP Review Update

B. Anderson circulated a table of substantive changes made to the plan since it was last presented to PNAC and gave an overview of each. He also noted:

- Cable Bay is noted on map as subject to Council's decision.
- Will ensure that the area from Departure Bay to Ferry Terminal is clarified in the text (page 37) and on the map.

A. Tucker gave the following answers to questions from PNAC:

- Before development could happen, those sections of Linley Valley to be included inside the UCB would be subject to completion of a comprehensive plan. This would require participation by all property owners in the reserve area. The same would hold true for Jingle Pot area. City may end up doing the comprehensive plan. It is in OCP as a medium term project. One owner can not go ahead and apply to develop without a comprehensive plan in place. Would be up to Council when to do comprehensive plan. Would be servicing constraints in some areas.
- DL 56 is outside the UCB and Council has already said it wants it to remain as recreational reserve. Showing on the map as future park space.
- If a Jingle Pot area type of large-lot subdivision was proposed, staff would let the Subdivision Approving Officer know they do not support this type of development in the Linley Valley.

Bruce Anderson advised that there is an existing policy in Plan Nanaimo, that is continued in the revised planNanaimo, that there be no further subdivision in Linley Valley until a comprehensive plan is completed.

PNAC commented:

- ESAs are included in resource protection and shouldn't be set for future use but set aside for no development.
- Urban density – are Rocky Point and other north Nanaimo neighbourhoods going to be exempted? They seem to have been in the past.

9. Late Items:

a) Provincial Throne Speech – Mental Health Facilities:

B. Holdom noted:

- In the Provincial throne speech, there was mention made of municipalities making provision for facilities for people with addictions and mental health problems.

A. Tucker advised:

- This issue was mentioned in Throne Speech but has not been made part of the *Local Government Act*.
- There was a question as to whether the Province intends to fund these facilities.
- Need to be cautious that this is not another case of downloading on local government.

After some discussion regarding a potential location, PNAC decided it was premature to move ahead and agreed that it was more appropriate that this issue be handled by the Social Planning Advisory Committee.

MOVED by B. Forbes, SECONDED by R. Meyerhoff, that this issue be referred to the Social Planning Advisory Committee.

CARRIED

b) DCCs / Harmac Water License:

In answer to a question from the Committee, A. Tucker noted:

- There is a separate public review process for DCCs.
- Don't know if Harmac's license to harvest water from Nanaimo River will go with the mill when it is sold. Can look into and report back to the Committee.

10. Next Meeting:

The next regular meeting of PNAC is scheduled for 2008-MAR-18.

11. Adjournment:

Meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m.