

**MINUTES OF THE PLAN NANAIMO ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD ON TUESDAY, 2007-APR-17 AT 5:00 PM
BOARD ROOM, CITY HALL, 455 WALLACE STREET**

Present:

Carey Avender	David Hill-Turner
Jolyon Brown	Councillor Bill Holdom
Edwin Deas	Shirley Lance
Stu Donaldson	Ralph Meyerhoff
Chris Erb	Michael Schellinck
Michael Geselbracht	Gord Turgeon
Jane Gregory	

City Representatives:

Andrew Tucker, Director, Planning and Development
Bruce Anderson, Manager, Community Planning
Deborah Jensen, Planner, Community Planning
Jerry Berry, City Manager
Ted Swabey, General Manager, Development Services
Dale Lindsay, Manager of Planning
Fran Grant (Recording Secretary)
Councillor Loyd Sherry
Marilyn Hutchinson, Economic Development Officer

Regrets:

Darwin Mahlum	Gail Adrienne
Bill Forbes	Brian Anderson

1. Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order by Chair B. Holdom at 5:07 p.m.

Chair B. Holdom introduced Bruce Anderson, the new Manager of Community Planning.

2. Adoption of Minutes for 2007-Mar-13:

MOVED by D. Hill-Turner, SECONDED by S. Lance, that the minutes of 2007-Mar-13 be adopted as presented.

CARRIED

3. Approval of Agenda and Late Items:

MOVED by C. Erb, SECONDED by R. Meyerhoff, that the agenda be accepted as presented.

CARRIED

4. New Business:

a) Growth Management Presentation was given by J. Berry, City Manager.

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

- Increasing DCCs to generate funds for social housing would make housing less affordable for other residents.
- DCCs will be here for some time to come.

- Agree that local governments should have more control over decisions on transit.
- It is accepted that light industrial needs to be located in the RDN because City of Nanaimo land costs and DCCs make it too expensive.
- Duke Point and Assembly wharf lands will help with the supply of heavy industrial lands, but it is difficult to find an appropriate location for light industrial operations.
- Would like to see light industrial lands located in a regional centre and not spread out all over.
- City should run zoning amendments in conjunction with OCP amendments so developers don't have to go through one process to then get turned down at the next. Still would go through public hearing process.
- When there is a conflict between a neighbourhood plan and the OCP, the decision should go to the larger good.

PNAC Comments:

- Development is not the enemy but is seen that way.
- City should support green building.
- Building code has made some design aspects worse for builders.
- Septic fields can be environmentally friendly if they are done properly.
- Concern about large buses on outskirts who have only a few people on them; should be using smaller buses on those routes.

In answer to a question from PNAC, D. Jensen noted:

- There was poor public response to the April 4th density workshop.
- Less than 50 people attended and only 13 worksheets were completed.

A. Tucker advised the Committee that Dr. Bill Rees from UBC, is speaking 2007-Apr-26 on 'Ecological Footprint' .

The Chair thanked J. Berry for his very informative presentation.

b) PNAC Terms of Appointment:

A. Tucker noted:

- As of June 30, the terms of appointment for S. Donaldson (neighbourhood), D. Mahlum (Vancouver Island Real Estate Board), and M. Schellinck (environment) expire, and asked if they are interested in continuing on the Committee.
- Will be advising the specific groups of the need to reappoint the current representative or appoint a new person.
- S. Donaldson noted he has advised the Stephenson Point Neighbourhood Association that he will not be able to continue as a neighbourhood representative on PNAC.
- S. Lance believes D. Mahlum (who is on holidays) is interested in continuing.
- M. Schellinck advised he is willing to continue as an environment community representative.

Chair B. Holdom thanked S. Donaldson for his many years of dedication representing neighbourhood interests on PNAC.

c) Urban Agriculture Land Uses:

M. Geselbracht distributed information on this issue and asked that it be discussed at the next meeting after Committee members have had time to review.

- d) Report on UCB Workshop 2007-Feb-15:
- e) Report on Infill and Densification Workshop 2007-Apr-04:

D. Jensen distributed handouts to the Committee on the UCB workshop. Both workshops will be discussed at the next meeting.

5. **OCP Amendment Application Update:**

B. Holdom advised that at the 2007-Apr-16 Council meeting:

- Two applications for properties located in the Linley Valley were denied as per staff and PNAC recommendation.
- Doumont Road multi-family was supported as per PNAC and staff recommendation.
- Hammond Bay Road gas bar was turned down as per staff recommendation; strong argument that OCP had already been amended to not allow gas bars on Hammond Bay Road. Council vote was unanimous.
- High-rise towers on Stewart Avenue – there was disagreement on Council but was eventually supported and will go to public hearing.

PNAC Comments:

- People on Hammond Bay came out en mass to speak against the gas bar. At PNAC's public meeting, we asked people to appoint leaders (as did Brechin Neighbourhood Association) to speak for them so there was not a lot of people repeating the same point; Brechin seemed to be 'punished' for not having a huge crowd in attendance.
- There were 600 signatures against gas bar. When PNAC made their decision, they did not know that a precedent had been previously set on not allowing gas bars in neighbourhoods.

T. Swabey noted:

- PNAC used to get a report from staff, stating staff's position before PNAC made their decision on applications.
- Cable Bay is an example where staff are still working with the applicant.
- PNAC members should not have to take criticism from the public, which has happened to one member in particular during this round of amendment applications.

PNAC Comments:

- Most committee members agreed they would like to have the report from staff before making their recommendations.
- Need some balance struck in that staff is not telling PNAC what to recommend.
- Need to know the whole picture, and that includes staff position.
- PNAC needs to remember that we are an advisory body, and can have different views from staff (community versus professional).
- Concern that once these applications go to rezoning, that committee will also get crucified.
- Need some type of parallel process where applicant can do OCP amendment and rezoning process together. Two committees could work together. Takes a long time for developers to get approval, and is costly.
- Purpose of PNAC and Rezoning Advisory Committee is different. We are looking at city wide big picture, whereas rezoning is site specific.
- When done separately, the OCP policy is sometimes approved but then rezoning is denied.
- As these processes get longer and longer, costs go up and affordability is affected. Costs from failed projects are passed on to the next project.

- Don't think we should make our judgment based on the amount of money someone is spending.
- Process isn't in place that keeps enough people happy. Should be able to find process that works better. Appreciate that there are a lot of stakeholders.
- Favour more efficient system even if it is to tell an applicant 'no' faster.
- City process is overcomplicated. Too many people involved in each project.
- When it is affecting the community, how can you speed up the process if it means the public doesn't get a chance to give input?
- Perhaps community associations could have more say in what is or is not approved.
- Whole society issue right now is nobody has the time to give to the process. Surveys can be useful but you have to be very careful of the way the questions are asked.
- The public hopes Council will make the decisions for them so they don't have to get involved.

6. **Next Meeting:**

T. Swabey suggested that PNAC have another meeting as soon as possible to discuss the OCP review process. He also noted that:

- He will provide a report to PNAC for their review on where we have been and where we are going, then discuss at the next meeting
- Feels we need proper public input if the Plan is going to stand the test of time. Don't feel we are getting that input.
- Don't want to rush and get it finished and have poor product.
- More outreach to the community and hear from those we aren't hearing from.
- Need to hear from folks who get upset about applications but don't get their ideas into plan policy.
- If they aren't interested, maybe we don't change the plan.
- Additional public outreach could be everything from surveys (which are expensive but effective) to information pamphlets going out with tax notices.
- Think there are still issues on corridors, social aspects, etc.
- Many statements in the OCP belong in the zoning bylaw.
- Will bring options forward for PNAC to review.

A. Tucker noted:

- Almost all feedback on website has been on applications. Very few on OCP review.
- Half way through the OCP review budget of \$150,000 right now. As a comparison, neighbourhood plans in Vancouver cost \$600,000.

PNAC Comments:

- Maybe we should tell public we are going to frustrate traffic, all neighbourhoods will have to accept multi-family, and other contentious ideas to catch the public's attention.
- Really appreciated J. Berry's presentation. The issue of public education is something we should have been doing for years and should start now. Could have a program of going into the schools on an ongoing basis. Did that for original Plan Nanaimo process but it was not continued. Education is the key and should not be done only on short term basis.
- Like the idea of putting out controversial thoughts to catch the public's attention.
- Need more participation by Council during OCP review and public meetings.
- Strong community plan can tie Council's hands and it takes political fortitude to maintain a plan.
- Need buy-in from Council so they will support the plan.
- Plan needs to recognize sustainability and that could mean zoning is changed.

- Current plan supports sustainability but perhaps needs to be toughened up in some areas.

It was decided to hold an extra meeting to discuss the above issue on 2007-Apr-24, Board Room, City Hall starting at 4:30 p.m.

7. Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned at 7:17 p.m.

File: 0360-20-P07-02
g:complan\pnac\age-min\age Apr17.doc