

**MINUTES OF THE PLAN NANAIMO ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD ON TUESDAY, 2007-MAR-13 AT 5:00 PM
BOARD ROOM, CITY HALL, 455 WALLACE STREET**

Present:	Gail Adrienne	Michael Geselbracht
	Brian Anderson	Jane Gregory
	Carey Avender	Councillor Bill Holdom
	Jolyon Brown	Shirley Lance
	Edwin Deas	Darwin Mahlum
	Stu Donaldson	Ralph Meyerhoff
	Chris Erb	Gord Turgeon
	Bill Forbes	

Staff

Andrew Tucker, Director, Planning and Development
Deborah Jensen, Planner, Community Planning
Ted Swabey, General Manager, Development Services
Fran Grant (Recording Secretary)

Regrets:	David Hill-Turner	Michael Schellinck
-----------------	-------------------	--------------------

Neighbourhood Representatives:	Joy Bremner	Brechin Hill Neighbourhood Association
	Iola Floyd	Brechin Hill Neighbourhood Association
	Mike Harrison	Brechin Hill Neighbourhood Association
	Jim Young	Chase River Neighbourhood Association
	Don Egeli	Chase River Neighbourhood Association
	Nadine Schwager	Chase River Neighbourhood Association

1. Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order by Chair B. Holdom at 5:10 p.m.

2. Adoption of Minutes for 2007-Feb-20 and 2007-Feb-27:

MOVED by S. Lance, SECONDED by B. Forbes, that the minutes of 2007-Feb-20 and 2007-Feb-27 be adopted as presented.

CARRIED

3. Approval of Agenda and Late Items:

Nanaimo Community Gardens workshop request (M. Geselbracht)

It was decided to move this item to the next meeting as tonight's meeting is for recommendations. Information sheets on the proposed workshop were distributed to the Committee.

MOVED by R. Meyerhoff, SECONDED by G. Turgeon, that the agenda be approved as presented.

CARRIED

4. OCP Amendment Application Recommendations:

A. Tucker advised that staff have received comments as follows:

- Some PNAC members feel that recommendations on the application should be made as soon as possible after the 2007-Feb-27 meeting.
- Other PNAC members feel that these applications are affecting path of OCP review and should be placed on hold.
- From applicants' point of view, process as set out in the OCP amendment application package should be followed.
- Applicants for the smaller amendment proposals are getting caught up in public's concern about the larger applications.
- Applicants feel there was misinformation distributed by public at 2007-Feb-27 event and would like to clarify the facts for PNAC.
- Suggestion from community and applicants that the PNAC recommendation meeting should be advertised and open to the public.

At the PNAC meeting of 2007-Feb-20, A. Tucker had distributed a discussion paper on how to move forward with the OCP Review given the ten applications:

- Committee will need to decide which of the three process options (as per previous handout) they wish to follow.
- Putting the applications on hold would have to be agreed to and authorized by Council.
- Staff will also be making their recommendations to Council on these applications, which may or may not agree with the PNAC recommendations.

Chair B. Holdom noted he will only vote on application recommendations if needed to break a tie.

Comments from PNAC:

- To make applicants wait for a year would be unfair to everyone including those opposed. Think it has to be done in timely manner.
- Feel these applications came in because of the review and perhaps the process should be changed for future OCP reviews to avoid this conflict.
- Advisory Committee on Environment members suggested, from legal point of view, that applications should be judged under the current OCP.
- Any applicant who is turned down could reapply next year under the revised OCP.
- This could also allow an application to be approved now that will not fit with revised OCP.
- Applications came in under the existing OCP so that is how they should be judged.
- Applications came in under this OCP and we have a responsibility to hear some really valid reasons to change it. Gives stability.

MOVED by R. Meyerhoff, SECONDED by S. Lance, that PNAC proceed with these applications and make their recommendations using the current OCP policies.

CARRIED

A. Tucker advised that 2007-May-01 is next application deadline. If PNAC is concerned about applications affecting the review, PNAC may wish to request that Council delay applications for the upcoming round until after the review has been completed.

Comments from PNAC:

- Some people may be planning to apply on 2007-May-01 and it may look like we are changing the goal posts.

- Feel that since it hasn't started yet and enough advance notice will be given, that this should not be an issue.

MOVED by G. Adrienne, SECONDED by S. Lance, that PNAC request Council postpone the 2007-May-01 application deadline until 2007-Nov-01.

CARRIED

1. Cable Bay Lands Inc.	950 Phoenix Way 960 Phoenix Way	1170 Phoenix Way 1260 Phoenix Way	1270 Phoenix Way
-------------------------	------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------

Staff:

- Have not received any revised plans for this application but have been advised that the marina and high-rise components have been deleted from the proposal. The overall project is expected to have lower density than originally proposed.
- Road access has not been finalized for the resort portion of the development, but is expected to come through Lindsay Road and not Pope & Talbot.

PNAC Comments:

- Given that issue of UCB is such a predominant one and we have heard a lot in public meetings not to change it, do not support this application.
- Would like to have seen a more concrete traffic plan for this proposal.
- Don't see that they are doing anything to protect the ESAs.

MOVED by S. Lance, SECONDED by B. Forbes, that PNAC recommend Council deny this amendment application as presented.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

2. 783371 BC Ltd.	4700 Hammond Bay Rd
-------------------	---------------------

Distributed a submission from applicant, which included information from environmental consultants and a summary report of the application and public consultation, at the 2007-Feb-27 PNAC meeting.

Staff:

- Under the OCP, Local Service Centres elsewhere in the City permit gas bars but the Rocky Point-Hammond Bay-Stephenson Point Neighbourhood Plan has a specific policy precluding gas bars in this Local Service Centre. This proposed amendment would remove that policy from the OCP.

PNAC Comments:

- At the public meeting, those people who disagreed lived in the immediate area.
- Most of the people who spoke against this application did not participate in the neighbourhood planning process.
- Concern about environmental impact – gas tanks now are double lined with sensors that warn of any problems immediately. Installed to a very high standard.
- The applicant's environmental report notes that Walley Creek has been damaged a lot in the past, but there has been restoration work done in recent years. The report from Cascadia Biological Services speaks in support of this application because of the enhancement work proposed by the applicant.
- The number of gas bars per capita is already too high. Neighbourhood seems to want the convenience store. Would support a better transit system instead.

- When Rocky Point-Hammond Bay-Stephenson Point Neighbourhood Plan came to PNAC, they didn't want any commercial space. This results in downloading services to other neighbourhoods. Nanaimo also gets 1.4 million ferry travelers each year so we do service many more vehicles than local residents.
- Residents did not want a gas bar in the neighbourhood because there are gas stations on the way to and from the area.
- Gas bar greatly increases the viability of the community store.
- Old convenience store at Pipers did not have a gas bar.
- The presentation by area residents seemed mostly "quasi" scientific information, all of which seemed to be based on an assumption that the tanks will leak.
- If people want the privilege of having no services, they should buy greenhouse gas credits.
- A community of only single-family homes is urban sprawl and contrary to the OCP. Perhaps should be paying higher taxes than those areas with multi-family and affordable housing.
- This proposal fit with the OCP before the neighbourhood plan was implemented, and the OCP supersedes neighbourhood plans. It also fits with the Local Service Centre designation.

S. Donaldson noted:

- Was a member of the Rocky Point-Hammond Bay-Stephenson Point Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee.
- This policy was a result of the neighbourhood's thinking of the time that this was a residential area. This site was not the original site of the Local Service Centre.
- When Pipers Pub was moved, the Local Service Centre moved with it. Owners plan was to have a gas station and convenience store.
- Checked with members of the neighbourhood association as best he could and found they had overwhelmingly changed their view on this issue so he will be voting in favour.

MOVED by S. Donaldson, SECONDED by C. Erb, that PNAC recommend Council approve this amendment application as presented.

CARRIED (11 in favour, 3 opposed)

3. John Salmon

141 Westwood Rd

Staff:

- Parcel of land was inside the UCB until 1996. It appears the reason it was taken out was that a portion of the property was purchased for the Parkway. The house met the criteria to be inside the UCB for the 1987 OCP.
- When the map was drawn in 1996, the property wasn't serviced. Has A2 zoning but that is not the criteria for the UCB.
- Staff consider the property being excluded from the UCB a "mapping error".

MOVED by S. Lance, SECONDED by B. Forbes, that PNAC recommend Council approve this amendment application as presented.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. Nanaimo Shipyard Ltd.	1020 Stewart Ave. 1100 Stewart Ave.	1040 Stewart Ave. 1110 Stewart Ave.
--------------------------	--	--

Staff:

- South of Moby Dick is zoned MA3 which permits multiple family residential, while the subject property is zoned MA2 for marine tourist and marine industrial use.

J. Gregory advised that the Port Authority has jurisdiction over the water part only and support marine uses on this site and protecting the channel. She noted that it is up to the City to determine upland land uses.

PNAC Comments:

- Have enough high-rises currently approved or being built. Think we should see if the market needs more high-rises before approving any more on the waterfront.
- High-rises were planned for the old city so it wouldn't obstruct views.
- Opposed to any more high rises on our waterfront.
- OCP sees this area as a marine use area and we don't have much of that property so it needs to be preserved.
- This is about density. When people are buying suites they want to be on the water.
- This area has one of the higher densities in the City. The uses they want also include a hotel and retirement facilities. Not really a residential development.
- Would add many more vehicles to Stewart Ave. B.C. Ferry traffic analysis says we will have the same situation in 10 years as we do today even with the road improvements now planned. High-rises would add greatly to the traffic congestion.
- Current apartments are three to four storeys high and they block the view.
- Proponent has not done due diligence – there was no consultation with the neighbourhood.
- The site is too small to accommodate the proposal.
- Don't think four storey condos are the solution either. Corridor needs a comprehensive plan.
- Application should not be considered until such a plan is in place.
- If this was approved, many other property owners along the corridor would want to do the same.

MOVED by R. Meyerhoff, SECONDED by S. Donaldson, that PNAC recommend Council deny this amendment application as presented.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED by S. Lance, SECONDED by R. Meyerhoff, that the City undertake a comprehensive plan of Stewart Avenue and Newcastle Channel in conjunction with Port Authority and the neighbourhood.

CARRIED

5. Wheel Estate Ltd.	3518 Hillside Ave.
----------------------	--------------------

Staff:

- In the 1987 OCP, the Linley Valley was designated a "residential reserve area" and contained statements recommending completion of a comprehensive plan for the area. In 1996, the UCB was drawn around the area to reflect the residential reserve designation and to recognize environmentally sensitive areas. There was concern

- about protecting the area for park space, and in the absence of park zoning, this was one of the ways to preserve green space.
- Higher elevations of this area are not easily serviced. Would be considerable expenditure, especially for water.
 - Policies in the existing OCP tend to refer to District Lot 56 as park space. Council has reiterated its position that District Lot 56 be turned over from the Province to the City and preserved as park space.
 - There are a number of policies about the need for a comprehensive plan and what that plan would entail.
 - No additional application information has been received. No signage has been erected, which is a requirement of the application.
 - Currently could be developed as five acre lots under A3 zoning.

PNAC Comments:

- NALT feels that although the City has identified District Lot 56 as future park, this subject property should be identified as well; have always had this parcel on the list of properties to acquire.
- Owners have also expressed interest in selling as park space. Property has been logged but not clear-cut and will recover.
- With UCB leaving this area as an 'island', there seems to be a need for a comprehensive plan.

MOVED by S. Lance, SECONDED by G. Adrienne, that PNAC recommend Council deny this amendment application as presented.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. CDF Developments Ltd.

553 Third St

Staff:

- Have received calls that neighbourhood was organizing a petition against this application, however, that petition was not received until this afternoon.
- Have not had a chance to verify names on the petition. There are 35 names on the petition who appear to live in the area.
- Applicant is asking for higher density residential.
- Do not have specific site plan or elevation drawings as to what is being proposed. The property is on a bus route, close to high school, Malaspina University-College and major sports centres.

PNAC Comments:

- From Fourth Street to Second Street, there is a lot of open space and undeveloped land.
- Have difficulty with doing comprehensive review because the applicant has applied under existing OCP and should be done in that process. This circumvents and effectively tables it.
- In the time it will take to do a plan, property could be developed as single family homes.
- Think a comprehensive plan is worthwhile for this area because of the huge changes that have taken place (i.e. aquatic and ice centres). Feel it should be designated as one of the foremost areas needing a comprehensive plan.

E. Deas noted that Malaspina University-College would welcome the opportunity to engage in discussion with the City and area residents about plans for the area.

MOVED by R. Meyerhoff, SECONDED by C. Avender, that Council defer this application until a comprehensive development plan for this area bounded by Fifth Street to Second Street, and Wakesiah to Howard, is completed with a view to densification.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. Sound Contracting Ltd.	4451 Burma Rd.	4471 Burma Rd.
---------------------------	----------------	----------------

MOVED by S. Lance, SECONDED by R. Meyerhoff, that PNAC recommend Council deny this amendment application until the comprehensive plan called for in the OCP has been completed.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. CDF Developments Ltd.	2421 Bowen Rd.	2425 Bowen Rd.	2429 Bowen Rd
--------------------------	----------------	----------------	---------------

Staff:

- Site specific amendment to allow for multi-family instead of single family homes.
- Proposal as described at the January PNAC meeting has been designed to fit with surrounding neighbourhood.
- One of the policies under discussion for the revised OCP is on the subject of putting density along arterial corridors to support transit instead of in the middle of established neighbourhoods.
- This is similar to recent applications at Uplands and Hammond Bay Road which PNAC recommended for approval.
- Received feedback from UCB workshop which asked about density in neighbourhoods, and found that up to four storey building forms had a fairly high level of acceptance.

PNAC Comments:

- Have had a number of applications come forward for this property and neighbourhood has been opposed to the proposals, but this has not happened this time.
- Previous proposals included commercial and that is what the neighbourhood opposed. This is strictly residential.
- Close to Beban, good bus route and shopping. Good location for higher density residential.
- Have some difficulty with the OCP policy that calls for Bowen Road to not have multi-family exceeding a maximum of two storeys. Apartments would be good use along Bowen Road. Think policy of allowing residential along major arterials is something that should be looked at during the current OCP review.
- We are caught in that this doesn't fit with OCP but now that we are talking about density, may fit with new OCP.
- Feel it does fit principles of the current OCP which support compact communities.

MOVED by B. Anderson, SECONDED by C. Erb, that PNAC recommend Council approve this amendment application as presented.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

 9. Pacific Pet Resorts Inc.

6200 Doumont Rd

Staff:

- Is not in ALR, is inside the UCB.
- Proposing townhouse style development.
- Services and access is available, Jenkins Road will be used for access to the property.

MOVED by B. Forbes, SECONDED by G. Turgeon, that PNAC recommend Council approve this amendment application as presented.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

 10. Snuneymuxw First Nation /
Northwest Properties

1200 Frew Rd. 1560 Island Highway S. 1650 Island Highway S.

PNAC Comments:

- A lot of work has been done and has some neighbourhood support, but do not support because it is a huge development that could start a domino effect and kill the UCB concept.
- Change in the past has been piece meal development but this is a comprehensive plan. Will eventually need to move UCB and this comprehensive plan would be better than piece meal plan.
- Not on waterfront and has 25 year build out. One criteria is whether the development can be done inside the UCB. This is the only application that does not seem able to be done inside the UCB.
- Some documents have said we are getting low on industrial land and we may have to expand to get more light industrial. This has light industrial and has comprehensive plan. If we go forward this light industrial must be kept.
- Concern about revitalizing downtown and this application is counter to that if we get another Woodgrove type mall in the south end. Also concern about UCB.
- Downtown cannot compete with malls.
- Need a different type of development in the downtown. Most downtowns have boutique type shopping.
- Have much difficulty with because opposed to expanding UCB and this application is a bit premature. This proposal would seem logical when the time comes to move the UCB and it does have a comprehensive plan. Good idea but don't want to expand UCB.
- Most don't want to expand UCB. Developable land is getting less and less. UCB will have to expand at some time for affordability, getting that way now. Industrial land is almost built out as well as commercial. City cannot expand for those two uses and that is needed for a city to grow.
- This is a comprehensive plan that has come to us. This plan is not going to be built out for 25 years. Time in this development is on our side.
- There are examples of redeveloping huge parking areas as a way of infilling. Different development from what we are used to but something to look at.

Chase River Neighbourhood Representative:

- Was against changing the UCB but this would be valuable to our community, and south end of Nanaimo alternative to driving to the north end. Would bring together our community and first nations. They have made it clear it won't be another

Woodgrove. They say it would be what is needed in the community. Would revitalize the area.

- Area residents are divided on the development, concerns about access.
- Existing Chase River Town Centre at Tenth and Lawlor will never work – very disjointed.
- Proposed Town Centre for this development will work better than what is existing.
- Have walked over a lot of the property and there will certainly be challenges.
- Has 15 to 25 year build out and will be developed in workable sub-units.
- Personally in favour and have lived most of my life in the area.
- This will make south end of town work.
- Biggest chunk of land under one ownership and they seem committed to work with City and RDN, and any other interest groups or government agencies.
- Was originally treaty land and we would have had no say in what occurred. It is now fee simple and under City policies.
- Foresee this as a good proposal for moving UCB.

PNAC Comments (continued):

- South end has continued to degrade – has been forgotten about; this plan is considering the needs of the community and will boost the area.
- Issue of light industrial; there is light industrial there now but this proposal would reduce the amount of light industrial.
- Given size of this proposal and the fact that we are in the middle of OCP review, think it is premature.
- There is still room for infill in the City. We have put off much smaller applications because it wasn't the right time.
- Would like to see it deferred and come back later as part of the review.
- Some areas of the City are having trouble renting commercial space but this looks good for the southend. May be only chance for a comprehensive plan for this area.
- Should not base decision on the fact that the Snuneymuxw First Nation is involved.

MOVED by G. Adrienne, SECONDED by J. Brown, that PNAC recommend Council deny this amendment application as presented.

DEFEATED

MOVED by S. Lance, SECONDED by S. Donaldson, that PNAC recommend Council approve this amendment application as presented.

CARRIED (8 IN FAVOUR, 6 OPPOSED)

5. **Next Meeting:**

A. Tucker noted:

- OCP Densification Workshop has been tentatively rescheduled for 2007-Apr-04.
- Dr. Ann McAfee will be the keynote speaker.
- Will be held at Bowen Road Auditorium, starting at 6:00 p.m.
- When everything has been confirmed, the Committee will be notified.
- The next regular meeting of PNAC is scheduled for 2007-Apr-17, Board Room, City Hall.

6. **Adjournment:**

The meeting adjourned at 7:20 pm.