

**MINUTES OF THE PLAN NANAIMO ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD ON TUESDAY, 2007-FEB-27 AT 5:00 PM
BEBAN PARK AUDITORIUM, 2300 BOWEN ROAD, NANAIMO, B.C.**

Present:	Gail Adrienne Carey Avender Jolyon Brown Edwin Deas Bill Forbes Michael Geselbracht	David Hill-Turner Councillor Bill Holdom Shirley Lance Darwin Mahlum Ralph Meyerhoff Michael Schellinck Gord Turgeon
	<u>Staff</u> Andrew Tucker, Director, Planning and Development Dale Lindsay, Manager, Planning Deborah Jensen, Planner, Community Planning Fran Grant (Recording Secretary) Cindy Hall (Recording Secretary)	
Regrets:	Stu Donaldson Chris Erb	Brian Anderson Jane Gregory
Neighbourhood Representatives:	Iola Floyd Jim Young	Brechin Hill Neighbourhood Assoc. Chase River Neighbourhood Assoc.

1. Call to Order:

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

B. Holdom gave a brief overview of the agenda and process for the evening. He also advised that:

- This is not a public hearing but intended for the Plan Nanaimo Advisory Committee (PNAC) to hear the views of the public.
- PNAC is an advisory body to Council.
- These applications will be reviewed under the existing Official Community Plan (OCP).

A. Tucker introduced the applications and gave a brief overview of each one.

2. OCP Amendment Applications:

1.	John Salmon	141 Westwood Rd ≈ 1.3 ha (3.4 acres)	Proposal to include the property within the UCB and to redesignate the property as "Suburban Neighbourhood".
----	-------------	---	--

Public Comments:

- Speaking to all the applications that want to move the UCB, not just this application.
- Don't think this is smart growth.
- Contributes to sprawl, which increases air pollution and cost of services.
- Happy to have higher density in my neighbourhood.

- Should not be allowing these applications to come forward when doing an OCP review.
- Already have six designated town centres and they are not yet complete communities.
- Do not need to create another town centre in another area.
- Should not consider any application for high-rises on our waterfront.

- Why was this property moved from inside the UCB (1987 OCP) to outside the UCB (1996 OCP)?
- Don't feel UCB should be drawn in a straight line. Opposed to expanding the UCB as we have enough land within to serve us for the next 15 years.
- Should look at infill development and higher density in the existing town centres.

D. Lindsay noted that when the UCB was drawn in 1994, he believes the boundary followed the agricultural land leaving it outside the UCB, but would need to verify that.

2.	CDF Developments Ltd. (Hans Heringa)	2421 Bowen Rd 2425 Bowen Rd 2429 Bowen Rd ≈ 0.4 ha (1.0 acre)	Proposal to develop for multiple family residential (i.e. apartment building).
----	---	--	---

There were no public comments on this application.

3.	Wheel Estate Ltd.	3518 Hillside Ave ≈ 47.2 ha (116.7 acres)	Proposal to place inside UCB so can be used for residential development.
----	-------------------	--	---

Public Comments:

- Live in this area and our neighbourhood fought to not have the roadway built through the Valley.
- Parklands should not be surrounded by houses.
- Land capacity report shows room for many new residents.
- This property is not needed inside the UCB.
- Against any change to the UCB especially in the Linley Valley area.
- Public raised a lot of money to buy Cottle Lake Park.
- Provincial government was trying to have DL 56 moved inside the UCB but they withdrew that application when they found out how area residents felt.
- If this property is moved inside the UCB, there will be more pressure from other properties including DL 56.
- Need to protect Linley Valley ecosystem.
- Against moving the UCB here.
- Impression was that Council's position on Linley Valley was that the UCB wouldn't be changed until there was a comprehensive plan for the whole valley.
- The entire valley area should be preserved as a park. There are not many more chances to create a huge park in the City.
- Area is private land and if we want more parkland, we will have to buy it.
- This is developable land and has services around it.
- Bringing it into the City would stop urban sprawl by developing inside.
- If this was going to be a park, it would have been a park already.
- If it doesn't impact environment, should be dealt with accordingly.
- At last night's Council meeting, there was an excellent presentation on urban sprawl and its affect on the environment.
- If we allow this application to be approved, then others will follow and one of the last vast areas of green space within the City of Nanaimo will be eliminated.
- Would also open it up to other owners to expand the UCB.
- Should remain outside the UCB.

A. Tucker noted:

- Zoning is not involved in this process.
- OCP amendment process is completed first and then an application can be made to amend the zoning bylaw.
- This property can presently be used for 5-acre lots under A3 zoning.

Public Comments (continued):

- The City should develop a comprehensive plan for Linley Valley so we don't have to react to all these applications.
- We should be clear on how we want to see it developed; developers would then know what they could do.

4.	Sound Contracting Ltd. / Steven Heringa	4451 Burma Rd 4471 Burma Rd ≈ 5.9 ha (14.7 acres)	Proposal to include lands within UCB and provide for multi-family residential.
----	--	---	--

There were no public comments on this application.

5.	Pacific Pet Resorts Inc. (Maureen Pilcher)	6200 Doumont Rd ≈ 2.0 ha (5.0 acres)	Amend land use designation from 'Rural Resource' to 'Neighbourhood' to provide for the development of a multiple-family, affordable housing project.
----	---	---	--

There were no public comments on this application.

6.	Snuneymuxw First Nation / Northwest Properties (Dillon Consulting)	1200 Frew Rd 1560 Island Highway S 1650 Island Highway S ≈ 293.0 ha (724.0 ac.)	Proposal for comprehensive development to incorporate an industrial enterprise area, low-medium residential, medium-high residential, industrial service/research education, and town centre.
----	--	--	---

Public Comments:

- Sees this as another town centre.
- Unless you make the town centres we already have into communities, no reason to have more.
- Opposed to this application.
- There will be extreme ramifications from this development.
- The Chase River Neighbourhood Plan states the area is to stay rural.
- Use what we have before extending the UCB.
- Proposal doesn't include affordable housing.
- Will create more urban sprawl.
- Don't see riparian zone.
- Would like to see a walking trail included rather than residential right up to the banks of the river.
- Young population can't afford large properties, but this proposal included higher densities that would be affordable.
- It's not good having to drive north to Woodgrove to do all their shopping.
- This is going to be a proper development, should listen to what the developers are saying.

- This proposal will improve shopping for residents in Chase River and Southend.
- Would like to see something like this included in the UCB and hope it goes through.
- Proposed road appears to run through a lot of private property.
- Every time we expand the UCB, more driving occurs – would prefer a more green approach.
- Have been waiting a long time for development to come south.

7.	CDF Developments Ltd. (Hans Heringa)	553 Third St ≈ 0.8 ha (2.0 acres)	Proposal for multi-family residential.
----	---	--------------------------------------	--

There were no public comments on this application.

8.	783371 BC Ltd. (Maureen Pilcher)	4700 Hammond Bay Rd ≈ 1.1 ha (2.9 acres)	Proposal to develop a gas bar at this address. Policies within the Hammond Bay Neighbourhood Plan specifically exclude gas stations from local service centre within that area.
----	-------------------------------------	--	--

Public Comments:

- A PowerPoint presentation, which was a collaborative effort by several members of the Hammond Bay community, was given. The presentation expressed opposition to the application (see attached).
- People need such amenities so they don't have to drive all over for their daily needs.
- Agrees with the idea of a gas bar and convenience store - there is no other place to go in that area.
- One that was in the area closed.
- Small stores need a gas bar to survive.
- Driving to other places to get gas causes more pollution.
- Other people won't drive from other areas just to use this gas bar.
- Gas bars and small stores are not detriments to surrounding communities.
- We need to support these small town centres.
- Cars are going to be here anyway and now they could get gas.
- We need to look at putting in proper sidewalks so people can walk and make it a viable community.
- Not from the area but appears the community has gotten together and made a decision about what they want in their area.
- Concerned about the environment and the need to steward the area to retain greenery.
- Doesn't think a town centre means everyone can drive a block and get gas and other services.
- Concerned that if a gas bar goes in, it would mean cutting down more trees.
- The gas bar would have a brightly lit canopy, which would be visible from many places.
- The applicant says they need a gas bar to make the store viable. Not all stores have gas bars and they survive.
- Opposed to the application.
- Wants the committee to consider the fact that residents are not opposed to economic development and creating a better atmosphere.
- Small stores will help create that end goal, but don't think a gas bar will.

- Citizens need to look at the ecological footprint; work in the environment field and our footprint means trying to diminish our impact on the earth.
- Don't think a gas bar will do this and there is no shortage of gas bars. Nanaimo already has too many gas bars.
- Don't think convenience is the best way to look at things.
- Don't think this application promotes sustainability.
- Does not support this application.
- Was told by the applicant that the foundation must be more than 10 ft. above the water line. If so, then don't see how gas tanks can be installed in this location.
- The applicant said when gas spills, they have facilities to take care of it. Does this mean spills will happen?
- How do we make sure pollutants are not discharged into Walley Creek? The development would be upstream of the creek.
- There would be the exhaust from 350 cars, as well as the exhaust from the cars coming to the store, that would settle in the trees, soil and river.
- We need places to walk to, not drive to. Does not want to walk with family in a place full of gas and exhaust fumes.

9.	Nanaimo Shipyard Ltd. (Randy Regier, Newcastle Quay Developments)	1020 Stewart Ave 1040 Stewart Ave 1100 Stewart Ave 1110 Stewart Ave ≈ 0.5 ha (1.3 acres)	Proposal for comprehensive development to incorporate walkway, marina, seniors independent living, commercial, pedestrian plaza, underground parking, and hotel and residential suites (these within two high-rise towers).
----	--	--	---

Public Comments:

- How does this proposal fit in with the OCP?
- It doesn't at all and is outside any of the designated areas for high-rises.
- Whenever the ferry comes in it makes it very difficult for residents getting onto Stewart Avenue. In the summer it is almost impossible.
- Don't think the changes being made to the road by BC ferries is going to fix the problem.
- This would open the door to many more towers.
- Waterfront is so beautiful. To imagine high-rises on the waterfront instead of upland would make it unfriendly to pedestrians and not aesthetically pleasing.

Mike Harrison, speaking on behalf of the Brechin Hill Neighbourhood Association:

- Totally out of scale with surrounding area.
- Size and height would make it larger than Cameron Island.
- Is being built on only 1.3 acres and would be right next to the sidewalk.
- Cameron Island has no single family homes in close proximity whereas this property has single family right across the street with absolutely no transition area.
- The proposal is inappropriate and the property should be kept for marine use.
- At the OCP workshop we saw examples of good urban planning. There is no urban planning at all in this proposal.
- There is plenty of land available in town centres for high-rises.
- Our area is being revitalized and is a pleasant place to live.
- This proposal doesn't show any respect for the area.
- If this goes forward, other developers will ask for high-rises all along the waterfront.
- Simply an attempt to make enormous profits at the expense of community.
- Urge you to reject this amendment.
- Asked the people in the audience how many are opposed to this development (many stood up).

A. Tucker noted the current zoning is for marine uses with MA2 zoning.

Public Comments (continued):

- Many residents have lived there for a long time. Not a transient neighbourhood but one whose residents care about their neighbourhood.
- Went to the public information gathering held by the proponent where developers said we could choose one of their options – no, that won't happen.
- Believe that developers who want to build in a neighbourhood should work with the residents to do something that fits.
- Why do we need another high-rise on the waterfront?
- Do not want to see high-rises on the waterfront, which will lead to more and more.
- Need to think strongly about who wants to live in our neighbourhood.
- When choosing where we want to live, we look at the neighbourhood, neighbourhood plan or OCP and make our decision to buy thinking that is what is going to be there.
- This should not be disregarded. People come here for waterfront and views.
- We don't have to say yes to everyone who comes along.
- The neighbourhood has unique character and a strong sense of community.
- Many pedestrians pass by on the street, more than vehicles.
- Need pedestrian-friendly communities.
- This development doesn't reinforce the neighbourhood character and could lead to a wall of high-rises.
- Decisions should be in response to neighbourhood and community wishes.
- Need comprehensive plan for all waterfront. It belongs to the residents.

Nancy Mitchell, 403 – 225 Cypress St., Strata Council President, speaking on their behalf:

- Proposal is in contradiction of OCP.
- Don't see anyone asking for it to be modified to fit this plan.
- We are losing marine activities and this is a water and marine town. Need to accommodate marine uses.
- There will be changes along this part of Stewart Avenue so we need to be proactive in our response. We need a comprehensive community plan in our neighbourhood.
- Build a plan that fits the OCP and indicates where the community wants to go, not the developers.
- Have a petition (2,000 plus names) against any high-rise development on Nanaimo's waterfront. It is ongoing and we will get more signatures.
- Moved here from the city and what attracted me was the waterfront.
- Vancouver has high-rises all along the beaches and only the rich can live there.
- This neighbourhood has a special appeal because it has roots and a sense of place.
- Don't let Nanaimo get like other cities.
- Residents need to stand up and stop this type of development.
- Go to the downtown often and enjoy walking along the waterfront.
- Proposed marina associated with the development would have impact on marine values.
- Marina would have impact on the water habitat from fuel spills and sewage.
- Channel is already too busy.
- Should be developed under present OCP and profit would still be made.
- Strongly opposed to this proposal.
- Do not want to have to close my curtains because of people in high-rises looking down into my home.
- Traffic is already atrocious in the summer and fall.

- These towers do not belong on our waterfront which is the most beautiful in the world.
- Brechin is already a mixed-use neighbourhood. We have industry, airplanes, strip malls, ferries, apartments and businesses; it is enough and don't need any more.
- Big proponent of change and renewal, and of the OCP which was developed with care and integrity.
- Don't see a compelling reason that development couldn't be consistent with OCP.
- This type of development would take away from the energy going into revitalizing downtown.
- Anxious that any type of development, of even three storeys, would block views as well.
- Vistas down streets heading down to the water should be maintained.
- Paid a high price for view of channel and any large development would block that.
- Enjoy looking at activity on the channel.
- Curious why we can't make it easier for marine-related businesses to survive on the channel and make residential development unattractive.
- Walkway on the waterfront is a huge benefit to all residents of Nanaimo.
- Hour by hour my view is being decimated by condos that are being built.
- Large fire was hard for fire fighters to get to.
- Density is already ridiculous, as is noise from traffic waiting to board ferries.
- Used to be able to swim in the area but now it is too polluted.
- All these extra buildings – where are the residents going to work?
- Other areas keep waterfront free but Nanaimo allows developers to block it out and make money.
- If the property owner was benevolent, he would donate that land for marine purposes to the City of Nanaimo.

A. Tucker noted the OCP directs high-rises to be built in Town Centres. This project is outside of the Town Centre.

10.	Cable Bay Lands Inc. (Vining Senini)	950 Phoenix Way 960 Phoenix Way 1170 Phoenix Way 1260 Phoenix Way 1270 Phoenix Way ≈ 208.5 ha (515.2 ac.)	Amend land use designation from 'Rural Resource' to Suburban Neighbourhood' and a new Resort Centre designation. The proposal is to develop a golf course, town centre, marina, and broad range of residential housing ranging from single family dwellings to multiple family and high-rise condominiums.
-----	---	--	--

Public Comments:

- Lives in the RDN and objects to such an extensive development in her back yard.
- Doesn't think that the developers have any idea of what environmental stewardship is.
- Two large moss meadows with Garry oaks are being proposed as park land.
- Do you think those moss meadows will stand up with a development that is proposing 2400 residential units, a golf course and stores?
- Animals will be shut out as well.
- The developer's own environmental study was concerned about maintaining drainage through these meadows.
- The survey also talks about the creek that runs parallel to Cable Bay trail. It is not true that the creek only runs six months of the year, it is wet all year round.
- There is running water in Baker Creek, and extensive wetland on both sides of hydro line is wet all year also.

- Need to consider the 100 acres that belong to Cedar.
- The development can't proceed without that land.
- The developer's environmental survey also stated that no rare wildlife was detected – that is not true.
- The survey also doesn't mention invertebrates – they are also there and some are endangered.
- Bats, minks, and cougars had also been observed in the area.
- There is no mention of habitat preservation for large animals in the proposal, and no mention of what will happen to them and bird life.
- Significant trees have been cut down and sawed up.
- There has been a sawmill in there twice since the developers bought the property.
- When survey work was being done, a truck ran over a meadow and made big ruts.
- Upland wet areas haven't been mentioned in the developer's environmental report either, and machines have run through those areas as well.
- The developer's geotechnical survey stated there is potential for rock fall from an unstable steep slope in the area, but has not stated how they will make the area safe for people walking in the area.
- Resulting interface from survivor trees from forest fires is a risk.
- Don't think this company has done its homework.
- Sees no reason to develop this land for such a proposal.
- Flora and fauna are beautiful here.
- The development won't add to it.

A. Tucker, in response to a question, advised that the current zoning allows 5-acre lots, with two dwellings per lot permitted.

- The developer previously stated that the original proposal fit with the zoning in place but was encouraged by City of Nanaimo to expand the project.
- Opposed to such a proposal being built in a small community like Cedar.
- Not opposed to anything new, but high-rise condos isn't what she had in mind when buying her house in this area.
- Chose the area for its beauty.
- There is a real sense of community in the area, and there already is a town centre.
- Supports businesses there already; wouldn't want to do her shopping in the new development.
- The City of Nanaimo received its Urban Land Inventory which stated that there is enough land already zoned to last 25 years; therefore, no further development is required at this time.
- Anything that moves into the UCB increases in value, and to create these values without demanding their use defeats the purpose.
- Densities can be increased inside the UCB and that will increase our land capacity.
- The developer hasn't done his job, and has not consulted with the community.
- The City of Nanaimo is holding Cedar residents ransom as they don't live in the City.
- Consider the Cedar residents when making a decision.
- Also has concerns about the environment as this is a very sensitive area.
- Worried about piecemeal development – doesn't work.
- How many town centres does Nanaimo need?
- The City of Nanaimo botched it up in the 1970's by allowing town centres in the north.
- Creates urban ghettos, and doesn't create a sense of community.

- Opposed to the application.
- There is a purpose for having an urban containment boundary.
- Start doing infilling first before looking at areas that border on rural areas.

- Knows a lot about the terrestrial community there.
- The beach has changed phenomenally.
- Access to trails has devastated a lot of the area.
- This is too intense of a development.
- Answers to questions about the development seem to change weekly.
- The plans need to be tightened up a lot before any approvals are given.

- Worried about trees disappearing.
- Asking that consideration be given to the environment.
- There is still room in the city for development - don't encroach on the animals in rural areas.
- Portland, Oregon has examples of good planning.

- It is ironic that Cable Bay Trail could eventually be through an urban area.
- It is important to keep some breathing space between the country and the city.
- It is important to keep the uplands and estuary areas as intact as possible.

- Motivation and spirit of community are important factors. Looked at their website – prime motivation is to provide alternative source of profit for their investors who are not local people.
- Looks a whole lot like a Toronto development.
- Walk Cable Bay Trail regularly - no way we could get near that place if there was a golf course and a very small amount of green space.
- 6,000 additional people in this area would be a huge drain on area resources and have a big impact on the environment.
- Nanaimo is beautiful because we have places we can go to in 15 minutes that get us back to nature.

- A ludicrous proposal because of increased traffic that would contribute to global warming.
- Want Nanaimo politicians to “walk the walk” if they care about the environment.
- Cable Bay Trail was given to the public and this proposal will ruin that trail forever.

- Was told that this development will provide a destination for Nanaimo. Do the residents really want this type of destination? I think not.
- Think we should be careful about this company and the plans they present because they haven't done their homework.
- At Cedar Hall open house, the developers were talking about a golf course that was going to take sewage from the development to water the golf course. That would cause problems with the wells in the area.
- Proposed road network then changed. Will now bring traffic down Nicola Road but local 'S' bends are especially dangerous in the winter.
- 5,000 people with cars down that road is ridiculous. Don't think the applicants know what they are doing.

- Would bring a huge increase in traffic.
- There are three golf courses in the area already.
- You can still walk on Cable Bay trail with dogs off leash for now.
- Have found first nations artifacts such as net weights and spear heads in the area.

- Would like to be able to ask more questions of the developer in a public forum. Attended the 2006-Jan-16 meeting and the development has changed a lot since that time.
- Developer said they lowered the high-rises but then someone said they would be as high as the trees, which could be anywhere up to eight storeys. That is a high-rise to me.
- There was talk of putting a parking lot in the Nanaimo area that will service the trail. Don't know how many cars that will be.
- All roads in the area are country roads and they are meant for that type of volume and we want them to stay that way.
- The applicant's public meeting on 2007-Feb-07 did not result in collaboration with the public.
- 100 acres is zoned Rural 4 (RDN) with permitted uses being agriculture, aquaculture and others. If this area is a part of their plan, why isn't it being considered by PNAC as well at this time?
- Gives us the feeling that we don't have any control over what happens if the City approves it.
- OCP policy 5.1.16 provides that amendments to the UCB be considered between the City and the RDN where they are equal partners and that the RDN will be actively included. Rather than doing an OCP for both areas and coming under the RGS, we are using these amendments to drive the Plan. This is not good stewardship.
- The RDN passed a bylaw that changed the size of lots permitted in Rural 4 lands from 20 acres to 100 acres (40 ha). The developer had a proposal at that time to subdivide into 20-acre and 5-acre lots. The developer hasn't pursued that.
- This area is remote from everything else and the City doesn't have any community connection to it.
- The OCP calls for 'documented needs' before changing the UCB - documented community needs, not developer needs.
- At the 2007-Jan-16 meeting, the applicant was questioned as to why change from 20-acre lots to this high density development and he indicated that City Council said this was their preference for the area. Don't think this documents a community need.
- Residents of Cedar need to get some confidence that politicians are looking after us. We don't get that feeling.

B. Holdom noted:

- Regarding the reference to developers approaching Council members – Council members don't have any power as individuals, only when they meet as a Council.
- These claims are meaningless and have no standing whatsoever.

Public Comments (continued):

- One would presume that if they get the zoning they want, they could change all their plans or just sell it for a much higher price.
- How much would it cost to service this area? There are areas inside the UCB that don't have services and they should be serviced first.
- Would ruin a pristine area of the City.
- This violates every part of the urban containment policy.
- No respect is being shown to area residents at all.
- Believes in the OCP, neighbourhood plans and Regional Growth Strategy and we have done well because of them.
- Don't want to see things fall apart because outsiders come in and want to make a profit and leave.
- We have a downtown that needs to be revitalized and redeveloped. People want that.

- This would be a big resort community five miles from the City. The residents would not be going to downtown Nanaimo, but would stay at the resort and not become part of our community.
- Nanaimo doesn't need this and Cedar doesn't want or need it.
- The green area on the map is a large drainage area. Lantern Creek has a water license on it and the people working on this property have been driving right through it. The water license owner is very upset. It also supplies a lot of the wells in the area. If this goes in, they may end up without water.
- Regarding the 100 acres – Area A has it protected but how is the developer going to get hold of that 100 acres – are they going to annex it to the City?
- Don't think the City is going to want to annex for the sake of development.
- The RDN can't protect it because the developer owns the rest of property and he could approach the provincial government and they could make that decision and overrule local government.
- We need this area as a buffer from Harmac.
- Harmac only has chips until 2008. They are not making large amounts of money. They could sell their sewer system and water supply to this company who could then build more high-rises.
- Wants to make sure PNAC considers how unfortunate it is that this process places the onus on residents to set criteria for development. The proposal should have been scrutinized by City Council and planners using the City's criteria before it came to the community.
- The OCP should be followed. The UCB was established after extensive review to contain sprawl, and to protect the environment and integrity of rural resource areas. What has changed?
- Who wants this destination golf course and high density? Has the City or neighbouring communities asked for it?
- The OCP is for people who live and pay taxes in the City.
- The RDN's Sustainability Committee produced a report. Can't turn a blind eye to the superb recommendations in the report and approve this.
- The onus is on PNAC to take all the things you have in the OCP and apply to the applications.
- Who is overseeing what is happening to all our resources and infrastructure?
- Who is going to pay for it all and cope with all the traffic and stress on schools and hospitals. Need to look at the larger picture.
- Really disappointed that the City would contemplate allowing all the traffic from this development to be funneled through an area outside the City.
- Should have to comply with the present zoning.

There were no further comments from the public.

B. Holdom thanked all those in attendance for coming to the meeting and stated appreciation for all the work people put into their submissions.

3. Next Meeting:

The next regular meeting of PNAC is scheduled for 2007-Mar-20, in the Board Room, City Hall

4. Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

File: 0360-20-P07-02

G:\commplan\PNAC\2007\min_Feb27_1