

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF PLAN NANAIMO ADVISORY COMMITTEE
HELD ON THURSDAY, 2007-FEB-20 IN THE BOARD ROOM,
CITY HALL, 455 WALLACE STREET**

Present:

Gail Adrienne	David Hill-Turner
Brian Anderson	Councillor Bill Holdom
Carey Avender	Shirley Lance
Jolyon Brown	Darwin Mahlum
Edwin Deas	Ralph Meyerhoff
Michael Geselbracht	Michael Schellinck
	Gord Turgeon

Staff

Andrew Tucker
Deborah Jensen
Fran Grant (Recording Secretary)

Regrets:

Stu Donaldson	Bill Forbes
Chris Erb	Jane Gregory

Neighbourhood	Joy Bremner	Brechin Hill Neighbourhood Association
Representatives:	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:

Chair B. Holdom called the meeting to order at 5:05 p.m.

2. Introduction of New Members:

Chair B. Holdom welcomed the new neighbourhood representatives to PNAC and introductions were made around the table.

3. Adoption of Minutes for 2007-Jan-16:

MOVED by S. Lance, SECONDED by D. Hill-Turner, that the minutes of 2007-Jan-16 be adopted as presented.

CARRIED

4. Approval of Agenda and Late Items:

a) Appoint alternate member to Rezoning Advisory Committee (A. Tucker)

MOVED by B. Anderson, SECONDED by R. Meyerhoff, that the agenda be accepted as presented with the addition of one late item.

CARRIED

5. New Business:

a) Discussion of OCP review in relation to the 10 OCP amendment applications (A. Tucker)

- A. Tucker distributed a handout outlining the OCP review process and options. Draft plan document delivery is at least 2 – 3 months behind the original timeline as the first Conference was held later in November than expected, and we did not anticipate ten amendment applications.
- Several PNAC members have expressed their concerns regarding dealing with applications and OCP review at the same time.
 - Outlined the two proposed formats for the Feb. 27 event.
 - Cable Bay applicant's public meeting was attended by over 300 people. There was no opportunity for public to present at this meeting
 - 90% of public inquiries we are receiving are about Cable Bay.
 - Could use March 6th workshop date for second public meeting (continuation of 2007-Feb-27 meeting) for Cable Bay application.
 - Trying to line up Dr. Anne McAfee, former Co-Director of Planning for Vancouver, as the keynote speaker for the density workshop. May have to move the meeting to later in March to accommodate Dr. McAfee.
 - Consultant proposed producing a working paper before a first draft of OCP so public would see direction the review is going.
 - Three options put forward to determine process for dealing with OCP applications and OCP review.

Format for 2007-Feb-27 discussion:

- Council is already being lobbied on the amendment applications.
- Need to provide a forum for the community to present their views on the applications in a calm, respectable manner.
- Applications should be put aside and the 2007-Feb-27 meeting cancelled. We need to get back to dealing with OCP review.
- OCP is in place and under review. Applications should be dealt with based on the existing OCP.
- We don't have new OCP in place to deal with them. Applicants could re-apply after revisions have been finished.
- Agree we should deal with the applications as the OCP is now, and still not enough information on some of them. Should deal with ones that have complete information.
- Might be perceived that the applicants got in under the wire if we go ahead and approve any of the applications, and then the OCP is changed in a way that wouldn't allow these applications.
- We have the UCB now and don't see that the UCB should be expanded.
- Trying to do both tasks at the same time may be too much for the Committee to deal with effectively.
- Committee's role is to make recommendations and not be involved with formal public input. Committee can't make decisions on applications, they must go to Council.
- Don't know how long we can hold up the applications (i.e. waiting until the review is complete before considering them).
- Five applications to move UCB – needs to be all or none, not on how much information they give. Is this effective land use? Can't say yes to one but no to others.
- Agree with not moving UCB. We are in middle of a public process that should be finished soon. Public is very confused. Need to put the applications aside so we can deal with public on OCP review.
- G. Adrienne will withdraw from PNAC if applications go forward.

- Several of the applications are simple housekeeping, others are much more complex. Don't know if it is fair to mix them all together.
- UCB is the OCP. Recommend option 2 or 3 (as per A. Tucker's handout).
- Need to separate for Council the changes to the OCP first, UCB being part of this, then deal with the ten proposals (with the new OCP in place).
- Proponents have applied to existing plan and existing rules. Can we change that mid-stream? We should process with existing rules.

A. Tucker advised that if PNAC makes a recommendation to place applications on hold, that recommendation would have to go to Council for approval.

G. Adrienne made a motion supporting Option 2 that all applications be deferred until the 10 year OCP review has been completed. The motion was not seconded.

B. Holdom advised:

- Proposed an open house format for the 2007-Feb-27 public meeting with different tables for each application.
- The Cedar neighbourhood organization wishes to address PNAC directly regarding the Cable Bay application.
- Could invite representatives of groups that have formed around these applications to submit written input to PNAC.

Comments from the Committee:

- Don't think public will appreciate having hundreds of people around one table.
- Difficult for PNAC to be present to hear all comments made at the tables.
- We know which applications are more difficult from the first meeting and those ones should be asked to get more information. Deal with ones without so much opposition first.
- Applicants have numerous opportunities to present their proposal – this is not City's obligation.
- Public will want opportunity to address the general public and PNAC; writing it down on comment sheets doesn't work for all.
- It is traditional for PNAC to have public meeting to hear feedback. January meeting was to ask questions but not give feedback. The public was told their opportunity to give feedback would be at the February meeting.

A. Tucker noted that:

- Feedback to PNAC would be forms filled out by the public in Option 1 (as per handout).
- From the phone calls received, the public didn't feel they were able to voice their concerns at January meeting.

Comments from the Committee:

- Change order of agenda to address less contentious applications first.
- Idea of doing in two sessions is good idea, would be more balanced.
- Have two meetings with contentious ones spread between the two (e.g. put Cable Bay with a couple of non-contentious ones).
- Cable Bay is a mix of RDN and City strategies. Incomplete information on application is also an issue.
- Having Dr. A. McAfee attend the density workshop is good way to become informed on good planning practices. Would help us to make logical decisions at the workshop.

B. Holdom suggested that applicants could set up tables if they wish and hold public meeting to get feedback to PNAC.

Comment from the Brechin Hill Neighbourhood representatives:

- People are expecting 2007-Feb-27 to be the chance for the public to voice their opinions and that is what has been advertised through neighbourhood flyers and phone calls.

Comments from the Committee:

- Is it possible to have people come at certain times with the schedule staggered a bit?

A. Tucker noted:

- Believe there is only one application that will not receive any public comment.
- Planning to order the applications from least contentious to worst, which will place Cable Bay last this time.

Comments from the Committee:

- Can application that seems to be a mapping error go straight to Council; this would subvert the whole process.
- We need to look at what makes sense in the Plan, not getting bogged down in a political process.
- Public should go to public hearing to talk to Council.
- Could encourage people to speak on behalf of groups, limit to five minutes. Ask the public to not repeat points already heard. Could ask for a show of hands how many people are here to say same thing.
- We need to design meeting so it flows well, and people not waiting so long. Establishing display tables in the lounge would provide another venue to impart information while they are waiting to speak.
- Set time limit and encourage people to not repeat what has already been said. Need to be well managed.
- Could distribute handouts on meeting format and how to organize groups (similar concerns) with select spokespersons.
- Need a proper PA system this time.
- Think we are trying to accomplish too much at this meeting.
- Applicant tables should be completely separate – place in separate room from auditorium.
- Have tables in lounge and meeting in auditorium.

A. Tucker noted:

- Have clear direction from PNAC so staff will organize 2007-Feb-27 as a public meeting.
- Will ask members of the public to wait in the lounge until their issue is being discussed.
- Waiting to hear back from A. McAfee. The density workshop seems to be leaning towards the end of March, after spring break.
- At the January meeting, 66 people left after Cable Bay presented; assuming higher attendance at this meeting.

b) Summary of Applicant Meetings: (A. Tucker, D. Jensen)

A. Tucker advised that staff have attended four neighbourhood meetings hosted by applicants and gave a brief overview as follows:

South Nanaimo Lands (Snuneymuxw First Nation / Northwest Properties)

Comments from the Chase River Neighbourhood representatives:

- Applicant gave us a complete run down. Had good maps to show what is proposed.
- Very complex proposal with commercial, industrial, residential.
- Impressed with fact that willing to work with the neighbourhood association, City, RDN and other senior levels of government.
- Will take 15 years to complete all phases.
- Largest neighbourhood association meeting we have had with approximately 50 people in attendance; SFN in attendance as well.
- Property is owned fee simple so will not be treaty land and falls under City of Nanaimo regulations.
- Feel it is a worthwhile proposal.
- Major concern is access and we already have some access problems.
- Highways would have to allow more access including Cedar Road.
- Found that the applicant addressed environmental issues in plans by setting aside various ESAs.
- Would need to have major setbacks and safeguards for Nanaimo River.

Comment from the Committee:

- Although this proposal is more accepted by the community, it is still a big issue because of UCB.

Nanaimo Shipyards:

Comments from the Brechin Hill Neighbourhood Representatives:

- Did not have accurate information.
- Traffic mitigation – nothing specific.
- Looked good but nothing specific.
- Confusing for a lot of people – many different terms used for same thing.
- Did not show how people would be affected by shade, using the models.
- City says over six floors is high rise. They said ten to twelve floors is high rise.
- Whole of city is interested because it is part of our waterfront.
- Residents have been told they can speak at 2007-Feb-27 meeting.

Pacific Pet Resorts:

D. Jensen noted:

- Small turn out of approximately 30 people.
- Most just asking a few questions.
- Some were in support.
- Some with concerns about loss of green space and view corridors.
- Few questions and concerns about access because of a steep bank and rail overpass.

Cable Bay Lands:

A. Tucker noted:

- Very large turnout.
- Did open house format and people were frustrated as they wanted to speak but weren't able to.
- Did have environment and engineering consultants present who showed mapping of ESAs and environmental inventory.

- Proposed access was through Harmac, but Harmac has now said no.
- Alternate road access through Leask, Ivor and Nicola. Revised plan shows all access through Nicola where Cable Bay trail starts.
- Proposed marina has been removed.
- Applicants are quoted in the newspaper that they are removing high rises from the proposal but we have no information from them on this.
- Spoken to their engineer and they say there will be a new site plan a week from now.
- Development of the easterly portion of the property is going ahead under existing zoning and development permit.

Comments from the Committee:

- Would be useful to have existing use and designation on each application.
- Should be dealing with just UCB as zoning is out of our scope.

A. Tucker:

- The public is always looking for some level of detail, and at the OCP level it is only the land use designation. Would need different designations for different aspects of proposal.
- City separates OCP and rezoning application. Some jurisdictions run both at the same time.

Comments from the Committee:

- OCP designation does not give zoning if we change UCB or land use designation.
- Public wants to know what is at the end of the road and what are they looking at.
- Moving UCB will determine what areas will be serviced, which subsequently could allow for other uses.
- If we clearly define where we want our buildings and development, we wouldn't have to go through this process all the time. Developers would know where they can build and could fill in the gaps.
- This process does not deal with zoning, yet we are getting pretty pictures from applicants. If Council approves OCP amendment, developers can then decide what they are going to do and often they are not anything like the pretty pictures we are shown. Need to be very conscious of this when we making a decision.

A. Tucker gave the following answer to a question from the Committee:

- Ucluelet situation is very different from Nanaimo's as it involves a single land owner in a small town. They are also marketing this development to households with \$3 million income, which allows for more amenities and needs of the town.
- UCB workshop feedback was people wanting to know with greater certainty where density could occur.

c) Land Capacity Study:

A. Tucker noted:

- Web site includes summary report, along with complete consultant report (with executive summary).
- 23,500 dwelling units are available under existing zoning.
- 8000 of the 11,000 are apartment units. Somewhat theoretical.
- Capacity is there and infill can take place in right circumstances.
- Does not include steep slope and riparian areas.
- Some of the land is vacant but not for sale.
- Capacity is based on existing zoning. Some builders are building under the number of lots they are allowed.

- One example is the building of five estate lots instead of the 150 allowed.
- Costs of bringing to market are not factored in.
- Based on maxing out land as it is currently zoned.
- A lot of capacity is in apartment style units.
- Traditionally we build single family homes but capacity is in condos.

Comments from the Committee:

- Demand is for single family homes.
- With costs on some single family lots it is too expensive to put in services. Can't afford to subdivide.
- Concerned that there is not enough capacity. Last number of years we have been underdeveloping land. We are approving these proposals and if we keep doing that, we will deplete this capacity. City should encourage maxing out land instead of minimizing.
- We might have developer that makes plans exactly as in OCP and it is turned down by Council. That has happened. Need Council to follow the OCP.
- Land capacity study raises how long are we expecting OCP to run counter to market forces. How far are we willing to go?
- Under-built sites are not paying their way as they are much more expensive to service.
- At November workshop, some people indicated they would like to see a workshop on whether Nanaimo wants to look at carrying capacity and ultimate size. Some communities are starting to put a cap on it. Based growth on sustainability not just how large we can push growth. This underlies all other questions and hasn't been discussed yet. Do we want to be only market driven. NALT is interested in hosting such a workshop.
- Four floor buildings are not viable because of cost of elevator, etc. Three floors is highest can go and still make money.

d) UCB Workshop Summary:

A. Tucker noted:

- Hoping to have summary ready soon.
- Attended by 69 people. Thought we would have approximately 150 people.
- Lively discussion at most tables. General summary from most tables is that UCB should stay roughly where it is.
- Need some type of escape clause for exceptional circumstances.
- Lots of discussion around density and how should we grow.
- Jingle Pot residents were also in attendance, indicating they would like to see the UCB moved.
- Each person had worksheet and staff will be tabulating the results.
- Much consensus on UCB criteria.

Comments from the Committee:

- Would be nice to know fallout from new steep slope zones, which allows for increased density.
- Good zoning goes a long way in maximizing density. Preserves green space but still improves density.
- One caution that some of the questions were rather ambiguous. One in particular: "would you be prepared to have multi-family near you?" If you don't know where the respondents live now, it is irrelevant. Might already live in higher density area.

D. Jenson noted:

- Most people indicated they were willing to take up to four storeys.
- Steep slope zones are both inside and outside UCB. So far we are seeing some increased density but not significant; not maximizing density.
- First approved Development Permit was three or four units shy of density allowed.

e) Neighbourhood Plans:

B. Anderson noted:

- Discussed his suggested recommendation to Council (attached e-mail).
- One neighbourhood plan is in contradiction with the OCP and don't think that should happen.
- Primary concept is try to control sprawl and just building single family dwellings is contrary and that is what some neighbourhoods are trying to say.
- Homelessness and affordable housing – lots of talk but no action.
- We are closing schools and we have a high number of parks. Perhaps the 10% that is taken from developers for parks could be put towards affordable housing. Increased density would make some units more affordable.

PNAC:

- Believe strongly in neighbourhood plan concept.
- Should list affordable housing as one of the issues to be looked at under the review.
- SPAC is assembling a paper about homelessness, which will be put forward for the OCP review.
- Is it in *Local Government Act* that 10% must go towards parks?
- Need to keep park funds for future buying.
- Maybe City could collect for parks and social issues.

A. Tucker responded:

- We try and make neighbourhood plans with more detail for the area but not contrary to OCP.
- Departure Bay did down size their Neighbourhood Village.
- There is more flexibility in the *Local Government Act*.
- Workshop topics have been set in response to issues identified by the public.

f) Homelessness, Affordable Housing (B. Anderson – attached e-mail)

- Discussed as above.

6. **Late Item:**

a) Appoint alternate member to Rezoning Advisory Committee (A. Tucker)

MOVED by R. Meyerhoff, SECONDED by S. Lance that D. Mahlum be appointed as an alternate to the Rezoning Advisory Committee.

CARRIED

7. **OCP Amendment Applications:**

This item was discussed under item 5 a.

A. Tucker advised that considerable information on all applications, and the review process, has been posted on the City web site, and suggested that Committee might wish to keep themselves up to date.

8. Next Meeting:

- A public workshop to review the ten OCP amendment applications is scheduled for 2007-Feb-27, 5:00 p.m., Beban Park Lounge.
- OCP Densification workshop is schedule for 2007-Mar-06, Beban Park Lounge. May be changed pending speaker availability. PNAC will be advised .
- The next regular meeting of PNAC is scheduled for 2007-Mar-20, Board Room, City Hall

9. Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned at 7:15 pm.