

CITY OF NANAIMO

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE REZONING ADVISORY COMMITTEE HELD ON THURSDAY, 2007-FEB-01, AT 4:45 P.M. IN THE BOARD ROOM, CITY HALL, 455 WALLACE STREET, NANAIMO, BC

PRESENT: Brian Anderson - Chair
Michael Schellinck
Shirley Lance
Bill Forbes

APPLICANT(S): Ruben Galdames – Robert Boyle Architecture (RA182)
Robert Boyle – Robert Boyle Architecture (RA182)
Larry Lokun – Owner (RA182)
Joan Shillabeer – Departure Bay Neighbourhood Association (RA182)
Allan Davidson – Departure Bay Neighbourhood Association (RA182)

Edward Nishi - Owner
Cecilia Plavetic – Developer / Owner (RA183)
Ivan Plavetic – Developer / Owner (RA183)
Mark Garrett – Designer (RA183)

STAFF: Dale Lindsay, Manager, Planning Division, DSD
Jason Carvalho, Planner, Planning Division, DSD

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:51 p.m.

2. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

MOVED by Ms. Lance, SECONDED by Mr. Schellinck, that the minutes of the 2006-NOV-02 Rezoning Advisory Committee meeting be adopted.

CARRIED

3. NEW AND PENDING APPLICATIONS

RA182: Robert Boyle Architecture, on behalf of Larry and Joanne Lokun, has submitted an application to rezone property at 2937 Departure Bay Road from Single Family Residential Zone (RS-1) to a new Comprehensive Development District Zone (CD-5), in order to allow for a multiple family residential development.

Mr. Carvalho gave a brief presentation on the property and application:

- Corner of Bay Street and Departure Bay Road; property is behind 7-Eleven and currently has a single-family dwelling located on this 0.97 acre lot.
- New CD Zone would be established in conjunction with the development and the site statistics would form the guidelines as they related to this zone.
- Application is proposing nine units, comprised of three two-storey townhouses and six condo units above.
- Property is within the Departure Bay Neighbourhood planning area which was recently adopted by Council. This property designated as 'Neighbourhood', which supports low density, multi-family development up to two storeys.

Mr. Boyle gave a brief introduction to his application:

- Noted that plans have been altered to adhere to previous suggestions from neighbourhood residents.
- CD Zone looked at because of archaeological matters on land.
- Main entry to the property off Bay Street. Access from Departure Bay Road would be somewhat problematic due to visibility.
- Unique property with excellent views of the waterfront and the owner feels the property warrants quality construction with separate parking.
- Area would be extensively landscaped. Number of profiles have been completed on the site, as well as view profiles from properties northwest of the site. Do not intend on impacting neighbours views.
- Believes the project would compliment the community and would generate a reasonable tax base for improvements in the area. Adding that it will not place an unreasonable load on the local school system.

Mr. Galdames gave an overview of the proposal:

- Gave an overview of the proposed landscape plan, access points, rooftop gardens and riparian restoration.

Mr. Boyle noted that they are not attempting a major modification to the existing zoning and that they have let area residents know that specific plans include quality construction that will not be altered from what they have seen. Plan on keeping residents involved in all steps of rezoning process.

Mr. Anderson asked for clarification on CD-5 Zone and whether or not design is included in the rezoning stage of this new zone.

Mr. Carvalho noted that it will not incorporate the design elements of the building, but the zoning designation would be based on and govern the height, setback, lot coverage, etc. of the proposal. Certain design elements (i.e.: projection on third storey) could change, however the footprint and FAR would be governed by the new zone.

Mr. Davidson asked for clarification on the next steps of in the rezoning process, specifically when public and neighbourhood input will be sought.

Mr. Carvalho noted that further discussions with immediate neighbours is planned prior to First Reading. A public hearing would be a part of the rezoning process.

Mr. Davidson noted that one concern raised at previous public open houses meetings was possible view impacts; added that a drawing which could give upslope residents an idea of how the development would look from their properties would be helpful.

Mr. Boyle noted that photographs were previously taken from the upslope properties which could be shown to residents, adding that an alternative method is to raise helium filled balloons to show height and proposed corners of building.

Mr. Galdames noted that they have superimposed the development on a photograph to show the relationship between the existing houses that indicates the developments height.

Ms. Shillabeer noted some residents think the project is a four-storey building; a clearer indication that the project is a two-storey building would be helpful.

Mr. Boyle noted that there are essentially two separate buildings terraced up to the slope, to minimize height. Added that with the existing grades of the property the profile of the building would be two storeys.

Mr. Galdames noted that the two buildings share a common parking unit.

Mr. Davidson asked about the building setback relative to the existing creek.

Mr. Galdames stated that the project is behind the riparian setback; 15-metres taken from the top of the bank. No excavation will occur within the setback and it will be extensively replanted.

Mr. Forbes asked for clarification regarding the area residents concerns regarding on-site trucks movements given that trucks would be common.

Mr. Boyle noted that the concern was in regard to trucks not being able to manoeuvre correctly on-site and would therefore need to turn around on the roadway. Added that Bay Street has a sidewalk on the same side of the road, if any trucks parked on Bay Street it would only block part of the road off.

Mr. Forbes asked when the development application came forward, in relation to when the Departure Bay Neighbourhood Plan (DBNP) was adopted.

Mr. Davidson noted that this proposal was presented after they had presented concept of the new Neighbourhood Plan to the City.

Mr. Carvalho stated that the City would be forwarding a letter to the applicant that would note comments from the neighbourhood association and to encourage that a time be set up to speak to them, adding that City Staff would be happy to attend any such meetings.

Mr. Forbes asked what feedback from the neighbourhood residents was up to this point.

Mr. Davidson noted that there were a lot of questions; some could not be answered as plans were still preliminary at the time. Added that the concerns he hears often revolve around whether or not the proposal is too big for the area.

Mr. Boyle asked what RAC's role is in the rezoning process and what occurs following RAC.

Mr. Carvalho noted that the RAC committee meeting is a requirement of the overall rezoning process; the City's referral process occurs in consultation with RAC. Once all referrals are in and the RAC meeting has taken place, a comprehensive letter to the applicant is prepared which includes RAC's recommendation and Staff's referral comments.

Mr. Anderson noted that RAC's purpose is to consider if the proposed rezoning is a fit for the property and not aesthetics or design concepts.

Mr. Schellinck asked for clarification on traffic impacts and the date of the traffic study, as traffic has likely increased since the date of the study completion.

Mr. Anderson stated that Staff would provide all necessary information regarding the traffic study and whether issues existed, adding that RAC's responsibility at this meeting is to ascertain if the zoning change to multi-family conforms to the OCP and if it is a fit to the neighbourhood. Design and traffic have nothing to do with the decision made through the RAC meeting.

Mr. Forbes noted that the Neighbourhood Plan was just adopted and should not be changed.

Mr. Carvalho noted that the designation on the property is currently 'Neighbourhood', which under the OCP and under the DBNP does support low density multi-family development. The 'Neighbourhood' designation would not restrict uses on the property to single-family and does allow for a multi-family development with a target density of 25 units per hectare.

Mr. Anderson noted that because he had not seen any information in the agenda from Staff that indicated any problems with compliance to the OCP or the DBNP he understood it to not be an issue. Added that the OCP encourages neighbourhoods to densify.

Mr. Davidson noted that the zoning on this property was considered during the creation of the DBNP, adding that they believed single-family designation was appropriate for the property. The DBNP clearly states that there is a two storey cap for multi-family developments and residents are unclear if this is over that cap.

Mr. Anderson noted that height should not be considered when deciding if the land use (zoning) is appropriate.

Mr. Forbes noted that a motion to approve should be put forward that indicates approval is granted subject to the residents and developer agreeing on final plans; in his opinion the residents have stated concerns regarding the number of units proposed.

Ms. Lance noted that a motion to approve as presented would mean the proposal would then go ahead in the rezoning process which would ensure neighbourhood representation at the public hearing. According to Staff this proposal does not fall outside what the OCP permits and supports.

MOVED by Ms. Lance that the application be approved as presented and be forwarded to Council. SECONDED by Mr. Schellinck.

CARRIED

RA183: Edward Nishi has submitted an application to rezone property at 6231 Hammond Bay Road from Rural Agricultural / Residential Zone (A-2) to Low Density Multiple Family Residential Zone (RM-3), in order to allow for a multiple family residential development.

Mr. Carvalho gave a brief presentation of the project and history of the subject application:

- Subject property located at corner of Hammond Bay Road and Uplands Drive.
- Previous OCP amendment application on subject property in 2005 to allow for a site-specific amendment to the 'Neighbourhood' designation to support a future rezoning to allow for a townhouse development of up to .045 FAR.
- Applicants have now come forward with this application and are proposing 20 single-family dwellings facing onto Uplands Drive, with a rear laneway to provide access to the units.

Mr. Garrett gave a brief presentation of the project:

- Property surrounded by RM-3 zones. Long, skinny lot.
- Will have a colonial streetscape with narrow homes.
- With City's permission the entire project will have a four-metre setback to aid in bringing forward the street presence.

Ms. Plavetic noted that the design includes consideration to neighbours privacy and all other facets of the development.

Mr. Anderson noted that he approves of the homes facing onto Uplands Road as it would be more attractive than rear yards.

MOVED by Mr. Forbes that the application be approved as presented. SECONDED by Mr. Schellinck.

CARRIED

4. NEW BUSINESS

5. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Lance MOVED that the meeting be adjourned at 5:35 p.m. SECONDED by Mr. Forbes.

CARRIED

APPROVED:


Chair

03/15/07
Date