

## STAFF REPORT

TO: A. TUCKER, ACTING DIRECTOR, PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT, DSD

FROM: D. LINDSAY, MANAGER, PLANNING DIVISION, DSD

RE: REPORT OF THE PUBLIC HEARING HELD THURSDAY, 2006-DEC-07  
FOR BYLAWS NO. 4000.406, 4000.407, AND 4000.408

---

### STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION:

That Council receive this report and the minutes of the Public Hearing held on Thursday, 2006-DEC-07.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

A Public Hearing was held on 2006-DEC-07, the subject of which was three items. Approximately 70 members of the public were in attendance. Minutes of the Public Hearing are attached and information regarding procedures for Bylaws No. 4000.406, 4000.407, and 4000.408 are contained within the report.

### BACKGROUND:

#### **1. BYLAW 4000.406 (2211 Jingle Pot Road – RA179):**

This bylaw, if adopted, will permit 'Teletheatre Outlet' as a site-specific use on land located at 2211 Jingle Pot Road. The teletheatre outlet is proposed to have a licensed capacity of thirty seats and will be accommodated within an existing space in the pub. The subject property is legally described as LOT A, SECTION 11, RANGE 7, MOUNTAIN DISTRICT, PLAN 45118.

This application appears before Council this evening for consideration of Third Reading.

Two members of the public attended the Public Hearing to speak to this issue. One written submission was recognized at the Public Hearing.

#### **2. BYLAW NO. 4000.407 (5640 Hammond Bay Road – RA180):**

This bylaw, if adopted, will rezone part of the subject property from Single Family Residential Zone (RS-1) to Residential Duplex Zone (RM-1) in order to allow for the development of three duplexes within a proposed fourteen lot subdivision.

☒ Council  
☐ Committee.....  
☒ Open Meeting  
☐ In-Camera Meeting

Meeting Date: 2006-DEC-18

The subject property is legally described as part of LOT 3, DISTRICT LOT 40, WELLINGTON DISTRICT, PLAN 7728 EXCEPT PART IN PLAN 26105, VIP76263, VIP76265 AND VIP76305.

This application appears before Council this evening for consideration of Third Reading.

One member of the public attended the Public Hearing to speak to this issue. Two written submissions were recognized at the Public Hearing.

**3. BYLAW NO. 4000.408 (2102, 2104 and 2106 Bowen Road – RA170):**

This bylaw, if adopted, will rezone properties from Single Family Residential Zone (RS-1) to Low Density Multiple Family Residential (Townhouse) Zone (RM-3) in order to allow for a 20-unit affordable housing development. The development, as proposed, will consist of four two-storey residential buildings with access to the site via a rear laneway. The subject properties are legally described as parts of LOT 34, BLOCK 1, SECTION 17, RANGE 7, MOUNTAIN DISTRICT, PLAN 526 EXCEPT PART IN PLAN VIP54414 and LOT 33, BLOCK 1, SECTION 17, RANGE 7, MOUNTAIN DISTRICT, PLAN 526, EXCEPT PART IN PLAN VIP54485 and LOT 32, BLOCK 1, SECTION 17, RANGE 7, MOUNTAIN DISTRICT, PLAN 526, EXCEPT PART IN PLAN VIP54603208.7 FEET, 40473 AND 45275 and SECTION 29, RANGE 17, OF SECTION 7, NANAIMO DISTRICT, PLAN 1332, EXCEPT PART OUTLINED IN RED ON PLAN 522 RW AND EXCEPT PART IN PLAN 3212 RW.

This application appears before Council this evening for consideration of Third and Fourth Reading.

25 members of the public attended the Public Hearing to speak to this issue. Five written submissions were recognized at the Public Hearing.

Respectfully submitted,



D. Lindsay  
Manager, Planning Division  
**Development Services Department**



A. Tucker  
Acting Director, Planning & Development  
**Development Services Department**

**MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC HEARING HELD PURSUANT  
TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT IN THE BOARD CHAMBERS  
OF THE REGIONAL DISTRICT OF NANAIMO, 6300 HAMMOND BAY ROAD,  
NANAIMO, BC, ON THURSDAY, 2006-DEC-07, TO CONSIDER PROPOSED  
AMENDMENTS TO THE CITY OF NANAIMO "ZONING BYLAW 1993 NO. 4000"**

---

**PRESENT:** Mayor G.R. Korpan  
Councillor M.D. Brennan Councillor W.J. Holdom  
Councillor C.S. Manhas Councillor L.D. McNabb  
Councillor M.W. Unger

**REGRETS:** Councillor W.L. Bestwick Councillor J.D. Cameron  
Councillor L.J. Sherry

Staff

A. Tucker, Acting Director, Planning & Development, DSD  
D. Lindsay, Manager, Planning Division, DSD  
J. Horn, Social Planner, Planning Division, DSD  
J. Carvalho, Planner, Planning Division, DSD  
P. Masse, Planning Clerk, Planning Division, DSD

Public

There were approximately 70 members of the public present.

**CALL TO ORDER:**

Mayor Korpan called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. Mr. Lindsay explained the required procedure in conducting a Public Hearing and the regulations contained within Section 892 of the Local Government Act. Mr. Lindsay read the items as they appeared on the Agenda, adding that this is the last opportunity to provide input to Council before consideration of Third Reading to Bylaws No. 4000.406 and 4000.407 as well as Third and Fourth Reading to Bylaw No. 4000.408 at Council's next regularly scheduled meeting of 2006-DEC-18.

**1. BYLAW 4000.406 (2211 Jingle Pot Road – RA179):**

This bylaw, if adopted, will permit 'Teletheatre Outlet' as a site-specific use on land located at 2211 Jingle Pot Road. The teletheatre outlet is proposed to have a licensed capacity of thirty seats and will be accommodated within an existing space in the pub. The subject property is legally described as LOT A, SECTION 11, RANGE 7, MOUNTAIN DISTRICT, PLAN 45118.

**Ms. Karen Anderson, 1385 Iver Road - Opposed**

- Owner of townhouse unit (#36 – 262 Harwell Road) located directly behind Jingle Pot Pub, speaking on behalf of the tenant who lives in this townhouse.

- Noted that tenant has expressed concern over noise emanating from vehicular traffic and late-night patrons of the pub that she believes will only worsen if the pub is expanded. Further noted that the tenant has a concern for her safety during peak pub hours.
- Does not believe the pub is a 'good neighbour' and that the expansion and betting facility may attract a clientele that could further increase noise levels.
- Asked for tallies regarding the Neighbourhood Comment sheets that were distributed to adjacent property owners and occupants regarding the pub.

Mr. Lindsay noted that the comment sheets being referenced were circulated with respect to the proposed liquor primary licensing expansion for Jingle Pot Pub. Further clarified that the bylaw amendment on this evening's agenda is to allow for the use of 'Teletheatre Outlet' on the property and that a separate application exists that deals with the liquor primary license, which this comment sheet is in relation to.

Mayor Korpan stated that the liquor primary issue would be coming before Council on 2006-DEC-18, adding that the speaker should feel free to contact Mr. Peter Wipper to review the Good Neighbour Agreements that are in place to ensure no violations are taking place on this property.

**Mr. Brian Phillips, 3463 Blackfoot Way – Applicant**

- Teletheatre currently operating at the Commercial Hotel. Believes Teletheatres are similar to other public lottery programs available today; viewing a program and betting on the outcome.
- Believes it is a quiet, relaxed atmosphere that is better suited to the proposed location due to more available parking and expanded food service for customers.
- Excited for the new partnership and believes it is a perfect fit for the property and the area.
- Addressed concerns regarding being a good neighbour to the community; believes that they have always tried to respond to any concerns in the past and committed to continuing to do so. Have abated noise issues in the past. More than happy to work with all neighbours to ensure a happy community.

Councillor Unger asked the applicant what the present alcohol service seating totals are and whether or not this would be altered with the Teletheatre Outlet.

- Mr. Phillips stated that current liquor seating totals 98 seats inside and 20 seats outside on the patio, adding that an application has been submitted which would bring totals up to 150 seats. Noted that the Provincial government now determines seat totals on occupancy loads.

Mayor Korpan asked that the applicant make his late-hour contacts available to the neighbours in the community to ensure action is taken if any problems arise.

- Mr. Phillips agreed to make contacts available to the community.

One written submission was received for this application and is attached as "Schedule 'A' – Submissions for Bylaw 4000.406 (2211 Jingle Pot Pub – Teletheatre Outlet)". There were no further written or verbal submissions received for this application.

**2. BYLAW NO. 4000.407 (5640 Hammond Bay Road – RA180):**

This bylaw, if adopted, will rezone part of the subject property from Single Family Residential Zone (RS-1) to Residential Duplex Zone (RM-1) in order to allow for the development of three duplexes within a proposed fourteen lot subdivision. The subject property is legally described as part of LOT 3, DISTRICT LOT 40, WELLINGTON DISTRICT, PLAN 7728 EXCEPT PART IN PLAN 26105, VIP76263, VIP76265 AND VIP76305.

**Mr. Brian Senini, 3056 Waterstone Way – Representative of Opposed Neighbours**

- Speaking on behalf of Ray and Lesley Finner who own three properties in the neighbourhood and who are opposed to all three duplexes and associated lot size variances being applied for.
- Mr. and Mrs. Finner's submission is attached as a part of 'Schedule 'B' – Submissions for Bylaw 4000.407.

Councillor Holdom asked for clarification on what the Finner's opposition is based upon.

- Mr. Senini noted that the Finner's own one of the three properties being developed adjacent to the subject property and Phase III of that development is currently pending, adding that they believe the value of their properties will be decreased if this application were to be approved.

Two written submissions were received for this application and are attached as a part of "Schedule 'B' – Submissions for Bylaw 4000.407 (5640 Hammond Bay Road)". There were no further written or verbal submissions received for this application.

**3. BYLAW NO. 4000.408 (2102, 2104 and 2106 Bowen Road – RA170):**

This bylaw, if adopted, will rezone properties from Single Family Residential Zone (RS-1) to Low Density Multiple Family Residential (Townhouse) Zone (RM-3) in order to allow for a 20-unit affordable housing development. The development, as proposed, will consist of four two-storey residential buildings with access to the site via a rear laneway. The subject properties are legally described as parts of LOT 34, BLOCK 1, SECTION 17, RANGE 7, MOUNTAIN DISTRICT, PLAN 526 EXCEPT PART IN PLAN VIP54414 and LOT 33, BLOCK 1, SECTION 17, RANGE 7, MOUNTAIN DISTRICT, PLAN 526, EXCEPT PART IN PLAN VIP54485 and LOT 32, BLOCK 1, SECTION 17, RANGE 7, MOUNTAIN DISTRICT, PLAN 526, EXCEPT PART IN PLAN VIP54603208.7 FEET, 40473 AND 45275 and SECTION 29, RANGE 17, OF SECTION 7, NANAIMO DISTRICT, PLAN 1332, EXCEPT PART OUTLINED IN RED ON PLAN 522 RW AND EXCEPT PART IN PLAN 3212 RW.

**Ms. Valarie Coughtry, 1855 Meredith Road – Opposed**

- Does not object to affordable housing, however does object to the proposed density of the project and the impact on existing traffic problems on Robbie Lane.
- Believes children in the area would be negatively affected by an additional 20 persons and vehicles.

- Does not think 20 single people should be housed on a lot that is zoned for three single-family dwellings, adding that low density is not housing for 20 single persons.
- Has discussed traffic issues with Staff who have acknowledged that there is not enough room on Robbie Lane for a sidewalk; however speed humps were suggested, as well as converting the lane to one-way. Does not believe these options will be enough to aid the traffic problems.
- Asked if resolving the traffic issues will be accomplished prior to or following application approval.
- Believes small families would be acceptable for this project; however, not single "17-20 year olds who may be entering the workforce or may be unemployed".

Mayor Korpan asked Staff for clarification on any proposed traffic improvements to the area.

Mr. Lindsay agreed that pressure has been put on Robbie Lane through past decisions, including limiting access to Latimer Road to right-in / right-out only. The lane was originally intended to service the lots off of the lane however; it now fulfills a much broader role in the area road networking. Staff recognizes this issue and heard these concerns at the public open house (2006-SEP-28). Staff have worked with the Engineering Department to best accommodate the traffic on the lane and the pedestrian priority (children walking to school). Options identified were the addition of speed humps and / or limiting the lane to one-way. However, limiting the lane one-way northbound would create additional problems such as turn-arounds or u-turns near the school; if the lane was made one-way southbound then vehicles going to any of the properties on the south end of the lane would need to enter through Latimer Road. Mr. Lindsay added that an on-site meeting took place on 2006-NOV-06 primarily with the neighbouring owners to follow-up on concerns made at the open house. No consensus was made at that meeting, however, it was agreed that all parties would meet again if the rezoning was approved. It was further noted that Staff do believe that speed humps would assist in slowing traffic to the posted 30 km/h speed limit.

Mayor Korpan asked if the traffic engineers would require a change to the use of Robbie Lane regardless of the outcome of this application.

Mr. Lindsay noted that the traffic engineers made no such comments.

Mayor Korpan asked for confirmation that Robbie Lane would therefore receive no alterations or use changes regarding safety levels even if this application were approved.

Mr. Lindsay confirmed that Staff are prepared to improve the lane in terms of speed humps however further consensus is needed from the neighbourhood.

Councillor Manhas asked the speaker if her main concern was the fact that 20 cars may be entering and leaving the proposed complex.

Ms. Coughtry stated that she is concerned about the added traffic.

Councillor Manhas noted that as this is an affordable housing project many of the tenants may not own vehicles, adding that the nearby amenities and bus route were one of the reasons this site was chosen for the proposed project as many of those living there will not have access to a car.

Ms. Coughtry stated that if the tenant does not have a vehicle they most likely will have "friends" with cars and that if 20 parking stalls were provided, 20 parking stalls would be used.

Councillor Manhas asked Staff to clarify the comment made by the speaker regarding the tenant base being "17 to 20 year olds".

Mr. Horn noted that this statement was given at the open house as an example of a category of people who are in need of affordable housing, adding that no decisions have been made about who the residents would be if approved.

Councillor Holdom asked for clarification on whether the project would be restricted to singles only and if couples or single parents would be permitted to reside in the complex.

Mr. Horn noted that the proposed design is for one bedroom units which are quite small (450 ft<sup>2</sup> to 550 ft<sup>2</sup> per unit), therefore the intent of the proposed development is to house single people. However, no one would be prohibited from renting a unit, it would be a matter of logistics and whether or not there would be enough room for a single parent and their child, adding that the management company would ultimately make decisions regarding proper tenant choices.

**Mr. Martin Buck, 5918 Oliver Road – In Favour**

- Volunteer board member of the Nanaimo Affordable Housing Society.
- Understands neighbourhood concerns regarding the proposal, adding that two of the concerns are quite legitimate, including housing and tenant quality. The proposed project is being designed by Insight Developments who have a long history of high quality projects. The need for affordable housing is so great that the number of applicants will exceed the number of affordable units, and these applicants will follow the same rigorous screening process currently in place with the Society. The tenants are selected on the basis of need and must meet suitable criteria for the neighbourhood. This screening process has successfully worked for the Society for many years. Intent is to create a community that is a partnership with the neighbourhood it resides in.
- Society has been active in Nanaimo for many years operating non-profit housing for the community's disabled and working poor. The demand for safe and affordable housing is huge, with few homes available. Have full time management and staff at the three existing housing complexes in the City. Maintenance of the buildings is contracted to local businesses.
- Invited anyone with concerns to visit any of the existing buildings within the city as the Society is proud of the street presence, landscaping, cleanliness and quality of their complexes (350 Prideaux Street, 153 Wallace Street and 510 Pine Street).
- Acknowledged Council and Staff for their leadership in recognizing the need within our community for quality affordable housing.

Mayor Korpan asked for further comment regarding tenant screening and what the process is if a tenant becomes a nuisance to other neighbours or abuses the affordable housing purpose.

Mr. Buck stated that the Society has to operate under the policies of the Landlord and Tenancy Act and if a tenant is unruly or undesirable a Notice to Vacate would be served on the tenant in question. The Society would operate the same as any for-profit tenancy and the tenant would be held accountable for their actions.

Councillor Manhas asked for input on parking capacities and use at the existing affordable complexes within the City.

Mr. Buck confirmed that most tenants have a limited income and therefore exceeding parking capacities have not been a problem at any of the existing complexes.

Councillor Manhas asked if any of the existing complexes receive consistent concerns or complaints from neighbours.

Mr. Buck noted that all complaints are recorded and kept track of and that each of the projects had neighbourhood resistance initially; however, in time neighbourhood concern eroded and the complexes become an asset to the neighbourhood and community. This is quality housing with tenants who, for the most part, have not been a problem.

**Ms. Joyce Hedges, 103 Berkley Place – In Favour**

- Ms. Hedges' submission is attached as a part of 'Schedule 'C' – Submissions for Bylaw 4000.408.

**Mr. Al Johnson, 1060 Hawkes Turnaround – Opposed**

- Has lived in the area for 12 years, rented his home to tenants for 24 years prior to that.
- Noted that of the eight houses in the cul-de-sac two of the houses have been separated into up and down residences, adding that the neighbourhood has experienced many problems with these split residences.
- Believes traffic in the area is already congested and dangerous to pedestrians, including children.
- Not opposed to low income housing however does not believe 20 singles "jammed" into a lot meant for single-family dwellings is appropriate.
- Asked for confirmation that the City of Nanaimo and its taxpayers own the subject properties.

Mayor Korpan confirmed that the property is owned by the taxpayers of Nanaimo and the City will maintain ownership once the development is completed if approved, however it would be leased to the Nanaimo Affordable Housing Society to operate and administer.

- Mr. Johnson asked for confirmation on the size of the units proposed.

Mayor Korpan confirmed that the proposal is for 20 units varying in size from 440 ft<sup>2</sup> to 600 ft<sup>2</sup>.

- Mr. Johnson asked for confirmation on what size the average single-family house would be on the properties if they were proposed for the development.

Mr. Lindsay confirmed that an average single-family dwelling on typical 600 m<sup>2</sup> lot in Nanaimo would be approximately 2,800 ft<sup>2</sup> to 3,000 ft<sup>2</sup>.

- Mr. Johnson stated that Robbie Lane is being used by the neighbouring community as an access to Bowen Road and that it is congested far beyond its means. Mr. Johnson asked for confirmation regarding number of parking stalls available and whether or not parking would be on-site.

Mr. Lindsay confirmed that 20 parking stalls would be available, all contained on the subject properties.

**Ms. Stacey Hendricks, 736 Nicol Street / Motel – In Favour**

- Single parent who lost custody of her child due to her rent being increased beyond what she could afford.
- Lives in a motel as she cannot afford anything else. Would prefer to be self-sufficient; however it is difficult to maintain a job when you do not have a home.
- An affordable housing project, which is located on a bus route and has nearby amenities would be a major benefit to her and people in the same low income situation.
- Believes she has the right to have a home.
- Noted that the traffic concerns on Robbie Lane could be improved by converting the lane to a one-way street leading onto Meredith Road.
- Believes that there is no difference between single people and families, adding that if the unit is very small, it still is a place to call home for her and her child.
- In support of all affordable housing for the City.

**Mr. Gord Fuller, 604 Nicol Street – In Favour**

- Mr. Fuller's submission is attached as a part of 'Schedule 'C' – Submissions for Bylaw 4000.408.

**Mr. Mark Warrior, #1 - 4128 Mostar Road – In Favour**

- Executive Director of Habitat for Humanity Nanaimo Society which is an institutional member of the Nanaimo Affordable Housing Society.
- Habitat for Humanity deals primarily with families in need, and is constantly having to refer single people who are homeless to other facilities which generally have substandard conditions.
- Believes the project will be well managed by the Society and that it will fit into and be an asset to the neighbourhood surrounding it.
- Congratulated the City and Insight Developments on taking a leadership position in establishing affordable housing.

Mayor Korpan asked for Mr. Warrior's expertise regarding designing housing to maximize limited space through the Habitat for Humanity and his opinion on the density being proposed for this project.

- Mr. Warrior stated that Habitat for Humanity does not develop housing for singles as they are building duplexes or triplexes in order to house families, adding that the proposal does meet the standards being set in the country for this type of project.

**Ms. Geraldine Prouten, 5186 Coach House Drive – In Favour**

- Ms. Prouten's submission is attached as a part of 'Schedule 'C' – Submissions for Bylaw 4000.408.

**Ms. Darcy Olsen, 435 Howard Avenue – In Favour**

- Single mother of two.
- Believes that integration is the most important part of making affordable housing work. Vancouver is proving this by committing 250 affordable housing units in the False Creek Olympic Village as well as approximately 100 units (89,800 ft<sup>2</sup>) allocated to modest market housing.
- Used the Woodward's project in Gastown as an example: includes a mix of 135 market and 100 non-market units. The market units sold out at \$800 per square foot in one day, proving that the wealthiest in Vancouver are not afraid to live next to a family in need of affordable housing.
- Rather than creating larger walls separating the classes we need to bring our community together. Diversity is something to celebrate not fear.

**Mr. Jim Spinelli, 643 Sixth Street – In Favour**

- Executive Director, Nanaimo Affordable Housing Society.
- Thanked Council for its foresight in working to rezone the subject properties in order to incorporate affordable housing into areas of the community other than the downtown. Believes it is important to point out in the City's Official Community Plan (OCP) that the City calls for inclusive neighbourhoods.
- Noted that Nanaimo has never had affordable housing for single individuals, which has created a gap in the community and one which the Society feels on a daily basis. Society currently operates supportive housing for individuals with disabilities. If you do not fall into that category there is no affordable housing existing in the City.
- Emphasized that Nanaimo needs more affordable housing; homelessness creates "social chaos" and the number of people living on the streets has to end. Believes this is an important first step.
- Spoke to the issue of neighbours concerns regarding density: noted that the Society understand the impact density has on a community but when they can only charge \$325 per month a certain density needs to be met in order to be able to keep the property maintained and managed. This ensures the complex is viable and a fit into the community.
- Spoke to the issue of neighbours concerns regarding parking: noted that the affordable housing complex operating on Wallace Street has 24 tenants and four of them have vehicles and that the complex on Prideaux Street has 20 tenants, seven of which have vehicles. Added that many of those vehicles are paid for by tenant relations. Believes the amount of traffic will be minimal and emphasized that he hopes to work with the City toward mitigating any traffic concerns for the community.
- Stated that Insight Developments is one of the best developers in the City and that their projects are gems within the communities they are built in, adding that the Society expects this project will also be a gem and will enhance the value of the properties in the neighbourhood.
- Stated that the Society intends to be good neighbours and will work with the City and the neighbours to mitigate any concerns because Nanaimo desperately needs these affordable housing units.

**Mr. Peter Robertson, 5444 Hiquebran Road – Opposed**

- Owner of 2024 Meredith Road (fourplex in subject neighbourhood).

- Bought property 14 years ago and has worked hard to make it a decent place to live as he believes it is an investment in his future and will be his pension.
- Concerned his property value will decrease if the proposal is approved. Believes young tenants 17 – 20 years of age could cause havoc in the neighbourhood, even with stringent screening.
- Stated he does not want this project in his backyard, adding that most speakers in favour of this proposal do not live in the neighbourhood it is being proposed in.

**Mr. Dave Saunders, 2113 Spencer Road – Opposed**

- Does not believe this Hearing is about low income housing, but rather it is about a community he has lived in for 17 years and raised three children in.
- Noted that Robbie Lane is a single vehicle lane that is already overcrowded by the 260 students that walk or are driven to school on. Three day care facilities also reside along or beside the lane. Added that an additional 20 vehicles, plus any guests, is a recipe for disaster.
- Stated the neighbourhood is already full and that creating a higher density in the neighbourhood would destroy every reason he moved to the area.
- Believes that single, 17-20 year old tenants trying to enter the work force are questionable as neighbours.
- Asked for clarification on why there are 20 parking stalls on-site if it is believed that they will not be occupied.

Mayor Korpan noted that there is a parking ratio policy required under bylaw that has to be adhered to, whether utilized or not they are required to be included.

- Asked for clarification on whether Robbie Lane would be enhanced as a part of this rezoning application.

Mayor Korpan confirmed that Staff has had on-going discussion with the neighbours and the Engineering Department to determine the best options for enhancement of Robbie Lane. This discussion is intended to continue until a consensus is reached.

Mr. Lindsay added that speed humps and a one-way southern access are options being discussed.

Councillor Brennan asked if the School District or Parent Advisory Committee (PAC) have submitted any official position on the proposal.

Mr. Lindsay confirmed that, as with all applications in close proximity with schools, referrals are sent to the School District, adding that submissions were not received from the School District or the PAC.

Councillor Brennan asked if any of the day cares in the area have submitted official comment.

Mr. Lindsay noted that one day care operator has expressed concerns regarding the application.

**Ms. Judith Heather, 1741 Tashtigo Crescent, Gabriola Island – In Favour**

- Councillor for Haven Society in Nanaimo which supports and shelters women who are fleeing abuse and violence. These women face overwhelming barriers not of their own making, including financial challenges for themselves and their children.
- Safe, decent, affordable homes need to be provided for these women and children. Applaud Council for this initiative.
- Alternative to affordable housing for many women is to outspend their means or to return to their abuser; the children feel the negative effects of both of these alternatives.
- Nanaimo cannot afford to not build affordable housing.

**Ms. Lynne Fraser, 2043 Latimer Road – In Favour**

- Has lived in the area for 16 years, her children attended the school, added the neighbourhood is a great place to live.
- Everyone deserves to have a home and this is a wonderful location for this project. Many amenities are nearby as is a recreational centre; great shopping venues and a nearby bus route make this area ideal for an affordable housing project.
- Respects the concerns of her neighbours and the fact that Staff will work to make the lane safer.
- Believes the property will be developed, if not today then soon. Added that as the City grows we won't have the luxury of vacant areas in residential areas. People need homes and it makes sense to increase the density in our neighbourhoods with a variety of housing types. Given that these units are intended for single people it should not add to the congestion at the school.
- Project to be managed by a non-profit society will ensure proper supervision and proper maintenance, making the proposal an asset to the neighbourhood. An affordable housing project does not mean the potential tenants will not be good neighbours.
- Thanked the generosity of the local home builders and the foresight of Council for the opportunity of providing 20 deserving people with homes.

**Mr. Brett Hayward, 5710 Vanderneuk Road – In Favour**

- Co-Chair of the Nanaimo Group on Homelessness Issues and Director of Island Crisis Care Society which provides emergency housing for disadvantaged people.
- Grateful that neighbours with concerns are voicing them so that all parties involved can ensure issues are taken care of.
- Noted that the cities of London, New York and Paris were once the size of Nanaimo, we are headed for a bigger, busier city and we live in a car culture, we will have to deal with density and traffic issues, sending it somewhere else does not work.
- If this project is successful and the neighbours are happy future projects could include affordable housing for single mothers, seniors and disabled people to the point that it could eventually be that the rest of Canada looks to Nanaimo for affordable housing answers. Nanaimo needs to put compassion into the equation.

**Mr. John Cousins, 2022 Latimer Road – In Favour**

- Noted there are several vacant lots in the area currently.

- Believes that Robbie Lane can be enhanced for the children and for all residents in the area; many approaches could be taken to improve the lane including safe drop zones for children, angle parking on frontages and railing blocks between the road and sidewalk for pedestrians.

**Mr. Kent Wilson, 2106 Robbie Place – Opposed**

- Believes this Hearing should be about rezoning the property and not about affordable housing; appreciates the need for low income housing but feels the subject property would be better suited for low income families.
- Believes the project will lower the value of his property.
- Parking in the area is already a problem.

Councillor Holdom asked if parking and traffic on Robbie Lane is currently a problem for the neighbourhood.

- Mr. Wilson confirmed that the neighbourhood currently has problems with traffic and parking and that an additional 20 units will increase those problems.

**Mr. Kevin Atkinson, 1847 Meredith Road – Opposed**

- Involved in Municipal enforcement in another community.
- Does not believe single low income housing is appropriate for these lands, family low income housing is more suitable, due to the schools in the area.
- If a bad tenant is accepted into one of the units, it will take months to remove the tenant and in that time the community "will feed upon themselves".
- Realizes we need the housing, however this project is not appropriate for the area.

Mayor Korpan asked how the speaker would comment on the difference between vetting a prospective tenant by a private landlord versus a non-profit society which has certain criteria and screening processes.

- Mr. Atkinson believes the pre-screening process used by the Society is a great asset which would probably result in a better clientele living in the suites, added it only takes one tenant to "stain the entire development".

**Ms. Maureen Wilson, 3818 Stronach Drive – Opposed**

- Grandson lives across from proposed development.
- Cited a newspaper article in which several Council members were present at the groundbreaking of this project. Asked for clarification on rezoning application process and why this article would be celebrating a project which had not yet been approved.

Mayor Korpan responded that he was present at that ceremony due to the expressed need for affordable housing in Nanaimo. Mayor Korpan added that his role in the Public Hearing process is to hear what the citizen's of the community have to say with an open mind to the issue of rezoning, as is all of Council.

- Ms. Wilson asked for clarification on how any missing members of Council would learn of all speakers input this evening.

Mayor Korpan noted that the recording secretary records all speakers input and distributes the minutes to all Council members prior to the next regularly scheduled Council meeting.

- Ms. Wilson asked for clarification on who would receive the rental payments from the proposed project.

Mayor Korpan noted that Canadian Home Builders Association and Nanaimo Affordable Housing Society would be presenting information before the end of the Hearing and asked Staff for input regarding rental payments.

Mr. Horn responded to Ms. Wilson and noted that the Canadian Home Builders Association (CHBA) have offered to construct four units contingent upon the approval of Council, adding that a proposal has also been submitted to the British Columbia Housing Corporation to build the remainder of the units. Mr. Horn noted that Insight Developments is a member of the CHBA who would be contributing to this project if approved. Mr. Horn stated that rent would be paid by the tenants to the Nanaimo Affordable Housing Society whom would operate and manage the buildings. That money would be used to sustain and maintain the site and buildings, adding that the arrangement with BC Housing would either provide capital for the buildings or they will provide a subsidy.

**Ms. Suzanne Andre, 3980 Hammond Bay Road – In Favour**

- Would support all affordable housing projects for Nanaimo. Impressed with Insight Developments and with the proposed design of the project, including the improvements slated for Bowen Road.
- Pleased the Nanaimo Affordable Housing Society would be managing the buildings, adding that this would minimize problems for neighbours.
- Asked for clarification regarding possible tenants and whether or not they would be required to have employment or if government assisted tenants would be permitted to rent.

Mr. Horn responded that rental consideration would be given to individuals with a low income, including both employed citizens and those on a fixed income. Basic overall premise is for renters who cannot afford to rent in the market sector.

- Ms. Andre supports density bonusing so the entire City could house projects like this. Concerned with traffic on Robbie Lane and urged Staff to work with neighbours to mitigate this issue.

**Mr. Albert Stewart, 7516 Lantzville Road – In Favour**

- Was involved with the Nanaimo Affordable Housing Society from 1990 to 2000 and remains a member of the Society today. Urged Council to approve this worthy project.

Mayor Korpan asked Mr. Stewart for his opinion on the effectiveness of the Society's screening of potential renters.

- Mr. Stewart noted that he hasn't been involved for the last six years however he noted that when he was involved, the screening process was very effective although a few tenants did need to be evicted over the years.

**Ms. Marina Greg, 3211 Uplands Road – In Favour**

- Nursing student, in favour of affordable housing from a health care perspective.
- Involved in various projects within the City and believes that homelessness is a major social determinant. Have met with many people who are on a fixed income or are homeless and they have expressed how that affects their well-being. Has worked in many hospitals on the Island and believes the effects of low-quality housing include respiratory illnesses, skin conditions and nutrition problems.

**Mr. Dustin Hayes, 20 Lorne Place – In Favour**

- Experience working with Nanaimo Affordable Housing Society and other housing resources in Nanaimo has shown the growing need for low income housing.
- Affordable housing would be a valuable asset in any neighbourhood of the City. This complex would house 20 human beings who would not have to sleep on the streets anymore; this is an important initiative and deserves to be supported.

**Ms. Lucy Green, 167 Ocean Walk Drive – In Favour**

- Speaking as the mother of a disabled 43 year-old son. Noted it has been impossible for him to find affordable housing on a disability pension. Believes this is a great opportunity for Nanaimo to proceed with this project, adding many more like it should be initiated.

**Mr. Doug Bromage, Insight Developments, 2520 Bowen Road – Member, CHBA**

- Wanted to emphasize that this project is not an Insight Developments proposal; however Insight is sponsoring the complete design of the project.
- CHBA is privileged to be a part of this initiative as affordable housing has been a prevalent need in Nanaimo.
- Believes it is everyone's obligation to be aware of all of society's housing needs.
- This initiative is a "give back" from the industry to the City, which would include the complete construction of four of the proposed units. Feedback to date indicated possible additional Provincial government aid. Would like to start work immediately on this project.
- Congratulated Council for its initiative in considering this project.

Mayor Council asked for the speaker's expertise and comment on the density of the proposed amalgamated three-lot design and what the design may look like if it were proposed as three single-family lots.

- Mr. Bromage noted that the potential square footage permitted on the three single-family lots would be likely equal, if not exceed, what the current design calls for, adding that he believes the design would fit into the neighbourhood well.

**Mr. Jim Spinelli, 643 Sixth Street – In Favour - Redress**

- Wanted to clarify target group of the project by noting that when the CHBA approached the Working Group on Homelessness with the offer to build housing it was decided that while there was a need for housing across the spectrum in Nanaimo, there has never been affordable housing for singles in the community. Added that there are currently 12 affordable housing complexes in the City for families, a number of complexes for special needs individuals and over 17 complexes for senior citizens. That is why the target group of singles was chosen; adding that intent was to aid in alleviating the pressure of homelessness.
- Currently no resource from the Provincial Government for family housing, the Society needs to be able to respond to the senior levels of government and indications are that this project will be acceptable to that level of government.

Mayor Korpan asked for clarification regarding the Society's experience with the effectiveness of their screening process.

- Mr. Spinelli noted that in the past 10 years of the Society's projects, they have evicted some tenants, the intent being to remove them within 30 days, as required by law. Know that it is important to maintain the integrity of housing communities, impact on surrounding community has been nearly negligible. The internal community however is affected, which the Society works closely on to reduce the impact on other tenants.
- The system anticipated for this project would be based on a need base system, which would utilize the Provincial Housing Registry, which involves a standardized system of definition based on the amount of money people are paying for rent and their need for housing.
- As landlords the Society takes the responsibility of vetting and screening very seriously.

Mayor Korpan noted that the other complexes run by the Society in Nanaimo have a process in place in regard to communication with the surrounding neighbours.

- Mr. Spinelli noted that the Society has made every effort to work with community organizations and neighbours involved in projects in the past. Communication with the neighbours is important and the Society will continue to work with the City and the developers to approach the existing traffic concerns
- on Robbie Lane.

**Ms. Valarie Coughtry, 1855 Meredith Road – Opposed - Redress**

- Stated that she did not properly identify herself during her first address as the current secretary of the Forest Park School Parents Advisory Committee, adding that the official position of PAC is that they object to the application due to traffic concerns.

Councillor Brennan asked for confirmation that PAC had voted on this position.

- Ms. Coughtry confirmed that this was PAC's official statement.

Councillor Unger asked if PAC has communicated this position to Council for this evening's Hearing.

- Ms. Coughtry confirmed that the position of PAC was communicated to Council this evening through herself.

**Mr. Martin Buck, 5918 Oliver Road – In Favour – Redress**


- Volunteer board member of the Nanaimo Affordable Housing Society.
- Wanted to confirm that the tenants being considered for this project would not only be "17-20 year olds" and that the intention remains to be a good neighbour and be an asset to the community.

Five written submissions were received for this application and are attached as a part of "Schedule 'C' – Submissions for Bylaw 4000.408 (2102, 2104 and 2106 Bowen Road)". There were no further written or verbal submissions received for this application.

MOVED by Councillor McNabb, SECONDED by Councillor Holdom, that the meeting be adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Certified Correct:

**CARRIED**



D. Lindsay  
Manager, Planning Division  
**DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT**

/pm  
Council: 2006-DEC-18  
G:\Devplan\Files\Admin\0575\20\2006\Minutes\2006Dec07PHMinutes

**Schedule “A”**

**Submission**

**For**

**Bylaw 4000.406**

**RA179**

**(2211 Jingle Pot Road – Teletheatre Outlet)**

From: webmaster@nanaimo.ca  
Sent: Tuesday, December 05, 2006 3:24 PM  
To: Public Hearing  
Subject: Public Hearing Submission

A Online Public Hearing Submission has been made:

Name: [REDACTED]  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Subject: 4000.406

Comments:

We are concerned about this application for 3 reasons. 1. There does not seem to be sufficient parking at this site currently. The expanded liquor store greatly reduced available parking while increasing the need for it.

This additional use will only make the problem worse.

2. The current traffic load at Jinglepot and Highway 19 is already of concern and this will only exacerbate it.

3. The expansion of gambling is of concern. If this gambling facility had been approved before the liquor store expansion, would that expansion been allowed?

It also seems odd, and extremely misleading, that there is no mention in the bylaw proposal printed in the local paper that this "Teletheatre Outlet" is in fact a gambling facility.

**Schedule “B”**

**Submissions**

**For**

**Bylaw 4000.407**

**RA180**

**(5640 Hammond Bay Road)**

Jason Carvalho

RA180

**From:** Pendziwol [pendfam@telus.net]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 05, 2006 9:15 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** Bylaw No. 4000.407, File Number RA180

To Mayor and Council members:

I am Gary Pendziwol and reside at 5641 Hammond Bay Road along with my wife Linda.

Upon review of Staff Report dated Nov. 14, 2006 regarding Bylaw No. 4000.407 at 5640 Hammond Bay Road we have the following comments;

-It is disappointing that a variance to lot area has to be granted along with the rezoning. Can lot lines be adjusted to establish lot areas of 750 sq metres without creating undue hardship? Lot 31 of the proposed subdivision has a lot area in excess of 1200 sq metres and is adjacent to one of the duplex lots!

-We would like to see an additional statement added to the staff report design criteria that would make it more difficult to convert these duplexes to illegal four plexes in the future. Statements such as, "each unit to occupy only one floor level" or "each unit to be one and a half storeys" or "no exterior stairs to second level" etc.

-The on site signage for preposed rezoning should have been in a more visible location so as to get more public comment. It is basically hidden from offsite traffic.

-Other than these three concerns we do not object to the rezoning.

Thank You for taking our concerns into account.

Gary and Linda Pendziwol



**NOTICE OF  
PUBLIC HEARING**  
2006-DEC-07 at 7:00 pm

R&L Finner Consulting Ltd.  
5651 Finale Place  
Nanaimo, BC V9V 1W2

**R&L Finner Consulting Ltd.**

To: Brian Senini Law Corporation      Fax: 754-8080  
From: Ray Finner      Date: 12/06/06  
Re: Re Zone Application      Pages: 1 of 2  
CC:  
  
☐ Urgent    ☒ For Review    ☐ Please Comment    ☐ Please Reply    ☐ Please Recycle

Attention: Brian Senini

On behalf of myself and Lesley could you voice our objections to the application submitted to the City of Nanaimo by Mr. Ivan Plavetic to rezone part of his property 5640 Hammond Bay Road from single family residential zone (RS-1) to (RM-1) residential duplex zone.

We are the owners of the adjacent property 5748 Broadway Road as well as 2 properties 5651 Finale Place and 5671 Finale Place.

The following persons that purchased property from myself have voiced their objections to the rezone application to myself.

Mr. & Mrs. Roy Hinder



5643 Finale Place

Mr. Mrs. Renier Van Rensberg



5667 Muggies Way

Regards, Ray Finner

**Schedule “C”**

**Submissions**

**For**

**Bylaw 4000.408**

**RA170**

**(2102, 2104 and 2106 Bowen Road –**

**Affordable Housing Development Proposal)**

December 7, 2006

*Address to City Council on the Subject of Affordable Housing*

I speak to you tonight about an important socio-economic issue that my husband and I feel strongly about. In our opinion, a key feature of a well-functioning modern and socially just society is one which ensures its citizens, including those of lesser means, are able to experience the security, stability and dignity that comes with living in clean, affordable housing. And, rightly, our Official Community Plan promotes diverse housing options in all neighbourhoods.

Affordable housing is for all people, not just those on welfare. Seniors, singles who are not parents, young couples just starting out, and families with children all deserve a leg up! Ensuring that everyone in Nanaimo has housing will improve all of our lives. People who have the security of a home they can afford, frees them to seek employment and education. While we need people to work in restaurants and retail, for example, we don't pay them wages that allow them to support themselves properly. We need affordable, rental housing to accommodate these folks. An added benefit is that affordable housing reduces social and health care costs, as proven by NAHS stats.

Thanks to the Canadian Home Builders for proposing to build a project that anyone would be proud to have in their neighbourhood. This Council was elected to provide leadership to the City, and I urge you to act courageously now, by giving the green light to this rezoning. It is the right choice and the only choice. My Nanaimo provides housing for everyone!

Joyce Hedges  
103 Berkeley Place  
Nanaimo, V9T 1L5

758-3354

December 7, 2006  
Gordon W. Fuller  
604 Nicol St.  
Nanaimo, BC V9R 4T9  
Ph: (250) 754 6389  
e-mail: [gorfathome@yahoo.ca](mailto:gorfathome@yahoo.ca)

Presentation to Council in support of: Zoning Bylaw Amendment Bylaw 2006 NO. 4000.408

---

Ultimately in order to address homelessness we must address housing.

The United Nations defines "absolute homelessness" as no physical shelter and "relative homeless" as living spaces that do not meet basic health and safety standards, security of tenure, personal safety and affordability

In July of this year a story in the Calgary Herald reported "About 50 per cent of homeless Calgarians are working. They simply don't earn enough money to pay rent and they have even less chance of being able to afford a home in Calgary's over-heated housing market".

A story last night on Global news reports that in both Vancouver and Victoria 20% or more of the homeless in those cities are working but cannot afford to pay rent in the ever decreasing number, yet increasing rents, of available rental housing.

Research reveals that Nanaimo's greater concern is relative homelessness. Extensive research concludes that the nature of that homelessness problem is generational poverty and structural and transitional problems in the local and regional economy.

Rental vacancy rates have dropped sharply in Nanaimo from a high of 16.5 percent in 1998 down to 1.2 percent in 2004. My guess is that in the last two years they have dropped even further. Sadly this drop in availability of rental accommodation, in large part due to the strong real estate market, has corresponded to an increase in rents. Approximately 53 percent of renters, as well as many low-income homeowners in Nanaimo, are paying more than 30 percent of their income towards rent. Of the more than 4000 people on income assistance that percentage rises to more than 50% of their income going towards shelter.

A growing reality is that even with the economic upturn in the community, and with the boom in the real estate market, many former apartment blocks are now being turned into condominiums. Other than 30 units of supportive housing geared towards a specific clientele

and one apartment complex, that I know of, no other forms of affordable housing have been built in Nanaimo for years. This leaves rooming houses, many of which are substandard, shared accommodation and secondary suites, many of the later being unaffordable because of increased housing values, as three of the dwindling housing options for many low-income people.

Most of the employment created by our booming economy is service based with low wages. Rising rents, the lack of affordable accommodation, as well as these low wages, all have the effect of pushing those with marginal or low incomes towards the edge of, some into, absolute homelessness.

While there exist in Nanaimo a number of affordable housing complexes they are primarily family oriented with those for singles oriented towards people with disabilities. Waitlists for these are already extensive with up to a two year before a unit might become available. While the 20-units for single low income wage earners eventually proposed for this site will in no way come remotely close to addressing the problem it is a start.

Yes the residents of the area will have concerns, especially in the area of increased density and traffic. My understanding is that these issues are already being addressed by the city but neighbourhood input must always be forthcoming. An added bonus to the area will be in the Management of these units by Nanaimo Affordable Housing Society, a well-respected non-profit provider in Nanaimo.

Municipal, Provincial and Federal Government are the key players in addressing the lack of affordable housing. In the case of the development on the corner of Meredith and Bowen Road we not only have these players involved but members of the broader community as well.

The Official Community Plan for Nanaimo, now under review, talks about building complete, viable communities in designated town centre and neighbourhood villages that collectively support a variety of lifestyles choices. While poverty is not a choice it is a reality. I believe it is up to every citizen of Nanaimo to support the building of inclusive communities within the city. One way to do this is to support projects such as <sup>h.s</sup> as well as others that will hopefully arise in the future, which will provide safe and affordable housing.

To this end I have attached a list of various types of housing as well as strategies that can be implemented by the city to move us in the direction of housing for all.

**Affordable Housing:** Housing where residents pay no more than 30% of their gross monthly income for shelter. Affordable housing means families and individuals of all income levels and lifestyles can find suitable places to live and can enjoy a stable, secure place to call home.

**Continuum of Housing and Support:**

A framework that sets out the essential components of what is needed to address homelessness. It includes: emergency shelters, transition houses, supportive and second stage housing, independent housing, employment, employment insurance, income assistance, outreach, drop-in centres, health, mental health, prevention and substance misuse services.

## Housing Types

**Emergency Shelters**

Provide accommodation to the homeless for up to one month. Sleeping arrangements may be in dormitories, or in shared or single bedrooms. Some shelters can accommodate families, or alternatively families may be placed in motel rooms.

**Safe Houses**

Provide temporary accommodation for youth aged 13-18 who require safe overnight shelter to escape the street and/or sex or drug trade. Length of stay varies across the province, ranging from a few days to six months. These facilities are funded by MCFD and operated by community agencies.

**Respite Facility** Provides beds in 24-hour licensed care facilities or in a supported unit for the care of mental health clients or seniors who need to be separated for a period of time from their current living situation.

**Emergency Housing** A temporary facility where the agency or landlord determines the maximum length of stay (generally short term), and where the goal of the agency is to stabilize the individual in crisis.

**Transition Housing**

Safe, secure but time limited housing (30 days) for women and children fleeing abuse or for persons leaving addiction treatment. This housing may include safe houses in private family homes and government funded shelters

**Wet, Damp and Dry Housing**

Housing stock that is part of the continuum of housing and support for those recovering from addictions and who need a place to go upon completion of treatment. Wet refers to housing where substance misuse is tolerated and is not considered a reason to bar or discharge the person. Damp refers to housing that tolerate substance misuse off-site and provides support to help make the transition to abstinence. Dry refers to housing that expects abstinence.

**Second Stage Housing** Transitional, time limited housing obtained after leaving an emergency shelter and before a person is ready for independent housing. Residents of second stage housing are expected to move on to permanent housing once their living situation is stabilized. Second stage housing may provide specialized services. Examples are housing for women fleeing abuse, for youth or for individuals with addictions.

**Special Needs Housing**

Housing that is designed to meet the needs of clients with physical, sensory, or cognitive impairments. This type of housing may also have support services for residents if they are not capable of living independently. Generally, this type of housing meets the requirement for adequate, affordable, suitable, and safe housing for those with special needs.

**Special Needs Residential Facility**

A small-scale community based residential facility, licensed or unlicensed, offering short term accommodation in a supported group setting.

**Supportive Housing**

Affordable, independent accommodation, sometimes in a purpose designed building or in scattered-site apartments, that have added support services attached to them. These supports may include meals and skill training, assistance with housekeeping and banking, health therapies, counselling and crisis response. This combination of housing and support provide the opportunity for an individual to stabilize his/her personal situation in preparation for moving back into the community.

**Ex:**

- Long-term Transitional Housing with Supportive Services - Subsidized housing that incorporates comprehensive support services to help stabilize a household's situation and transition to permanent housing;
- Housing that requires on-going subsidies to reduce shelter costs for very low-income households. This housing is typically owned and/or administered by a public body on behalf of municipal, provincial or federal government.

**Independent Housing**

Permanent, affordable housing for individuals who can live independently without need for support services provided in conjunction with the housing.

**SRO – Single Room Occupancy**

Hotels, motels and rooming house rooms rented by the week or month. Typically SROs are one small room without bathroom or kitchen facilities.

**Secondary Suite**

A self-contained suite in a single-family dwelling. Increased Housing prices and mortgages can affect the affordability of secondary suites/

**Social Housing**

Housing built under federal/provincial or provincial programs, or by a non-profit society, where some or all of the units are made affordable to low and moderate income tenants. In the 1970s, social housing with its mixture of tenants, replaced the old notion of public housing projects occupied solely by those with low incomes.

**Permanent Housing**

Long term housing where the resident or tenant is in control of the length of stay, subject to compliance with residential tenancy agreements.

- Affordable Permanent Housing - Safe, secure and affordable housing that creates a sense of stability and belonging which helps a person achieve goals and contribute to his or her community

# Strategies

The federal, provincial and municipal governments are the key players in providing affordable housing. **The City must adopt a more proactive stance** with respect to advocacy on housing issues at the Province and Federal level.

## What you can do:

- Work with Neighborhood Associations to increase awareness around the need for affordable housing.
- Advocate on housing issues at Municipal, Provincial and Federal levels of government

## Encourage Municipal Government to Adopt/Amend City policies and practices

- a. Zoning flexibility
- b. DCC flexibility
- c. Approval process flexibility
- d. Zoning change to facilitate siting of homeless/special needs shelters and services throughout the community to prevent ghettoization
- e. Preservation and rehabilitation of existing housing stock
- f. Policy on preserving land zoned for housing
- g. Explore possibility of **expedited ("fast-track") approval process** for identified affordable housing projects.
- h. create a **mandatory standards of maintenance and safety by-law**

## Encourage mixed use in *Town Centre and Neighbourhood Villages as well as in low intensity industrial areas and commercial zones*

- People will be able to live close to where they work; which supports 'Smart Growth' principles.
- require a mix of housing units in all new developments - small lot single-homes, duplexes, as well as secondary suites and apartments

## Options for Municipal Government:

**Increase the Property Acquisition Tax** by 1% to be put specifically to affordable housing. By that amount \$400 million would be available per year for housing

**Require developers** to build 20% of their units at an affordable price, and mixing them up so that they are not shoved off to one side as "poverty alley".

### Density Bonusing

A system that allows for variations to zoning in exchange for community amenities or beneficial housing. An example would be allowing a developer to increase the floor space in his development in exchange for some amenity or housing bonus to the community.

**Inclusionary zoning** - requires or encourages developers of market residential projects to contribute some proportion of units, generally from 10 percent to 25 percent, as affordable housing as a condition for approving an application for a rezoning or comprehensive plan zoning. Inclusionary zoning has the advantage that it can produce hundreds of affordable units annually at no cost to taxpayers, can create all types of housing including single-family detached, and helps to promote diverse communities where households of a wide range of incomes can live. Inclusionary zoning **can be either mandatory or voluntary.**

**Mandatory programs** - developers are required to contribute some affordable housing as a condition of development or rezoning approval. In voluntary inclusionary zoning, developers are offered density bonuses and other incentives as inducements to contribute affordable housing. According to *CMHC* ***“incentive-based programs produce much less affordable housing than mandatory ones” and “the most successful inclusionary programs have been mandatory.”***

**Community Land Trust** an undertaking that involves difficult political and financial choices and must be tied to the specific needs and nature of the individual community. Land for the land trust would be comprised of City (or other public entity) holdings, private contributions and select purchases with a separate funding source.

**Housing Trust Fund:** a dedicated source of funds to be used for housing-related purposes  
Projects typically eligible for HTF funding would include, but are not limited to:

- ☐ Acquisition and rehabilitation of existing housing
- ☐ New construction (single family and multi-family)
- ☐ Special housing needs for the:

- mentally ill
- developmentally disabled
- elderly
- physically disabled

#### **Zoning flexibility**

The City can create additional opportunities for the construction of new housing by increasing flexibility with respect to zoning.

changes to the existing codes in order to provide design and development flexibility and thus encourage the development of more affordable housing. The move towards mixed-use development, which permits housing and commercial elements in the same area (typically commercial on ground floor and residential on higher floors or next door) is a major element of this flexibility. Density bonuses, density transfers,

**Pilot a multi- family DCC financing program with rent caps.** City staff should pursue the possibility of a deferred payment schedule applicable to a broad spectrum of housing construction.

**Develop formal tax abatement criteria** for selected affordable housing projects.

**Refurbish Nuisance Properties and Grow-Ops,** acquired by the City for affordable Housing

## Affordable Housing in Nanaimo, BC 2006

### Presentation to Mayor Korpan and Council, December 7, 2006

Your Worship Mayor Korpan and Councillors:

We are pleased to know that 20 units of affordable housing are planned by BC Housing in cooperation with the Canadian Home Builders Association. Such collaboration comes along rarely whereby a group such as the Home Builders are prepared to build at their own expense four of the 20 units. We urge you to take advantage of this significant offer now.

We understand that members of the community have concerns about this proposal. It is with this in mind that we wish to comment. If we lived in a small village we would live with a diverse population and each would be there to support the other. As a City, we have many smaller communities within. Optimally, each area of the city would have a diverse population giving richness to the area. Nanaimo needs to develop this small but diverse community concept in all parts within its boundaries. No areas should be exempt.

Homelessness is increasing in Nanaimo if the data from this year's survey is any indication. Financial need was reported to be a significant reason for much of this situation. Research has shown that it is less costly to provide affordable housing than to provide temporary shelters. Yet, we continue to look only at stop-gap measures instead of permanent solutions. This affordable housing project is not the complete answer but a start to addressing the real needs of people in a positive manner enhancing quality of life.

We present to you the imagery of a *segway*. a vehicle to move smoothly from one place to another, a bridge. *Affordable housing is such a segway! Given a well-planned residence with an environment for growth, social and clinical supports and trained personnel, individuals may maximize their potential . This housing provides stability, promotes self-actualization and positive interaction with the surrounding neighbourhood. Clearly, this is what we desire for the citizens of Nanaimo.*

We encourage the following:

- \*clear statements of goals and objectives for affordable housing projects to the community,
- \*active research that is ongoing identifying strengths, weaknesses and making adaptations to the project as needed,
- and \*positive participation by the surrounding community.

If we succeed with our affordable housing initiatives, Nanaimo may be recognized as a progressive social community. Certainly the housing for the disabled opened in 2005 is an example of progressive thinking. We know that non-profit housing owners are interested in well-serviced , well-maintained projects, however, we know nothing of the non-profit society that will oversee this project. We encourage Council to provide this information to the citizens.

In closing, we repeat our support for this project. However, this project will address the needs of only 20 individuals. The survey reported 300 homeless this summer. What are the plans for addressing the needs of the other 280 persons? As we all know, even a job does not preclude poverty. We cannot rest with this one project. Clearly much has yet to be done! We encourage you , Your Worship and your Council to vote boldly in favour of this initial step to provide affordable housing.

Thank you for this opportunity to speak.

Presented by:

Frank and Geraldine Prouten  
5186 Coach House Drive  
Nanaimo, BC V9V 1H4

RA170

Gale Lindsay Re lots 2102-2104-2106

We live at 2023 Latimer Rd.

We attended your open house at Seban Park on Sept 28/06 and wish to say No - No - No to your rezoning of those lots

It should be left as single family dwellings. Robbie's Lane is far too busy with young children using the lane to travel to and from school.

We have had rotten neighbours with some of the rentals in our area. A drug house was right across from us for 8 years and not one person from the RCMP or anyone else would help us.

We want no more rentals in our neighbourhood. They only decrease the property value.

Will city council reimburse the home owners the difference in price when our home values drop. Why should we lose out because you wish to put low cost rentals in our area? How will we know who is living there? Will it be drug addicts, prostitutes, peddlers who will be living so close to the children? Who will take the blame if just one child is hurt by the increase in traffic?

Our whole neighbourhood is sick of rentals. We have had our share and more. Put it somewhere else and leave us alone.

Thank you

Mrs Gay Spender 250-7581052

Gay M Spender

Jason Carvalho

PA170

From: Dale Lindsay  
Sent: Monday, November 27, 2006 3:56 PM  
To: Jason Carvalho  
Subject: FW: Proposed Development

-----Original Message-----

From: Lynne Fraser [mailto:lynne.fraser@telus.net]  
Sent: Wednesday, November 01, 2006 7:44 AM  
To: Dale Lindsay  
Subject: Proposed Development

Hi Dale, just wanted to confirm our support for the Nanaimo Affordable Housing Development on Bowen Road. We believe that it is essential that we not only increase housing density in our community but also provide housing that is affordable. We appreciate the City of Nanaimo working with Nanaimo Affordable Housing to make this development possible.

Let's do more developments like this!

Regards,

Edward (Ted) and Lynne Fraser  
2043 Latimer Road  
Nanaimo, B.C. V9S2W6

Lynne Fraser  
lynne.fraser@telus.net  
Home Telephone: 250-758-0375

Work like you don't need the money.  
Love like you've never been hurt.  
And dance like no one is watching...