

**-MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF PLAN NANAIMO ADVISORY COMMITTEE
HELD ON THURSDAY, 2006-JAN-17 IN THE BOARD ROOM,
CITY HALL, 455 WALLACE STREET**

Present: Gail Adrienne Bill Forbes
Brian Anderson David Hill-Turner
Carey Avender Shirley Lance
Councillor Bill Holdom Ralph Meyerhoff
Stu Donaldson Neil McNiven

Guest: Councillor Joy Cameron

Staff
Andrew Tucker
Lisa Bhopalsingh
Fran Grant (Recording Secretary)

Regrets: Chris Erb Michael Schellinck
Gordon Mckinnon

1. Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order by Chair Bill Holdom at 5:00 p.m.

The Committee welcomed the new Chair and introductions were made around the table.

2. Adoption of Minutes for 2005-Nov-15:

MOVED by S. Lance, SECONDED by B. Forbes, that the minutes of 2005-Nov-15 be adopted as presented.

CARRIED

3. Approval of Agenda and Late Items:

There were no late items.

MOVED by S. Donaldson, SECONDED by D. Hill-Turner, that the agenda be approved.

CARRIED

4. Presentation:

No presentations.

5. Outstanding Business:

a) Departure Bay Neighbourhood Plan

A. Tucker gave a brief update on the Departure Bay Neighbourhood Plan process and noted that:

- The plan has been expanded from just the core commercial area to a full neighbourhood plan because of issues brought forward by residents at a public open house in October that was attended by approximately 150 people.
- The second work shop was attended by over 120 residents.
- The next closed session, a design work shop, is being held on Feb. 03 with the Neighbourhood Steering Committee, invited architects and property owners.
- The results will be presented to the neighbourhood at an open meeting at the end of February.
- UBC students hope to have a draft neighbourhood plan ready in early March but that may be extended to the end of March.

A. Tucker gave the following answers to questions from the Committee:

- To date, members of the dive pier group have not made an attempt to engage in the process to promote the project.
- The working group is concerned about the proposed dive pier and the effect it would have on the beach. Most of the neighbourhood is opposed as well.
- The waterfront walkway is a larger issue than just this neighbourhood. It involves other neighbourhoods as well as B.C. Ferries and the Port Authority.

Comments from the Committee:

- Had a call from a Departure Bay resident about Departure Creek. They are interested in setting up an active stream protection group. NALT is able to help them get organized and assist with restorative work on the creek.
- The Brechin Hill Neighbourhood Assoc. has not been contacted about the waterfront walkway even though it goes through their neighbourhood.

MOVED by D. Hill-Turner, SECONDED by B. Forbes, that the report be received.

CARRIED

b) Land Inventory Analysis

L. Bhopalsingh gave an overview of the project and noted that:

- This process is part of the OCP ten year review.
- Have set up a focus group with six realtors to get on-the-ground information regarding demand for industrial and commercial land.
- Outcome of this project will be a data base model.

L. Bhopalsingh gave the following answers to questions from the Committee:

- Also looking at under utilized industrial lands.
- There is a distinction being made between single family and multi-family housing.
- RDN currently is using only 5% of the sewer capacity allocated to the Duke Point industrial lands.

Comments from the Committee:

- Would be a good idea to also bring in realtors regarding the demand for residential land.
- Concerned about the lack of industrial land available within the City.
- Also feel strongly about keeping industrial land and not opening it up for residential use.
- Councillor J. Cameron expressed an interest in attending the meeting with realtors.
- NALT has been in contact with an enterprise interested in moving to Duke Point but have found there is insufficient sewer services for their business. The company

would need to post a \$2 million bond in order to enhance the sewer system. This is not financially feasible.

MOVED by R. Meyerhoff, SECONDED by S. Donaldson, that the report be received.

CARRIED

c) Indicators Update – Progress Nanaimo

L. Bhopalsingh gave an update on the indicators project and noted that:

- Indicators were initially identified in the 1998 Progress Nanaimo Report.
- Have a Malaspina University-College student working for nine weeks to update the indicators. This will allow us to look at data from 1998 and see if we can draw any comparisons.
- Example of an indicator would be park land – has it increased in neighbourhoods?
- Will identify which indicators are meaningful and are there others we should be including.
- Looking at what projects we have completed that were called for in the OCP (e.g. Steep Slope Guidelines).

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

- Adherence to the Plan has not been monitored. We did start a report card in the fall but found there were too many variables so it was not completed.
- We did find that since the OCP was adopted, there have been approximately 335 amendments made. Of those 290 were internal amendments and only 45 from external applications.
- Most of the amendments were not a departure from the Plan.

MOVED by R. Meyerhoff, SECONDED by S. Donaldson, that the report be received.

CARRIED

d) UCB Amendment Applications update

L. Bhopalsingh gave an update on the following UCB applications:

- 6101 Pearce Road
- Deerwood Mobile Home Park – Biggs Road

She advised that:

- Both applications are within the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR) and that the Agricultural Land Commission (ALC) refused both applications to have the property removed from the ALR.
- The ALC did say they would allow four rural residential lots on 6106 Pearce Road if it meets City bylaws.
- Both owners have asked that their UCB applications be kept open while they appeal the ALC ruling. However they have yet to start that appeal so we are looking at setting a time limit of approximately 3 months for keeping the files open.

L. Bhopalsingh gave the following answer to a questions from the Committee:

- The property at 6106 Pearce Road is not quite large enough to meet the requirement for a rural subdivision into four lots.

Comments from the Committee:

- Why would we change rural land into urban lots? See this as the thin edge of the wedge.
- Need to be pro-active rather than re-active on changes to the UCB.
- When the ALR was set up, they didn't actually look at the property they were including in the ALR.

MOVED by B. Forbes, SECONDED by D. Hill-Turner, that the report be received.

CARRIED

6. **New Business:**

a) OCP 10 Year Review Process – update

A. Tucker gave an overview of the process and noted that:

- Have started gathering some of the background information needed for the review.
- A review of the Growth Centre Concept was started at the five year mark but only completed last year.
- The Land Inventory Analysis and Indicators Study, which Lisa described above, will provide a base line.
- Anticipate that review may end with a rewrite of the OCP but the fundamental goals will be the same.
- It is anticipated that the five Goals are still what the community wants.
- PNAC will be involved in the review process as well as external groups such as the environmental community.

A. Tucker asked PNAC members for their input on which areas of the OCP they feel should be reviewed and received the following comments:

- Given the current atmosphere of distrust with the City, the process needs to be seen as transparent and open to the public. May be an opportunity to heal some of the wounds.
- Agree with above suggestion. Public wants to feel they have an opportunity for input. May take some work to get public to look at the bigger picture.
- Most people think the Plan is basically good. Need to look at what is good for the broader community and not just special interest groups. Must be allowed to grow.
- What comes out of specific group meetings needs to be made available to the public.
- Surveys can be useful. Received a good response to the Parks, Recreation and Culture Commission's ten year review. Met with interest groups as well. More people respond to a survey than will come to a meeting. Was a sample survey covering 8 – 10% of the City.
- Hold public forums and have displays in malls and community facilities.
- PNAC needs to be involved and do some of the work.
- Need to communicate that the Plan is a living document.
- Intent of the Plan is to make more efficient use of the land with densification for places to live, work and play.
- Cannot make everyone happy no matter how much public input you receive.
- Some people will only get involved when the Plan does something they don't like which affects them.
- Do not see the logic in doing surveys because it may give some people the idea that whole plan can be redone.
- Average person does not know what the Plan is. Have done a poor job of explaining the OCP.
- Plan can be better evaluated with fewer people than too many.

- Pick specific areas to review that have changed, e.g. transportation, food security and density.
- Look at the Goals to see if they are still realistic.

A. Tucker thanked the Committee for their input and asked them to send him any additional comments they may have.

7. Next Meeting:

- The next regular meeting of PNAC is scheduled for 2006-Feb-21.

8. Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned at 6:21 p.m.