

**MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING OF PLAN NANAIMO ADVISORY COMMITTEE
HELD ON TUESDAY, 2005-JAN-27 IN COUNCIL CHAMBERS,
CITY HALL, 455 WALLACE STREET**

Present: Gail Adrienne Ralph Meyerhoff
Councillor Diane Brennan Joan Perry
Stu Donaldson Michael Schellinck
Chris Erb Carey Avender
Bill Forbes Gordon Mckinnon
Jim Young, Chase River Neighbourhood Representative

Staff

Andrew Tucker
Dale Lindsay
Lisa Bhopalsingh
Jason Carvalho
Rob Lawrance
Fran Grant (Recording Secretary)

Regrets: Robert Borden Neil McNiven
Shirley Lance

1. Call to Order:

The recommendation portion of the meeting was called to order by Chair Councillor Brennan at 8:36 p.m.

2. Adoption of 2005-Jan-18 Minutes:

MOVED by R. Meyerhoff, SECONDED by S. Donaldson, that the minutes of 2005-Jan-18 be adopted as presented.

CARRIED

3. OCP Amendment Applications:

MOVED by R. Meyerhoff, SECONDED by C. Erb, that staff amendment applications be dealt with first.

CARRIED

PNAC RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff Amendments:

1. 3950 Biggs Road

The purpose of this application is to amend the location of the UCB to be consistent with the RM8 zoning boundary on the property (following the existing trail right-of-way) and to re-designate that portion of the subject property from "Rural Resource Lands" to "Suburban Neighbourhood" to be consistent with the RM8 zoning boundary. The amendment will correct a mapping error that occurred at the time of rezoning to RM8.

MOVED by C. Erb, SECONDED by R. Meyerhoff, that PNAC recommend to Council acceptance of this amendment as presented.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

2. 3679–3789 Shenton Road

A. Tucker noted that PNAC had previously directed staff to bring forward an amendment to allow office use as a site specific amendment within the Neighbourhood designation.

MOVED by C. Erb, SECONDED by S. Donaldson that PNAC recommend to Council acceptance of this amendment as presented.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

3. 3721 Shenton Road

The purpose of this application is to make a site specific amendment to the “Neighbourhood” designation to permit office use.

MOVED by C. Erb, SECONDED by S. Donaldson, that PNAC recommend to Council that acceptance of the staff amendment for 3679-3789 Shenton Road also covers the external application for 3721 Shenton Road.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED by C. Erb, SECONDED by S. Donaldson, that PNAC recommend that Council consider refunding this applicant’s amendment fee.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. Staff – Environmentally Sensitive Areas Development Permit Areas

The purpose of this application is to make various text amendment to policies and mapping amendments to Schedule B (Development Permit Areas (DPAs) and Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs)) of the OCP by:

- Changing the boundaries of some ESAs to more accurately reflect the location of non-aquatic ESAs.
- Designating a Development Permit Area and Development Approval Information Area in order to protect non-aquatic ESAs as identified on Schedule B of the OCP.

MOVED by C. Erb, SECONDED by J. Perry that PNAC recommend to Council acceptance of these amendments as presented.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

EXTERNAL APPLICATIONS:

5. 2360-2364 Arbot Road and 2365 Mill Road:

The purpose of this application is to move the subject property inside the UCB and to re-designate it from “Rural Resource Lands” to “Suburban Neighbourhood”.

MOVED by G. Mckinnon, SECONDED by C. Erb that PNAC recommend to Council acceptance of this amendment application as presented.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

R. Meyerhoff left the room due to a perceived conflict of interest on the following application.

6. 6101 Pearce Road

The purpose of this application is to move the subject property inside the UCB and to re-designate it from "Rural Resource Lands" to "Suburban Neighbourhood".

Question to staff from PNAC:

Q. Is this the only piece of property inside City boundaries that is in the ALR as was mentioned by the applicant?

A. It is not the only property in the ALR but there is not a significant portion of City lands within the ALR.

Comments from the Committee:

- Do not support moving this property inside the UCB.
- The neighbourhood doesn't seem to be concerned about this application.
- There has been considerable impact on the owners from surrounding development.
- It would be unfair to delay this application by waiting for the ALC ruling and having them to wait until the next UCB amendment period in another three years.
- If this application is accepted, it could start a domino effect with applications from owners of property around it.
- Sets precedence that could affect many other properties. Change happens in lots of places.
- Should not make a decision in favour because the owner does not like his farm anymore.
- Should be judged on its own merits on how the individual has been affected and is there support in the neighbourhood.

MOVED by C. Erb, SECONDED by G. McKinnon, that PNAC recommend to Council acceptance of this amendment application as presented subject to acceptance of its removal from the Agricultural Land Reserve.

CARRIED (6 in favour, 3 opposed)

R. Meyerhoff returned to the meeting.

7. 3950 Biggs Road:

The purpose of this application is to move the far westerly portion of the subject property inside the UCB and to re-designate it from "Rural Resource Lands" to "Suburban Neighbourhood".

Comment from the Committee:

- Should support this application as it part of the same parcel of property covered under the staff amendment.

MOVED by G. Adrienne, SECONDED by C. Erb, that PNAC recommend to Council acceptance of this amendment application as presented subject to acceptance of its removal from the Agricultural Land Reserve.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. 1321 Island Highway

The purpose of this application is to re-designate that portion of the property designated "Medium-High Density Residential" to "Mainstreet (Commercial/Residential)".

Questions from PNAC to staff:

Q. What is staff's position on this application?

- A. Staff support this application subject to protection of the watercourses and that the project be mixed use (commercial/residential).

Comment from the Chase River representative:

- Concern about access to the property which could compound existing traffic problems.
- Neighbourhood plan calls for a connecting road. Maybe this could become part of the development.
- If the development proposal goes through as is, it will take away from our Neighbourhood plan which calls for Mainstreet type development.
- Concern about the impact on Wexford Creek.
- Council has already allowed development that went against the Neighbourhood plan.
- The proposed building has a large blank concrete wall facing the Mainstreet that will be there for a long time.
- There is support in the community for this new store especially if a hardware store goes into the old site.

Comments from the Committee:

- Not sure why some residential cannot be incorporated during the rezoning process. There are other parts of the City where there is residential on busy streets. Landscaping could be used to block some of the view of the highway.
- Will the 15m setback on Wexford Creek be sufficient taking into account the large amount of impervious surface that will going into this site. This will increase the amount of pollution going into the creek. [D. Lindsay noted that a professional engineering study would be done to determine pre-development flows.]
- Have a problem with the impact this development will have on the neighbourhoods community vision.
- The problem is not the store proposed for this location but that the neighbourhood wanted to keep the Mainstreet concept as well. The property could be developed with the store front facing the Mainstreet. [D. Lindsay advised that it would be difficult to have a store this size fit on the Mainstreet designated portion of the property.]

MOVED by C. Erb, SECONDED by G. Mckinnon, that PNAC recommend to Council acceptance of this amendment application as presented.

CARRIED (8 in favour, 2 opposed)

9. 6010 Uplands Drive

The purpose of this application is to make a site specific amendment to the "Neighbourhood" designation to permit a density of up to .045 floor area ratio (FAR).

Questions from PNAC to staff:

- Q. What is the density allowed in this Neighbourhood and will the infrastructure support this increase?
- A. 15 uph is current target density for Neighbourhoods. As this site is adjacent to existing multi-family, additional multi-family is not allowed under the current policies of the OCP. The infrastructure would support this number of units.
- Q. Is there a reason by we should not support increased density on this site given that it is on a major road and not really suitable to single-family?
- A. There is support for increased density along major roads and this may be something that PNAC would like to review for the whole City.
- Q. Is the proposal for 32 units at 1200 sq.ft. not 130-150 smaller units?

A. Yes. The 130-150 units was from a previous proposal with the P2 zoning.

Comments from the Committee:

- This piece of property is on the corner of a major intersection and not really suitable for single family. This is a good use.
- The question of traffic flow should be addressed at the rezoning stage.

MOVED by R. Meyerhoff, SECONDED by G. Adrienne, that PNAC recommend to Council acceptance of this amendment application as presented.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. Adjournment:

MOVED by C. Erb , SECONDED by J. Perry , that the public portion of the meeting be adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

CARRIED