

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT STANDING COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD IN CONFERENCE ROOM 1, CITY HALL ANNEX,
ON THURSDAY, 2001-NOV-01, COMMENCING AT 4:07 P.M.

PRESENT: Councillor L. J. Sherry, Chair

Members: Councillor W. J. Holdom
Councillor L. D. McNabb

Staff: B. N. Mehaffey K. L. Burley
E. C. Swabey M. Goddard
R. Lawrence

1. Adoption of Minutes:

Minutes of the 2001-OCT-18 Meeting of the Planning and Development Standing Committee held in Conference Room 2, City Hall Annex at 4:05 p.m.

Moved by Councillor McNabb, seconded by Councillor Holdom that the Minutes be adopted as circulated. The motion carried.

2. Receiving of Delegations:

(a) Mr. Barry Lyseng, Hammond Bay Neighbourhood Association, regarding steep slopes.

Moved by Councillor McNabb, seconded by Councillor Holdom that Mr. Lyseng be permitted to address the Committee. The motion carried.

Mr. Lyseng stated that:

- he had suggested that he join the tour of the steep slopes.
- he doesn't want to take a lot of the Committee's time, and requested a recap of the steep slopes tour.
- issues Staff and residents are dealing with are not the same.
- clear-cutting (for example Gulf View from Sundown to Malaspina), has resulted in changes to run-off, causing damage to properties downhill.
- this is an issue individual property owners have to deal with.
- there has been silting up of Walley Creek, and concern regarding potential for silting of Cottle Creek.
- some of the standards of construction which were applied to the Linley Valley slopes caused excessive run-off, affecting property owners, and the re-habilitative costs were borne by the City and the residents.
- the Neighbourhood Association is looking to see guidelines, which will head this off.

- the recommended clear-cutting affects lot margins and devalues individual lots and the neighbourhood.
- it doesn't serve any purpose to the City to have lower property values, especially if the lots sit vacant of structures for a number of years; this takes away from the neighbourhood.
- road standards need to be addressed.
- downzoning and the need for retaining walls and foundation construction, such as on Cumberland Place, are issues of concern.
- residents bear these costs; they are not costs of the developer or the City.
- at the drop-in centre, he personally saw three residents who came in, where the City had approved their lots, the developer did his thing, and then the owner had to pay \$60,000 for the foundation.
- developers are building to the demands of the market place; they are not naive developers.
- there are no City reports which show that Option 2 in the plan can be done; however, reports from other cities show what has been accomplished in a number of other municipalities.
- he emphasized that Option 2 was developed in direct response to residents' opposition to City Staff recommendations for steep slope guidelines.
- Option 2 was not the Neighbourhood Association's proposal to residents, but was City Staff's proposal, which used the Neighbourhood Association's proposal to residents, and was embraced by the Neighbourhood Association.
- the residents did not agree with Option 2 because of their lack of trust
- residents do not believe that City Staff and Council would follow the guidelines.
- there are difficulties with higher densities on slopes.
- there have been ill-conceived and ill-managed family housing projects.
- in May 2000, the Neighbourhood Association went back to the residents to try to understand their concerns.
- residents have an issue with cluster housing - a video had been developed with the Hammond Bay Neighbourhood Association.
- this illuminating video is available to Council.
- residents were willing to accept strategically located higher densities (cluster housing) if there is an adequate trade-off, i.e. on projected slopes.
- this Committee should encourage a compromise.
- from May 2000 on, the Neighbourhood Association received Staff reports and had discussions with Staff, but City Engineering Staff said they would not support reduced road standards, so if the guidelines would not be supported, the Neighbourhood Association would embrace what the residents were saying.
- Option 2 is not the Neighbourhood Association's first choice.
- there needs to be a political recommendation.
- the Neighbourhood Association's choice was Option 3, but it was not workable and was not an option at the time.
- he personally feels Option 3 is attractive, but the Neighbourhood Association has disbanded, and the choice is therefore now in the political field.
- he is having a hard time figuring out the differences between Option 2 and Option 3.
- they understand there is no problem with the neighbourhood plan, but there would be a problem if there is no change to road standards and no change to densities on steep slopes.

- City's engineering road standards are creating frustrations.
- he wants to impress that this document was developed with a lot of discussion from a broad range of citizens and committees.
- there is an issue with point number 6 under Option 2 - "large lot option lowers the lot yield compared to subdivisions using the minimum lot size allowed under existing zoning likely creating more expensive lots".
- he agrees with the first half of this point, but does not agree with the last part.
- large lots do lower lot yields, but it doesn't necessarily create more expensive lots.
- it needs to be more flexible, with reduced grading costs, road standards and infrastructure costs.
- he is representing the residents.
- he indicated that Dave Hammond was present and might want to speak.

Mr. Dave Hammond stated that:

- he has a copy of the report, which outlines the three options.
- he is unsure that there is an understanding about the differences between the options.
- he will make a few general comments.
- he is wearing two hats - as a citizen and as a representative of Century Holdings, the Company most affected.
- with the exception of Linley Valley, the lots affected are pretty much all owned by Century Holdings.
- he recognizes the differences.
- he would support the statement personally, and developers generally agree, that there needs to be a middle ground.
- there still needs to be discussion about the "Monster Home Bylaw", which is the other part of what is being talked about here.
- he agrees that what was done in the past was not a good job; there were too many small lots.
- design can create a better job - design guidelines, home construction and form and content will help accomplish this.
- there is no difficulty with larger lots.
- land owners have a large investment in the economic situation in town.
- you can lessen the density, but don't lessen the standards.
- there is a concern with roads on the ridge.
- another issue is that of cluster housing.
- there was a comment made that cluster housing is a problem for the neighbourhood, i.e. Stephenson Point proposal for townhomes.
- that is the concern land owners have, looking at density and the provision of green space.
- the trade-off is to give up green space and approve town-homes, (i.e. 8 to an acre instead of 3-4 to an acre).
- unless they are pre-zoned for the property owner, it is up to Council to make the hard decisions.
- once people live in an area, they don't want it to be changed.
- we want tax dollars and the investment in land, so it has to work for everybody.
- the internal structure with Engineering and Planning needs to work.

- another possibility is bare land strata, with its engineering standards.
- an example of bare land strata is Long Lake Heights, which seems to work well and have acceptance.
- there has been a reorganization within Century Holdings, which now has more professional Staff dealing with the land development end, so they are more prepared and are in a better position to be part of the solution and work with the Neighbourhood Association.

3. General Correspondence:

- (a) Correspondence dated 2001-OCT-09 from Andrew Massil, Regional Manager, Real Estate Marketing, Canadian Pacific Railway (CPR) advising that, subject to the control of others, CPR would be willing to be party to discussions regarding re-use of lands in and around the Nanaimo waterfront.

Moved by Councillor McNabb, seconded by Councillor Holdom that the Correspondence be received. The motion carried.

4. Adjournment:

Moved by Councillor McNabb, seconded by Councillor Holdom at 5:00 p.m. that the meeting terminate. The motion carried.

CHAIR

CERTIFIED CORRECT:

CITY CLERK