



MINUTES

GOVERNANCE AND PRIORITIES COMMITTEE MEETING

Monday, July 14, 2025, 1:00 P.M.
Shaw Auditorium, Vancouver Island Conference Centre
80 Commercial Street, Nanaimo, BC

- Members: Councillor H. Eastmure, Chair
Mayor L. Krog
Councillor B. Geselbracht (entered at 1:01 p.m.)
Councillor E. Hemmens
Councillor P. Manly
Councillor J. Perrino
Councillor I. Thorpe (vacated at 3:30 p.m.)
- Absent: Councillor S. Armstrong
Councillor T. Brown
- Staff: D. Lindsay, Chief Administrative Officer
B. Sims, General Manager, Engineering and Public Works
N. Vracar, Deputy Corporate Officer
J. Holm, Director, Planning and Development
L. Brinkman, Manager, Community Planning
F. Mah, Transportation Engineer
D. Stewart, Environmental Planner
N. Sponaugle, Communications Advisor
L. Young, Recording Secretary

1. CALL THE MEETING TO ORDER:

The Governance and Priorities Committee Meeting was called to order at 1:00 p.m.
Councillor Geselbracht entered the Shaw Auditorium at 1:01 p.m.

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:

It was moved and seconded that the agenda be adopted. The motion carried unanimously.

3. ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES:

It was moved and seconded that the minutes of the Governance and Priorities Committee Meeting held in the Shaw Auditorium, Vancouver Island Conference Centre, 80 Commercial Street, on Monday, 2025-JUN-23, at 1:00 p.m. be adopted as circulated. The motion carried unanimously.

4. AGENDA PLANNING:

(a) Upcoming Topics and Initiatives

Nikolina Vracar, Deputy Corporate Officer, spoke regarding topics and initiatives scheduled for upcoming Governance and Priorities Committee (GPC) meetings.

5. REPORTS:

(a) Green Nanaimo:

(1) Demolition and Deconstruction Waste Regulation

Introduced by Jeremy Holm, Director, Planning and Development.

Presentations:

1. David Stewart, Environmental Planner, provided an on-screen presentation included with the report in the agenda package. Highlights included:
 - The Regional District of Nanaimo (RDN) has a goal to reduce waste going to the landfill by 90 percent by 2030
 - The City has several waste diversion goals which are outlined in the Integrated Action Plan as well as City Plan

- The remainder of this page is intentionally left blank -

- On 2025-MAY-01, Staff met with industry representatives, the RDN, non-profits, and builders/developers to receive feedback. Potential challenges identified by industry representatives included:
 - Alignment with BC Building Code when reusing wood or meeting energy performance requirements
 - Space and time required for sorting materials
 - Safety related to nails or lead in recycled boards as well as fire hazards
- Recommendations from industry representatives included a focus on education before regulation and a phased approach to implementing any new regulations
- Older homes are more difficult to relocate and have generally less value than newer builds; however, they usually contain higher quality building materials
- The building removal hierarchy lists the different ways to handle a building that needs to be removed from a site, with priority given to keeping or relocating the building, and sending waste to the landfill as the last option
- Key elements of a demolition and deconstruction bylaw may include a relocation assessment, wood salvage requirement, waste management planning and salvage materials assessment, refundable deposits and compliance report
- Alternative options that do not require a demolition and deconstruction bylaw may include flagging building relocations early in the development permit process, having deconstruction permits separate from building permits, and prioritizing relocation and deconstruction for City-owned buildings
- Potentially removing the requirement that the value of a building relocated in Nanaimo match the existing buildings within 50 metres, as this was identified as a potential barrier to building relocation

Committee and Staff discussion took place. Highlights included:

- Staff consulted other municipalities with similar bylaws and estimate the administrative workload for Staff to be approximately 0.5 to 1.5 full-time equivalent positions
- Implementing recycling minimums could be an administrative burden to developers
- Currently, a developer's decision regarding building removal is dependent on the market, regulations, and costs

2. Cassidy vander Ros, Marketing Manager, Nickel Brothers, provided an on-screen presentation included in the agenda package. Highlights included:

- The average home's carbon payback period is 168 years, but in BC, homes are typically demolished after just 72 years – well before their embodied carbon is offset
- Suggestion to support demolition alternatives such as implementing a building reuse assessment form, large refundable demolition deposits, early green removal permits, a municipal building removal procurement standards policy, and the provision of dedicated space for demolition materials and temporary spaces for building relocation

Committee discussion took place. Highlights included:

- Homes are currently permitted to be moved 100 kilometres over land or unlimited distances by water
- Early notification in the demolition permit process would allow the marketing of a relocated home to take place sooner
- The average cost to relocate a home is \$120 per square foot

3. Gil Yaron, Managing Director, Circular Innovation, Light House, provided an on-screen presentation included in the agenda package. Highlights included:

- While there has been a decrease in building permits issued, the demolition rate relative to the number building permits has increased and is expected to continue increasing
- Factors such limited landfill space, the climate imperative, dependency on precarious markets, and increasing material costs are driving a need to refocus on preserving materials in existing homes
- A major barrier to deconstruction is that it costs more than demolition; however, some costs can be recovered from the materials salvaged during deconstruction
- Provided policy recommendations which included implementing a building hierarchy, mandatory assessments of the viability of preserving a home for its highest and best use, refundable deposits, policies that are applicable to all building types to ensure all value is captured from existing homes, and clear definitions

Committee discussion took place. Highlights included:

- Assessments of properties to determine the viability of relocation or deconstruction being conducted by a third party hired by the permit applicant
- The potential to have a facility where materials are quantified with compliance reporting
- Relocation and deconstruction companies assess homes to determine if the building is able to be relocated or deconstructed and would sign a portion of the demolition permit
- Initiatives that do not require a demolition and deconstruction bylaw may include education/outreach, and funding material exchange services

Gil Yaron, Managing Director, Circular Innovation, Light House, invited the Committee to attend the opening of the expanded Habitat for Humanity in Nanaimo on 2025-SEP-01.

4. Darren Moss, Director/Project Manager, Tectonica/Nanaimo Development Group, provided a verbal presentation. Highlights included:

- The goals of a demolition and deconstruction bylaw include diversion of materials from the landfill; however, other methods could be implemented to achieve this goal
- Taking steps prior to the implementation of a demolition and deconstruction bylaw, such as education of the development community, and separating the timing of demolitions from the sale or reuse of materials
- Concerns regarding the current challenging permit process and the potential impacts of adding additional complexities
- Recommendation that the City be deliberate in its environmental stewardship, but also consider other processes prior to a demolition and deconstruction bylaw

Committee discussion took place regarding the importance of considering building relocation during the development process and the importance of having a space where building materials can be sorted in order to be sold or reused.

5. Ben Routledge, Manager, Solid Waste Services, Regional District of Nanaimo, and Sonam Bajwa, Solid Waste Planner, Regional District of Nanaimo, provided an on-screen presentation included in the agenda package. Highlights included:

- The RDN's waste reduction target is 109 kilograms per person per year by the year 2030
- The RDN collaborates with haulers and waste generators to confirm that materials that are under landfill disposal bans are not being shipped to landfills outside of the region
- In 2020, the Solid Waste Management Plan was released, and includes programs and initiatives designed to improve how waste materials are recycled, composted, and reused in the region

- The importance of adopting a circular economy in order to achieve waste diversion goals
- Light House has received partial funding to help develop a community-led construction, renovation, and demolition materials exchange program through the Zero Waste Recycling Funding Program
- The construction industry puts significant pressure on local landfills due to the waste generated and can significantly impact waste diversion targets through practices such as deconstruction, salvaging, and material reuse
- The RDN has developed a Construction Waste Best Practices Guide to aid with diversion efforts as well as a 'What Goes Where' tool to help citizens find appropriate waste disposal options
- Implementation of the Mandatory Waste Source Separation Bylaw will require all businesses, multi-family dwellings, and institutions to have the three-bin system (garbage, food waste, and recycling)
- The Waste Hauler Licensing Bylaw requires waste haulers operating in the RDN to acquire an annual license, allowing the RDN to provide licensed haulers discounted tipping rates to allow for competitive pricing

Committee and Staff discussion took place. Highlights included:

- Determining how much construction waste entering the landfill comes from the City of Nanaimo would be challenging
- The regional landfill is nearing capacity and only has space available for active landfill use
- As deconstruction and waste reduction initiatives take place, there will be a greater volume of materials that will require space for sorting
- Concern regarding adopting a bylaw before the proper sorting facilities are available; however, policy would be a significant driver for such facilities and services to be created

- Relocated homes are considered current homes and do not need to be upgraded to BC Building Code standards
- The importance of designing current buildings with future deconstruction in mind
- While there are current restrictions for using salvaged lumber in new construction, there are several other non-structural uses for these materials
- Concern that implementing a demolition and deconstruction bylaw may create an additional barrier to developers
- Education may be more beneficial and less costly than regulation
- A desire to see results of similar bylaws in other municipalities over time

It was moved and seconded that the Governance and Priorities Committee recommend that Council direct Staff to bring forward a Demolition and Deconstruction Waste Regulation Bylaw for Council's consideration. The motion was defeated.

Opposed: *Mayor Krog, Councillors Hemmens, Perrino, and Thorpe*

It was moved and seconded that the Governance and Priorities Committee recommend that Council direct Staff to bring forward an amendment to the City of Nanaimo Building Bylaw to remove the requirement for relocated buildings to have an assessed value not less than the average assessed value of all dwellings situated within 50 metres of the site or parcel of land to which the building is to be moved. The motion carried unanimously.

The Governance and Priorities Committee recessed the meeting at 3:18 p.m.
The Governance and Priorities Committee reconvened the meeting at 3:30 p.m.

Councillor Thorpe vacated the Shaw Auditorium at 3:30 p.m.

(b) City Plan:

(1) City Plan Review 2025

Introduced by J. Holm, Director, Planning and Development.

- *The remainder of this page is intentionally left blank* -

Presentation:

1. Lisa Brinkman, Manager, Community Planning, provided an on-screen presentation included in the agenda package. Highlights included:
 - The City is meeting the *Local Government Act* requirements for City Plan to contain policies that address housing
 - There is the potential for addition of approximately 147,000 housing units in City Plan and the Zoning Bylaw has land rezoned for approximately 65,000 housing units; therefore, no amendments to City Plan are required to accommodate the 20-year anticipated housing need target of 23,776 units
 - Staff have been encouraging BC Housing to find sites and construct supportive housing in North Nanaimo; however, to date these sites have not come to fruition and the proposed Distribution of Supportive Housing Policy would strengthen that goal
 - To avoid conflicting policies regarding density and building height, Staff recommend a clarifying policy be added to City Plan for parcels in Transit-Oriented Areas

Committee discussion took place regarding the distribution of supportive housing being incorporated into City Plan and the perception of supportive housing projects concentrated in South Nanaimo.

It was moved and seconded that the Governance and Priorities Committee recommend that Council direct Staff to proceed with:

1. Preparing a bylaw to amend “City Plan Bylaw 2022 No. 6600” as outlined in the Staff Report titled “City Plan Review 2025” dated 2025-JUL-14; and,
2. Consultation with the Ministry of Transportation and Transit, Snuneymuxw First Nation, District of Lantzville and Regional District of Nanaimo in accordance with Section 475 of the *Local Government Act*.

The motion carried unanimously.

(2) Parking Review and Bylaw Update - Mid Project Update

Introduced by Bill Sims, General Manager, Engineering and Public Works.

Fraser Mah, Transportation Engineer, provided an overview of the report included in the agenda package.

Presentation:

1. Dan Casey, Transportation Planner, Urban Systems, provided an on-screen presentation included in the agenda package. Highlights included:

- Community engagement was conducted in the winter of 2024 through the spring of 2025
- Key takeaways from community engagement include the following:
 - Vehicle ownership is lower downtown and in the surrounding area
 - Parking is expensive to build, the cost of which is borne by those buying or leasing the space
 - There is community support for driving alternatives
- Staff and Urban Systems are seeking confirmation that the Committee approves the advancement of the following preliminary directions:
 - Adjusting parking requirements in Primary and Secondary Urban Centres in order to support desired land use and transportation options
 - Supporting increased transit ridership in Transit-Adjacent Lands (nearby Bus Rapid Transit and Bus Frequent Transit Corridors)
 - Introducing new and/or increased requirements for sustainable transportation facilities to support the City's mobility objectives
 - Adjusting regulations to continue to support unique parking needs in line with City objectives such as improving accessible parking design requirements and introducing requirements for small loading/delivery spaces
 - Focusing curbside management in areas where changes to off-street parking regulations may impact curbside functions
- It is anticipated that this topic will return to the Committee in the fall of 2025 with detailed recommendations and bylaw updates

Committee and Staff discussion took place. Highlights included:

- Most of the survey respondents were 35 years or older; however, due to the subject matter, this aligns with typical survey results of this kind. Survey results provide feedback; however, they are not treated as comprehensive
- The importance of safe bike storage and sufficient end of trip facilities for cycling infrastructure
- Potential impact on businesses as some segments of population may not shop in areas without sufficient parking
- Reduced parking, especially in zones with frequent transit, would encourage the use of transit instead of driving
- The importance of accommodating e-bikes in future bike security design requirements

(3) Review of Nanaimo Parking Rates and Penalties

Introduced by B. Sims, General Manager, Engineering and Public Works.

F. Mah, Transportation Engineer, provided an overview of the report included in the agenda package. Highlights included:

- The review of parking rates and penalties was not specifically included in the scope of the Parking Review and Bylaw Update Project; however, parking rates impact how parking spaces are utilized and fines are important in discouraging unwanted behaviour
- City services are not intended to be a method of cost recovery
- The City parking rates are not significantly over or under other municipalities; however, some municipalities have different rates on the third hour or during different times of the day, while the City has flat rates
- Monthly parking permits may discourage active transportation, as someone may choose to drive if they have paid for parking in advance
- City rates are lower than other local entities such as Vancouver Island University

Committee and Staff discussion took place. Highlights included:

- A review of parking rates may help Staff determine whether variable rates and differing rates at peak hours may be viable options for the City
- Operating surplus is strictly used for operating costs and a request for clarification regarding what the operating costs entail
- There are some residential areas within the City that enforce two-hour parking limits with exemptions for residents
- The parking rate review would be incorporated into the existing parking review and bylaw update
- Concern regarding potential rate increases; however, the intended purpose of the review is to ensure consistency of rates, penalties and signage, and to streamline regulation

It was moved and seconded that the Governance and Priorities Committee recommend that Council direct Staff to update existing public vehicle parking rates and fines to align with City Plan policies and similar BC municipalities. The motion carried unanimously.

6. QUESTION PERIOD:

The Committee received no questions from the public regarding agenda items.

7. ADJOURNMENT:

It was moved and seconded at 4:42 p.m. that the meeting adjourn. The motion carried unanimously.

CHAIR

CERTIFIED CORRECT:

DEPUTY CORPORATE OFFICER