

CITY OF PARKSVILLE
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES OF MEETING

Date: April 15, 2010
Time: 8:00 am
Place: PCTC, The Forum
Chair: D. Luke

Members Present:

<u>X</u> _____	J. S. Baldwin	<u>X</u> _____	E. Chabot
<u>X</u> _____	T. Knight	<u>X</u> _____	D. Luke
<u>X</u> _____	K. Paskin	<u>X</u> _____	L. Taylor
<u>X</u> _____	R. Thompson		

Others:

G. A. Jackson, Director of Community Planning
B. Russell, Manager of Current Planning
S. Harbottle
D. Smith, The Focus Corporation
B. James, Poets Cove Resort & Spa
M. Cloghesy, Landscape Architect
6 members of the public

1. Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order at 8:10 am by the Chair.

2. Adoption of Minutes:

Moved by T. Knight Seconded by L. Taylor

That the minutes of the meeting of January 21, 2010 be approved. CARRIED

3. Official Community Plan and Zoning Amendment Application (161 Island Highway West)

Legal: Lot 1, District Lot 89, Nanoose District, Plan VIP78996

Civic: 161 Island Highway West

Applicant: Focus Corporation, Dave Smith

Owner: Parksville Beach Development Inc., Inc. No. 683777

Planning File: 3060-09-02

The Chairman introduced Michele Cloghesy who provided a PowerPoint presentation regarding the Parksville Beach Motel and its most recent application. She advised the owner's history of the site and his previous applications. She presented the three driving factors of the proposal:

1. Enhance view corridor;
2. Provide beach access for pedestrians;
3. Allow road access connecting beach front properties.

The following points were noted:

- proposal is for permanent residential;
- Cape Cod/west coast style of building;
- the project name is the Watermark;
- 8 buildings of 3 storeys with underground parking as well as visitor/guest parking on the surface of the site;
- a small commercial component was presented but is not fixed at this time; perhaps public/private partnership for the commercial component;
- variance for height is required;
- 7m dedication proposed;
- maintaining view corridors;
- comparisons made to Kits Beach and Dundarave in Vancouver;
- there is a 45 m corridor within the green space of the development.

Member Discussion:

- Q. This is a major departure from the Official Community Plan and this is a significant site within the community. How does Parksville benefit from this proposal?
- A. The applicant responded that the current zoning would allow the same structures but only with a tourist commercial use on a temporary use basis; a development permit would be required. The applicant is more interested in having permanent residents on site which would provide a more secure, less transient population in the downtown core and provide year round benefit versus three months. Further the owner is not prepared to continue as a motel and may board it up. They view the view corridor, access road, 7 m setback, as substantial gifts to the community.
- Q. Under the Official Community Plan the vision is for tourist commercial, so the site is more open to the public. If permanent residential is permitted it will become strata and private from the community. Why did the developer not choose a Comprehensive Development Zone and what is stopping them from developing to the full build-out once zoning is in place?
- A. The applicant responded that yes they are correct from the zoning standpoint. Further the applicant advised this is not a firm design; she further advised that covenants can be prepared for the zone to ensure the zoning. The owner would like RS-3 residential only plus the commercial component that was requested by Staff and Council.

Comment from the Director of Community Planning: The commercial component spoken of today is the first that has been seen by Staff. As a result the RS-3 zone is no longer the correct zone to apply for.

- Q. There is currently a setback of 7m proposed; would the developer consider changing the setback to 18 m?
- A. The applicant responded that the building form would have to increase in height if 18 m is required to make it viable.
- Q. Will this be a full time residence? What will the units be comprised of i.e. 1, 2 or 3 bedroom and will there be a social housing component?
- A. The applicant responded that this is proposed for full time residence with a diverse mix of 1, 2 or 3 bedrooms. There will be no social housing on the site. The owner is proposing to relocate the old building if land can be found for affordable housing.
- Q. Will there be housing along the highway and along the neighbouring properties?
- A. The applicant responded that the property along the highway is owned by the City. The neighbouring properties, the Beach Club, already has a component of permanent residential and eventually the RV Park will go to another form of residential. People who live there spend money at home.
- Q. Will the green space shown on the drawings be private? How will the public be stopped from entering the property?
- A. The applicant responded that currently there is access on the other side of the Beach Club for the public. There will not be a permanent barrier placed and there will be signage advising it is private property.
- Q. What happens when the economy improves? Will there be a desire to change the use to tourist commercial?
- A. The applicant responded that currently there is lots of empty commercial space. We feel it will be a very long time before the economy returns, perhaps in 5 years. We are floating the idea of the commercial component today for discussion purposes. The applicant is not prepared to wait that long for the economy to return and wishes to have permanent residential as opposed to tourist commercial.
- Q. What is the width of the pedestrian walkway? What effect will the walkway have on neighbouring trees?
- A. The applicant responded that 1.5 - 2 m will be the width of the sidewalk along the eastern side (RV Park). Further she advised they would provide whatever the City requires. The applicant will not be able to save those trees on site due to the lower level parking lot but they will be providing elaborate landscaping.
- Q. How does the walkway connect to Highway 19A and the parking proposed?
- A. The applicant responded that the owner has offered to assist in providing a stairway to Highway 19A but there is no agreement in place and they are willing to negotiate this.

Q. How do cars access the development?

A. The applicant responded that cars will access the site through McMillan. The Alberni Highway access is for emergency access only.

Q. Question regarding underground parking?

A. The applicant responded that the elevation of the parkade is partially underground/at ground level.

Q. Will the sundeck block the view corridor?

A. The applicant responded no. There is a 45 m open space corridor which will be maintained.

Q. What about preservation of trees on adjoining properties?

A. The applicant responded that a sweep with an urban forester will be done using best practices and if it is determined that the trees will not survive they will be replaced. There is an elaborate process for this and it will be looked at seriously with professionals.

Q. Is there a back up plan if the present zoning is kept in place?

A. The applicant responded yes. She advised it will be the same proposal with smaller massing but with the temporary use in place. It is not the owners desire to have the current zoning, he wishes full time residents.

Q. Would it be possible that the proposed clubhouse be used as a California style juice bar available to the public in order to entice people to Parkville

A. There was no response to this suggestion.

Comment from the Director of Community Planning: Regarding public parking, the technical review at the Staff level has not been completed. The drawings show parking on a City right of way which is a concern. Further the plans don't show visitor parking on the site. If parking is not adequate it is a concern. Additionally, the Parks Master Plan shows a road connection which necessitates further discussion and review with Staff.

Q. There are 4 major development sites for multifamily residential use in Parkville that are currently vacant now. Why is this application viable?

Q. The applicant responded that the Official Community Plan was quoted respecting the balance between residential and commercial with one goal being an economic one about job creation. This proposal indicates a major change in direction from that.

A. The applicant responded that the owner would be happy to do commercial waterfront in a better economic climate. Further she advised that the Beach Club restaurant is empty and the owner does not want so much commercial that it won't lease. He is listening to the public and has proposed the coffee bar but not a restaurant. She advised he does not want to create competition. He would like to hear ideas if the public has more.

- Q. Although the primary purpose is for a zoning amendment this is a major Official Community Plan amendment. There is current community discussion about an Official Community Plan change. The waterfront section of the current Official Community Plan preamble quotes: owners have the opportunity to define the future of the City. This is a major change. The member has some reservations and understands that strata owners don't like people walking on their property. The member is concerned about the timing of the proposal relative to the Official Community Plan review, and in that context, this application may be premature.
- A. The applicant responded that this application came in August and was held up due to road access issues. The Official Community Plan review could be a 1 - 2 year process, too long to ask the owner to wait. She advised that more tourist commercial is not economically viable.
- Q. Once residential zoning is in, what is to say it will never change?
- A. The applicant responded that the owner has the right to do something. He would go to Plan B and would develop under the existing zoning.
- Q. The application has insufficient information to come up with a recommendation and the member would like to walk the site to get the physical feel prior to making a recommendation.
- Q. Parksville was once a village; the view was to keep the feel of the village; the member thinks people need to be living downtown and thinks City residents should agree with the benefit that people will walk.

Comment from the Director of Community Planning: The application needs to be amended to show the commercial component.

- Q. What is the status of the Official Community Plan review?

Comment from the Director of Community Planning: The topic is being presented to the April 19, 2010 Committee of the Whole meeting. The members may make a motion to postpone to the next meeting, a recommendation in order to clarify the changes that are being made at which time the Official Community Plan matter will be clearer.

Recommendation: Moved by T. Knight Seconded by S. J. Baldwin

THAT a recommendation regarding the Official Community Plan and Zoning Amendment Application for 161 Island Highway West be postponed to the next Advisory Planning Commission meeting. **CARRIED**

General discussion and comments ensued and the following comments were made:

- a member requested if a site visit could be arranged;
- a member expressed concern that his primary issue is about the commercial component coming in after the application was filed;

Questions/comments from the general public:

- Q. A member of the public questioned where the location of the proposed bistro is?

- A. The applicant responded that the bistro is proposed to be along the waterfront walkway which is the proposed Clubhouse building. The bistro is not firmly planned.
- Q. A member of the public asked if that is the extent of their answer regarding tourist commercial and asked what is it worth in dollars? Further he questioned, is the bistro the answer to the Official Community Plan?
- A. The member of the public was advised of the procedures with regard to Robert's Rules and the public's involvement in this meeting and he stormed out of the meeting.
- Q. A former member of the Advisory Planning Commission expressed concern about complete residential on the site while the parks resolution requests tourist commercial and except for the explanation of the rationalization of there being no market for tourist commercial, she questioned the presenter, why doesn't the owner go through with the development with the current zoning?
- A. The applicant responded that there is nothing wrong with proceeding with the development with the current zoning but the owner believes it is better for people to live on the waterfront rather than have a transient population.
- Q. A member of the public heard the only reason to change it is coming from the developer and asked if there were any other demands to change the zoning on the waterfront. Told no, he spoke of his preference to go with the existing zoning due to height.
- Q. A member of the Commission asked why is the audience against permanent residential development.
- A. A member of the public responded and questioned why should developers change the Official Community Plan? He would like to see the residents change the Official Community Plan and not developers.

At 9:50 am there was a 10 minute recess in the meeting.

The meeting resumed at 10:00 a.m.

Due to technical difficulties the remainder of the meeting was postponed until the next meeting.

4. Adjournment:

Moved by S. J. Baldwin Seconded by L. Taylor

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:04 am


Chair

BR/sh