

**CITY OF PARKSVILLE  
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION**

**AGENDA**

**DATE:** JANUARY 17, 2011  
**TIME:** 8:00 A.M.  
**PLACE:** THE FORUM, PCTC

- 1. Adoption of Minutes**  
Minutes of October 7, 2010
- 2. General Update**
- 3. Official Community Plan Process Update**
- 4. Adjournment**

**NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING FEBRUARY 17, 2011  
PCTC, THE FORUM**

/sh

# TO BE ADOPTED

<b>CITY OF PARKSVILLE</b> <b>ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION</b>
--

## MINUTES OF MEETING

**Date:** October 7, 2010  
**Time:** 8:30 am  
**Place:** PCTC, The Forum  
**Chair:** D. Luke

### Members Present:

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

### Others:

F. Manson, Chief Administrative Officer  
T. C. Patterson, Council Representative  
B. Russell, Manager of Current Planning  
S. Harbottle  
N. Gray, MacDonald Gray  
D. Smith, The Focus Corporation  
M. Cloghesy, Landscape Architect  
9 members of the public

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked them for attending on such short notice. He reminded the gallery that although this is an open forum participation is not necessarily accepted. Further he advised he will accept questions after the termination of the meeting, but the gallery is not permitted to ask questions during the presentation.

### 1. Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order at 8:30 am by the Chair.

### 2. Adoption of Minutes:

Moved by E. Chabot                      Seconded by T. Knight

That the minutes of the meeting of July 15, 2010 be approved. CARRIED

At the April 15<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Commission postponed a resolution regarding this issue. It is now appropriate to bring forward a motion to continue discussion.

Moved by T. Knight    Seconded by R. Thompson

That the motion to postpone the recommendation for 161 Island Highway West and to continue the discussion be approved. **CARRIED**

### 3.    **OCP & Zoning Amendment Application (161 Island Highway West)**

N. Gray:

- Thank you to everyone for showing up on such short notice. Also thanks to team for showing up. Introduce M. Cloghesy & D. Smith. Slightly revised version of original application; no longer seeking OCP amendment. Straight rezoning. Compliant with the OCP policies & guidelines. 2 major pieces being residential has been reduced to 50% of the land use, the balance being tourist commercial/commercial. The new amenity package includes 70% of the total area being dedicated to the City, partially as park, and partially as roadway dedication. Within that is a greenway road dedication that extends the Alberni Highway to waterfront, an accessible pedestrian stair and ramp connection. Along water is the waterfront walkway and also proposing waterfront walkway feature similar to the Community Park for McMillan. That may be pulled but they would like to see that included.

M. Cloghesy:

- Thank you for showing up at early hour. Very similar presentation as the public information July 2010 meeting. No new information just communicating it to the Commission further to the April meeting. B. Walsh is still involved who is at another meeting and not able to attend. Quite a history on the project. Been in the process 8 almost years, although this current application is 1 year in the municipal system. Lots of dialogue the past and could we consider some of the other options but the economy locally does permit that looking at today's world. Site is currently zoned for 3 storey tourist/commercial enterprise. If the owner wanted to build this he could but it would result in no public amenities whatever, strictly 3 stories and all usual setbacks according to current zone. It's not something the owner wants to do therefore he is seeking a rezoning. They have heard loud and clear that the community wants view corridor from Alberni Highway is most important to maintain, access to the public foreshore, beach, and walkway, very important and providing a road connection of some sort whether it's through to Beachside Drive or otherwise, very important. View corridor is in the centre, secondary corridor is between Beach Club and this property. This application includes giving over the foreshore, now is a right of way but would give it for public ownership plus a portion of Beachside Drive. Sketches shown are exact view of what you would get. Generous setback between Beach Club and proposal, wider than required. 18 m centre road right of way, 6 m wide public pathway. Suggesting a public right of way to the waterfront. Small commercial building and small gateway element. Very generous view corridor. Suggest to provide public access such as stairs/ramps would be challenging due to grade change but doable, to be negotiated. 50/50 percentage of permanent residential, 50% tourist commercial, commercial shorter term use of residential. In terms of phasing none of these things has been negotiated yet, because we have yet to develop the bylaw, or even discussed exactly what zone we are looking for here but most likely be residential building permanent one built first cause they're closer, which means your

servicing is produced by getting your pipes in the ground closer and also they general money to allow for 2<sup>nd</sup> phase. It will be done in a timely manner.

- All access to property is through Beachside. All parking is underground due to nature of site and geotech constraints; ½ underground, ½ above ground due to the water table.
- Proposing 3 storeys. They are asking for a 13 m height for the proposal in order to permit a peak roof, instead of a flat roof if the 11 m height restriction is met. More comfortable fit for a peak roof fit.
- They are not extending the Alberni Highway; the slope/grade precludes this. Would require a lot of fill. Transportation Studies show that it is acceptable not to have a road extension.
- Don't know what they are asking for regarding zoning. To be discussed with Staff. Maybe a CD zone to allow for split small commercial/residential use. Lot average is 30% instead of 50% allowable. 123 units proposed.
- All servicing has been considered and will be dealt with in a similar manner as other projects within the municipality.
- Extensive work has been done on this site using sustainable methods for drainage issues. Dealt with in an environmentally, sensitive way. Sewer and water will meet municipal standards.

Questions from the members:

- Q Can you provide more detail about the 50% other than residential, what the concept involves?
- A OCP allows for a 50% permanent/50% tourist commercial. Straight commercial not doable at this stage. Looking at shorter term residential, typical tourist commercial use. Very small commercial at waterfront. Not precluding other tourist commercial uses over time; would like to be able to leave that open in the zone. Whatever is economically viable.
- Q What about road access that you have? It stops. Road dedication? What is happening to this? You're not going to do a turn around?
- A Where Beachside Drive continues they are continuing to discuss with Engineering. Developer to put funds up and not construct right now. Still discussing there are options. Perhaps temporary turn around; developer put in funds for future. Should be included as it is in long term plans.
- Q Is there going to be a fence along the beachfront? Are you going to close this area?
- A The area in the front, near the residences. This is the front yard for the residences. The City may require that. The current fence, chain link, is not going to be there. It will be residential style fence. The public section is the roadway and right of way; the boulevard, the roadway is totally public. That is public lands.
- Q Parking - Is the only access off 19A, primarily next to the parking garage, next to the Beach Club?

- A Primary access is from McMillan. Future development down the line will likely have to consider this. Both transportation engineers and municipality confirm that the arrangement shown for circulation can easily handle the amount of traffic by this project.
- Q Can Staff comment on this?
- A The traffic analysis has it as a "D" grade, with the addition of the development, which is just passable. The other concern is length of the cul de sac that will be formed without additional access to the highway.
- Q Question regarding use do you envision it as "hotel/motel" type of use? Tourists come over short period of time. Is that the use? Basically residential use?
- A Yes. It could be. It could be if that's what the market will handle. They don't want to remove the current tourist commercial land use in order to use it for future use.
- Q Do you envision that whole property be strata use? With residential/commercial section type property?
- A Haven't worked out end strata. May be 2, 3 stratas, may have to be subdivided at some point.
- Q The small commercial property, noted as a concession of some kind. How does this property get service vehicles to access it?
- A That is the reason for the 6 m right of way, rather than 3m walkway, which will allow vehicular access. This will be resolved at the development permit stage. The drawings shown may be slightly reconfigured to work out the details to accommodate at that time. It would be something small, like the Kiwanis Tea Room in Oak Bay. Something small for a service group, as a seasonal operation, whatever is viable at that time. The municipality will also need access to the structure and boardwalk and would have to be designed by the City to allow for servicing etc. Also would like to take clarify that the "D" grade for circulation mentioned by Staff earlier, is acceptable, an "E" which is barely passable. It's deemed acceptable, not just passable.
- Q The residential layout; the component of usage of land. Currently zoned tourist commercial with no permanent residential. You are asking to change that. I can see future problems. Presuming it will be strata and the people that live there and their concerns; it will not be long before those people will be complaining about public traffic in front of their property. From a long range point of view from the City, what is the City of Parksville, the residents of Parksville, gaining on a positive note from going from commercial to residential use of this land?
- A The notion of strata and public and private spaces. Proposing ground oriented medium density housing, a model which encourages social sustainability; provides a better relationship to the street; people living and visiting there by monitoring activities on the street, good CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design). To make greenway connection viable and safe and the idea of having bodies in a permanent residential. To have people there only 4 - 6 months of the year would be a great void, with no one to monitor what happens in the space.

Comment Can see concerns over the long term.

Q Residential/tourist commercial. Will this be a hotel, ¼ ownership, ½ ownership, as seen in other places? Are you proposing daily, weekly rental or ¼ ownership, ½ ownership, whatever the case may be?

A The zone will allow the above. The market will dictate what it will be. What form those temporary rooms take really can't be determined at this point. They will follow the same requirements within the zone.

Q Is there going to be guest parking at the front or are they going to be for anyone using the boardwalk or anyone coming to the area?

A The City requires a certain amount of parking for residents and visitors. That is what is shown for visitor parking underground, not public. To show public visitor parking needs to be negotiated with the City regarding the right of way. We are willing to put in parking on the street but are not in a position to show it until they have discussions with the City at the next stage. There is a drop off zone. Parking shown on drawings is on private property not on municipal roads.

Q Is there any way to limit parking to guests?

A After negotiations it will be determined which is public and private. There will be signs.

Comment The Chair asks for a recommendation from the members.

Q Would it be appropriate today to ask the gallery to ask questions at this time or appropriate after we've passed our motion?

A It would not be appropriate. The decision is the consensus of the Commission, keeping in mind it is only a recommendation to Council. We should make that decision amongst Commission members.

Moved by T. Knight                      Seconded by

That the Advisory Planning Commission recommend to Council that the Zoning Amendment Application for Parksville Beach Development Inc., Inc. No. 683777, on Lot 1, District Lot 89, Nanoose District, Plan VIP78996 (161 Island Highway West) be approved as presented subject to technical review by City Departments.

The vote for this recommendation was a tie, resulting in defeat of the motion.

## 4. Adjournment:

Moved by T. Knight Seconded by R. Thompson

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:18 am

---

Chair  
/sh

I:\Users\Planning\0540-20\APC\2010\Min\_Oct\_7\_10.doc

## Questions from the gallery:

- Q Al Pastars - If there are 2 bathrooms and 2 toilets per unit there is a concern regarding whether or not the infrastructure could handle a development of that size for the amount of water needed for such a large proposal.
- A All of the modelling regards engineering was completed through the City through Koers Engineering and there were no issues identified and is serviceable for the site.
- Q Elaine Hofer - Concern expressed its not following the rules of the OCP; that it is back 30% from the waterfront as noted in the OCP requirements.
- A It meets the guidelines noted in the OCP. Can Staff interpret that?
- Staff Planner would need to verify the specific text of the OCP to determine.
- Q Chris Drake - Hears concerns and comments. The OCP allows this development; the process is already started; can only go 3 stories but she understands the applicant is proposing 3½ stories because parking can't be put underground, so you are asking for a height variance; it is supposed to be only 50% residential, now you are asking for change; also concerned about the road. When she spoke with a Councillor she was told the road from the Beach Club had been built with an understanding that it would carry on as a road into this development, so she would like to know who is paying for this road and she doesn't want to pay for it.
- A The height can be done at 11 m if you want a flat roof design. It is doable under the 11m. Whether the parking is underground or not, they are just communicating the realities of waterfront development. They will be dealing with Staff through Council about this in terms of the look and feel when they get to the development permit stage. They are not looking for a variance if there is no support for this. The residential and tourist commercial part, the reality is that the City may ask them to create a separate zone or two separate zones to allow for different uses. Tourist commercial is the current zone; that could be done right now. The developer will pay for the development of Beachside Drive.
- Q Valerie Dare - The vagueness of the proposal is a concern. Why isn't there a computer generated picture or 3D model of what they can expect to see? Something that gives a sense of what they are looking at, it is really hard to make a decision.

- A At rezoning one rarely does a physical model, it is not a requirement to show built form. We have shown some modelling in the slides shown in the presentation but it is not the final product. When they get to the next level they will provide more drawings. At the Design Panel the form and character gets discussed and resolved. There are additional steps at that stage that can change the design.
- Q Al Pastars - Going back to residential; agrees with the Chair that there will be a major problem with people; the only reason residents are sitting on their stoops is to stop the public from parking in the private parking on the street. This will be a major problem. If you can build your buildings under the 11m restriction and the site is already tourist commercial, why not take that residential section and make it residential/tourist commercial? In other words you don't need a rezoning.
- A The parking on the road for visitors can be put in the back; it's not really relevant to land use. As far as the tourist commercial use, there is no market for it right now.
- Q Jeff Goodinson - Seems clear this proposal is not ready, is ill thought out. I thought the OCP required height to go down?
- A Height and slope are zoning requirements. OCP is just a generalization of what the use will be. They just want to go with the base line OCP, because they don't want a six storey tower at the end of the Alberni Highway. They will provide options what can be done right now, at the Public Hearing under the tourist/commercial zoning. It will give people a chance to see.
- Q Jeff Goodinson - That would be too late to change. Having it sooner would be much more useful.
- A The only decision made was that Council determined that this go forward. It will go to Public Hearing and everyone's voice will be heard. Council will have to make the decision.
- Q Valerie Dare - It has been stated that there is no market for tourist accommodation. I'm wondering whether that's because it is becoming more and more expensive. Perhaps a lower priced or family oriented tourist accommodation would find a better market here since there is a lot of undeveloped space in the City at the moment.
- A Yes, the market is tending towards the lower end and yes it is over saturated. A campground, a fall back as to what could be done, would not be the highest and best value of this particular site. It comes down to the broader question to what the vision is and what should be done at the end of the Alberni Highway. Keep in mind you have no public amenities, no access. The OCP doesn't suggest that's the best use.
- Q Bill Neufeld - The motion failed. Personally, he would like to have the City buy the property. The residents would like to be able to see from Alberni Highway through to the mountains. What is the height as far as the gables etc. as far as above grade, ½ underground, ½ above. You've said you don't know what you're asking for. Feel as though they are not getting answers. What is the height? From grade? Will the view be blocked?
- A The zone allows for 11m and we're asking for 13m from grade. If they have to build up the site it will be from finished grade. This is an opportunity to lock in. You could back fill and go 11 m.



Staff The development permit process will deal with the guidelines, would address detail, fill or whatever.

A The Mayor advised it would cost \$10 million to purchase the property. You may want to ask Staff the practicalities of that.

Q With low interest rates, etc. it should be viable.

Council Representative

Ask CAO to answer that question. She feels that the water intake is more important than purchasing this property. Not in the best interests of the community.

Administration

Difficult question to answer. Don't have any idea of the value of the property. Can go to long term borrowing but will cost at least \$1million to service the debt. This would be a 10% tax increase, which amounts to approximately \$125.00 per household.

A There is community park land and there are sites identified as being good to be acquired. This site is not the best site for acquisition. This proposed site is too disturbed.

Q Can they obtain a comparison of tax revenues and the tax base provided by a tourist facility?

A Staff report on this already done.

Q Can a rendering be done from the Highway?

A Yes, there will be a rendering available at the Public Hearing showing the view from the Highway.