

CITY OF PARKSVILLE
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES OF MEETING

Date: September 15, 2011
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> _____	D. Luke	<u>X</u> _____	K. Paskin
_____	L. Taylor	<u>X</u> _____	R. Thompson
_____	K. Jacobs		

Others:

G. A. Jackson, Director of Community Planning
S. Chow, Chow Low Hammond Architects Inc.
G. Carey, Glencar Consultants Inc.
C. S. MacDonald, Project Manager, MacDonald Gray Landscape Architects
M. Jacobson, Transportation Engineer, Boulevard Transportation Group
M. Warbrick, P. Eng., Newcastle Engineering Ltd.
S. Harbottle, City of Parksville
Members of the public

1. Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order at 8:02 am.

2. Adoption of Minutes:

Moved by R. Thompson Seconded by E. Chabot

That the minutes of the meeting of May 19, 2011 be approved. CARRIED

3. **Official Community Plan and Zoning Amendment Application (263, 259 and 253 Dogwood Street)**

Legal: Lots 4, 5, and 6, District Lot 70, Nanoose District, Plan 15905

Civic: 263, 259 and 253 Dogwood Street

Applicant: Glencar Consultants Inc.

Owner: Van Steen, Luksay & 0849459 BC Ltd.

File: 3360-10-01

The Chairman introduced S. Chow, of Chow Low Hammond Architects Inc., architect for the proposal. Mr. Chow provided a brief overview and PowerPoint presentation of the proposal and noted the following:

- The proposal is to rezone 3 parcels from RS-1 and RS-2 to a new comprehensive zoning category.
- This transition area has merit to densify the zoning.
- The proposal is for a 4 storey townhouse/condominium building, for a total of 30 units.
- The site parking is situated on the ground and under the building.
- The use of land is somewhat unique as a mix of townhouse and condominium units is proposed.
- They are proposing a reduction in the number of parking spaces (36 total), slightly under the 1.5/space requirement in the Zoning and Development Bylaw, for which they have requested a variance.
- A variance is also being requested for height; they are proposing a 13.26 m height building while the current zoning permits 11.0m. They are looking at sloping roofs, and articulation of the building to reduce the massing, but at this point require a variance of 2.6 m and feel it will be a more attractive building with the additional height.
- The applicant is proposing 6 affordable housing units, a total of 20% of the project.
- The building will incorporate some sustainable practices (i.e. strict adherence to material handling principles to reduce waste and avoid contamination during demolition and construction).
- The landscaping will enhance the building and street aspects and be an asset to the neighbourhood.

Member Discussion:

- Q. Expressed concern regarding on-street parking for Dogwood and felt it was limited; further questioned access to Highway 19A and felt it was a dangerous intersection.
- A. The applicant advised that most municipalities regulate parking via signage along with enforcement. The applicant felt that the Highway 19A access question to be more of a general transportation issue and not relevant to this application.

[G. A. Jackson, Director of Community Planning]

The extent to which transportation is a valid consideration for the Advisory Planning Commission is limited with regard to this application. The City Engineering and Operations Department has accepted the transportation information relating to this application as being sufficient.

[M. Jacobson, Boulevard Transportation Group]

This site has negligible impact regarding issues with Highway 19A. There has been discussion indicating the installation of a two-way left turn lane on Highway 19A as a consideration.

- Q. Questioned who the occupants might be and expressed concern about on-site/off-site parking.
- A. The applicant advised it could be family oriented as well as senior oriented. They wished to allow for flexibility due to market conditions. He also advised there would be the 6 affordable housing units, which would be 1 bedroom units.
- Q. Questioned the parking with regarding to seniors and their need for larger parking spaces and questioned what the applicant meant by community garden.
- A. The applicant advised that the community garden is intended for residents of the proposal; further he repeated his response regarding parking off site and how more municipalities are now looking at lessening their requirement for parking in consideration of sustainability issues, and looking at alternate forms of transportation so as not to rely on cars.
- Q. Is the additional height required? Is there no way this can be alleviated?
- A. The applicant advised that the massing is relative; he advised there are sloping roofs to help with the massing of the building so you don't get the sense of additional height. Also the additional height in the roof tops allows for concealing of mechanical equipment.

[G. A. Jackson, Director of Community Planning]

In answer to a question about how the Planning Department view the parking reduction, Ms. Jackson advised that there is a trend now to consider reducing parking requirements so as to discourage automobile use.

- Q. Is the applicant proposing pedestrian access to the Highway for the Dogwood proposal?
- A. Advised they are allowing for pedestrian access around the parcels but will rely on future developments to provide pedestrian access to Highway 19A.

[M. Warbrick, Newcastle Engineering]

Advised that the sidewalk is being extended to Bay Avenue as part of this proposal.

- Q. Asked if the properties on Roscow Street, backing onto the proposed site have been advised of the proposal.
- A. The applicant advised that there is a landscaping buffer proposed in addition to the setbacks on the east side of the property. Further he advised that the building will not cast shadows to the Roscow Street properties.
- Q. How is the affordable housing component proposed to be handled and how is ownership protected regarding this aspect of the proposal?

- A. The applicant advised that there will be a housing agreement put in place regarding the 6 affordable housing units which will be for a ten (10) year duration. Further he advised that this information will be in the disclosure documents for the potential purchasers of units.
- Q. Expressed concern again regarding parking on Dogwood Street and passing the responsibility on to the municipality.

[G. A. Jackson, Director of Community Planning]

Advised the members that the on-street parking and parking infractions are beyond the control of this applicant. The issue is on-site parking and whether it is adequate for the proposal.

Advised she would have the Bylaw Compliance Officer check out parking in the area.

Recommendation:

Moved by R. Thompson Seconded by K. Paskin

That the Advisory Planning Commission recommend to Council that the Official Community Plan and Zoning Amendment application for William Barend Van Steen, Paul Michael Luksay and 0849459 BC Ltd. to rezone Lots 4, 5 and 6, District Lot 70, Nanoose District, Plan 15905 (263, 259 and 253 Dogwood Street) from RS-1 and RS-2 to a new comprehensive zoning category be given support subject to:

Technical review by Staff of the on-site/off-site parking issues and further consideration of the building height variance request.

4. General Update

Ms. Jackson provided the members and the public with information regarding recently received applications and noted that the Official Community Plan contract has been mutually cancelled. She advised that the lead consultant, Marc Holland is no longer with HB Lanarc. Further she advised that Staff is continuing with the committee meetings in their review. Further she advised the OCP will "take as long as it takes". There will be a consultant hired and a "Report for Proposal" is being done shortly. There are 2 reasons for a consultant to be hired; Staff is up to capacity and the City has obtained a Green Municipal Fund (GMF) grant which will allow for a greater proportion of funding to be provided, but only if the City uses a consultant. Further she advised that the timelines have not yet been revised but would provide that information at a later date.

Ms. Jackson advised that the supply of lots in the City is low so there are more subdivision applications at this time. Further there are several small 1 to 3 lot type applications and there are several very large lot applications. The larger projects are somewhat slower to get off the ground but there is activity being processed in the background. At this time there are not many rezoning applications and a number of small development permit applications.

There was some discussion regarding the Wembley Mall, Save-On-Foods proposal for a free standing food store.

Regarding the Post and Lantern rezoning it was discussed and noted there wasn't a lot of information on the operating model and the proposed upgrades. She advised that it was a close vote for Council and that the bylaw was defeated.

Ms. Jackson advised that there are pre-application discussions regarding the waterfront property owned by Mr. B. Walsh.

A question was raised as to what was the status of the boardwalk. Ms. Jackson advised that at this time the Planning Department is looking for grant support for funding; the boardwalk continuation from McMillan to the Westin Hotel is the most expensive section due to the requirement of the boardwalk having to be elevated. The City does have a preliminary design ready but requires funding in order to build. From an estimate done approximately 5 years ago, the level of funding required is approximately \$1 - 2 million. She further advised that there is a Staff member always looking for grant funds.

Ms. Jackson advised the members that Sarah Ross, the junior planner who was working on the Official Community Plan is now on maternity leave.

Ms. Jackson advised of other projects being carried on within the Planning Department. She noted Planning Staff's participation in the computer upgrade and further advised that there will be a report to Council at the Monday, September 19, 2011 Council meeting regarding the Development Process Review.

5. Adjournment

Moved by R. Thompson Seconded by J. S. Baldwin

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:01 am



Chair

/sh