



**Summary Report / Minutes of the Advisory Planning Commission Meeting
(Held on November 2, 2017,
in the Committee Room at City Hall, at 12:00 p.m.)**

Advisory Planning Commission

Wes Hewitt – Chair
Seva Dhaliwal – Vice-Chair
Larry Ransom - (SD #70 Liaison)
John Douglas
Amy Anaka
Ken McCrae
Councillor Chris Alemany (Council Liaison)
Rick Newberry Thoen (P.A.F.D. Liaison)
S. Sgt. Terry Smith (R.C.M.P. Liaison)
Rob Gaudreault (Parks Operations Liaison)

Staff

Scott Smith, Director of Development Services
Cara Foden, Dev. Services Technician

Guests

Members of the Public – 14
B. Crema (Applicants)
N. Nygren
D. Francis
D. Hamelin

Regrets

Cynthia Dick (C.C. Tseshah First Nation)
Jim Tatoosh (Hupacasath First Nation)
Hedley Crowther

Alternates (not in attendance)

Councillor Ron Paulson (Alternate–Council)
Sgt. Dave Boyce (Alternate–R.C.M.P.)
John Bennie (Alternate S.D.70)
Steve Tatoosh (Alternate Hupacasath First Nation)



1. Adoption of September 21, 2017 Minutes

- Introductions were made and members of the public welcomed by the Chair.
- The minutes of the September 21, 2017 meeting of the Advisory Planning Commission were adopted.

(McRae / Ransom) CARRIED

- L. Ransom, (SD 70 liaison), declared a conflict of interest, recused himself from the application and left the room. The School District currently owns the subject property.

**2. DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION – Official Community Plan Bylaw and Zoning Bylaw
4000 Burde Street**

Lot 1, District Lot 46, Alberni District, Plan 11651 (PID: 004-971-418)

Applicant: B. Crema dba District Acquisitions Corporation

- The Director of Development Services (D.D.S.) summarized his report to the APC dated October 25, 2017.
- M. Jarrett (public) asked the Chair for permission to submit a letter to the APC regarding the application. The Chair accepted the submission and the Commission motioned to receive it and include it in the minutes for Council's consideration.
- The APC, and members of the public in attendance, discussed the application as follows:
 - P. Kermeen (public) noted that the property is a large tract of land and suggested that the proposed use was not the best use of the land for the community and urged the APC members to recommend against moving forward with the proposal.

- S. Brownlee (public) voiced concern regarding the timing of a traffic study recommended for the intersection of 10th Ave. and Burde St. She noted that visibility at the intersection was impeded by a fence on the southeast corner and was concerned about the suggested timing (post development) of a traffic study. She would prefer a traffic study be done prior to Phase 1.
- D. Jarrett (public) asked the applicants about their company and funding of the project. The applicants responded with a brief history of their local background, experience in the development industry and company history. Mr. Jarrett also asked if any of the company's investor's would be in a position to vote on the application. The D.D.S. advised that any conflict would have to be declared.
- K. McRae (APC) asked about a projected timeline for the project. B. Crema (Applicant) spoke to the issue of low vacancy rates in the Province including the City of Port Alberni. Several Commission members spoke to the need for senior's housing and Mr. Crema indicated that senior's housing could be contemplated within the spectrum of zoning options that could be applied for from within the Multi-family OCP designation. He described the projected timeline for the project to be 5 -10 years with this initial phase to take approximately 24 months.
- J. Douglas (APC) asked about current ownership status of the property and expressed that there is a need in the community for health facilities and supportive housing options. Mr. Douglas also asked for clarification of the infrastructure and servicing needs for the site. The applicant indicated that the School District owns the property. The closing date for the sale is December 20 and subject conditions have been removed. It was clarified that the current P1 zoning would remain on a large portion of the site and would allow for the operation of both private or public health facilities and a variety of supportive housing options.
- M. Nygren (Applicant) advised the APC that the real estate market in Port Alberni is more subdued than other locations in BC and that this is a reason for well thought out, phased development that works for the community needs. He indicated that the company is open to exploring partnerships with supportive housing providers. Mr. Nygren also explained that new rental apartment housing has not been developed in Port Alberni for many years. In recent years it has become a more financially feasible and viable development option due to low interest rates and other economic factors. He would encourage the City to promote the building of more rental apartments.
- The D.D.S. spoke to the APC to clarify that the infrastructure requirements for the development of the site would be considerable and the developer would be required to submit engineering plans and drawings at the subdivision phase and design work would need to consider the entire site rather than reflecting a piecemeal approach.
- The applicants indicated to the APC that planning for accessible housing was included in their business plan with a reasonable percentage being 5-10%. The D.D.S. clarified that the City had no bylaws that required affordable housing to be provided.
- A. Anaka (APC) commented that the wait list for rental apartments in the recently opened Thunderbird building was an indication of the need for rental units in Port Alberni. She asked why zoning amendments would be pursued in phases rather than a phased development agreement with the City. The applicants commented that the OCP amendments would meet the long term objectives of developing diverse multi-family housing options. Future Zoning amendments would be pursued once the topographic and market requirements of the site were more defined. The natural topography of the site lends itself to "development chunks" and the applicants will want to incorporate that approach into the development of a Master Plan for the site.

Ms. Anaka expressed concerns regarding the design elements shown on the concept plan and presenting street facing parking lots for the multi-family building. The applicants indicated that they would consider other options. The D.D.S. spoke to the need for the applicants to obtain Form and Character Development Permits for the multi-family development. Many of the design details and requirements would be addressed through the Development Permit (DP) process. DP's will not come to the APC for consideration but are reviewed by staff and a report is considered by City Council at a regular meeting of Council that is open to the public. Three bedroom units were identified as a need and the applicants indicated that some three bedroom units would be included in the development.

- I. Thomas (public) questioned the applicants regarding the inclusion of amenities in the multi-family development and also asked who would be responsible for ongoing ownership and maintenance of the building. He requested details regarding the quality of the development and asked if units would be constructed with balconies vs. no balconies. The applicants responded that amenities such as common rooms and possibly a gym room would be considered. Their intention is to retain ownership of the building and contract a Property Manager. Their objective is to create livable units with in-unit laundry, balconies and durable finishing as they wish to keep the building fully rented. The D.D.S. noted that the RM3 zone has requirements for usable open space.
- N. Myrfield (public) questioned the applicant regarding the retention of trees along the intersection of Anderson Ave. and Burde St. The applicants responded that some trees may need to be removed. They will work to preserve trees where they can. They did indicate to the APC that there would be an overall increase in vegetation and that they are sensitive to the need to focus development of taller buildings closer to Anderson to preserve views from the higher elevations. Single family residential lots are proposed along 16th Avenue. The D.D.S. indicated that a further shade study would be required.
- E. Frood (public) indicated concern about the need for affordable housing having reached a critical level in Port Alberni. She would like to see the trees on the Anderson Avenue streetscape preserved.
- D. Deluca (public) addressed the APC regarding increased demand for purpose built rental housing for people who do not want to own a home for a variety reasons.
- J. Douglas (APC) encouraged the applicants to investigate partnerships with developers (such a Berwick for supportive housing) for the portion of property that is proposed to remain P1 Institutional at this time. He indicated support for the project.

MOTIONS:

- 1) *That the Advisory Planning Commission recieve the submission from Marjorie Jarrett, a letter dated November 2, 2017, for inclusion in the Minutes and the consideration of City Council.*

(Douglas / Anaka) CARRIED

- 2) *That the Advisory Planning Commission recommends to City Council that the City proceed with a map amendment to the Official Community Plan Schedule A Land Use Map to change the designation of Lot 1, District Lot 46, Alberni District, Plan 11651, (PID: 004-971-418), located at **4000 Burde Street**, from 'Institutional' use to a mix of '**Residential**' and '**Multi-Family Residential**' use.*

- 3) *That the Advisory Planning Commission recommends to City Council that the City proceed with a map amendment to the Official Community Plan Schedule B Development Permit Areas Map to include a portion of Lot 1, District Lot 46, Alberni District, Plan 11651, (PID: 004-971-418), located at **4000 Burde Street**, in '**Development Permit Area No. 1 Multi-Family Residential**'.*
- 4) *That the Advisory Planning Commission recommends to City Council that the City proceed with a map amendment to the Zoning Bylaw (Schedule A – Zoning Map) to change the designation of Lot 1, District Lot 46, Alberni District, Plan 11651, (PID: 004-971-418), located at **4000 Burde Street**, from 'P1 – Institutional' to a mix of '**P1 Institutional**', '**R1 Single Family Residential**' and '**RM3 High Density Multi-Family Residential**' zones.*
- 5) *That the Advisory Planning Commission recommends to City Council that as part of the development process the applicant be required to complete the following before final adoption of the bylaw:*


a. Receive a Preliminary Layout Approval from the Subdivision Approving Officer

(McRae / Douglas) CARRIED

3. **Update** – Director of Development Services advised those in the room that the Minutes of the meeting would proceed to the November 14th meeting of City Council.
4. **Other business** - No other business
5. **Adjournment** – The meeting adjourned at 1:25 p.m. The next regularly scheduled meeting will be held on **November 16, 2017** at 12:00 pm in the Committee Room at City Hall.

(Douglas / McRae) CARRIED

Davina Hartwell - City Clerk



Wes Hewitt - Chair

Proposal to rezone property bounded by 16th Avenue, Burde Street, 14th Avenue and Dry Creek Park.

Response by Marjorie Jarrett, 3515 16th Avenue, on November 2, 2017.

This 22 acre parcel is zoned P1 – Institutional. Properties with this zoning are scarce but serve a very important purpose – that of ensuring the services and amenities which enhance the quality of life in the community.

On the other hand, land zoned residential and future residential is not scarce.

Understandably, City Council wishes to increase the tax base. However, simply building a lot of apartments will not bring people to town. Young people need job opportunities and amenities; older people need appropriate housing and services.

The 4 story apartment block is a bare-bones design with outdoor parking, no exterior enhancements and no interior amenities. This is a design to maximize income and minimize construction costs.

Much of the remainder of the property rezoning request is for multi-family. The prospect of clusters of apartment buildings and other multi-family configurations is neither appealing nor wise. Large cities have found this type of planning to be a disaster. We currently have one new apartment block, another in the building stage, another proposed and a potential renovation of an old building into apartments. There are many empty lots throughout the city which can be used for multi-family. Why is it necessary to carpet an area with apartments, which could be put to better use?

Our council has been advised by both the Health Officer and the local head of Police that our crime problem will not be solved or improved until we address the underlying problems of mental health, lack of a variety of job opportunities and affordable housing.

The potential for genuine senior housing, extended care and various levels of treatment would satisfy many of the recognized needs, not just of our community but most communities in Canada. Such a development would provide a variety of levels of employment for our young people, would fill the classrooms of the local college, preparing people for those jobs and would put the Alberni Valley on the map for innovative and effective approach to our social problems, much as Medicine Hat has achieved and continues to achieve.

It seems strange that the first viable proposal for the use of this property is for rezoning to primarily multi-family. Has the School District #70 had any requests for development proposals which are within the zoning description? If so, why have we not heard of it or them? If not, why not? This is the logical use for this property.

M Jarrett