

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: ByLaw No 4500.204
Date: Friday, May 5, 2023 4:55:01 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Just reading the notice of public hearing, my only concern is that we continue to have a walkway and bike path from Mill St to the bridge, and we have a cull-de-sac at the end of Mill St (should be built by developer). M. E. Anderson, [REDACTED]

Sent from my iPad

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Comments.....public hearing May 18 7pm 2023...thank you
Date: Friday, May 12, 2023 11:26:05 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

To Nanaimo City Staff and residents,

This brief letter is in regard to the notice of public hearing May 18th 2023 at 7 PM.

We are landowners in the very near vicinity of the proposed development on the old Tally Ho site.

We are in favour of all the plans to date.

We feel the whole thing is quite exciting and would add value to the neighbourhood on many levels, particularly public safety.

Please accept our support towards the amendment to bylaw 7355 and 4500... And all that relates towards creating a subdivision and subsequent housing/commercial development.

We strongly feel that the connection between Muffeo Sutton park and the neighbourhoods along the Mill Stream (Prideaux Street and upwards) are currently substandard for our growing community.

We ask that the public passage way along this stretch of the creek (particularly under the Pierson Street bridge) receive critical attention and improvement.

Development of this magnitude certainly steps us towards being the Monaco of Canada.

A safe night walkway under that highway bridge would certainly be of great value to the residents... And much appreciated.

Thank you
Dawn Meisner and Paul Gogo

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: New form entry is submitted - Public Hearing Submission
Date: Sunday, May 14, 2023 4:14:56 PM

[Public Hearing Submission](#)

Submitted on 14 May 2023, 04:14 PM

Your Name	Jonagh Fairbrother
Your Address	[REDACTED]
Bylaw Number or Subject Property Address Which You Are Addressing Your Comments	4500.204 & 7355
Comments	<p>I would like to reiterate the recommendations from my original submission, provided to the first public hearing on the Terminal 1 project. See "Public-space improvements for "1-Terminal" project concept" in original submissions. Specifically I'd like to encourage removal of the unnecessary section of street parallel to the riverfront, in favour of replacing it with public park space. That section of road does not seem to be necessary, as the remaining street segments provide access to buildings/parking and connect to Mill St. Also there seems to be a significant oversight with regard to pedestrian/cycling access from/along Terminal Ave down to the riverfront (along the eastern edge of the site, i.e. Terminal Ave). This is an existing access route and will clearly be a "desire line" which people will use whether or not it is designed for. Other recommendations within my original submission touch on an intuitive path diagonally across the site connecting the Terminal/Comox intersection to Mill Street, and a better site interface towards the Terminal/Comox intersection itself. Thank you kindly, and I hope these recommendations are considered in earnest</p>

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: New form entry is submitted - Public Hearing Submission
Date: Wednesday, May 17, 2023 2:05:15 PM

[Public Hearing Submission](#)

Submitted on 17 May 2023, 02:05 PM

Your Name	Colleen
Your Address	[REDACTED]
Bylaw Number or Subject Property Address Which You Are Addressing Your Comments	444, 450, 500 Comox Road, 55 Mill Street, and 1 Terminal Avenue
Comments	<p>I am in favour of the development. It will improve the appearance and health of the neighbourhood by cleaning up the estuary, reclaiming/increasing greenspace, and tearing down the eyesore that is the old hotel/bus depot sitting on prime, showcase potential property. I like the plan to improve pathways connecting Bowen Park/Prideaux/Mill Street/Waterfront. I'm looking forward to interesting new shops and services. But living so close to the property, I do have a few concerns. There will be huge noise, dust and disruption to cope with during many months/years of demolition and building, so I'm hoping the benefits will outweigh the inevitable disadvantages in the long run for those of us already making our homes in the neighbourhood. Will increased public safety be ensured, especially in the more expansive greenspace and less visible pathways, and under the bridge to the park? The area is notoriously risky. Out of town guests at the hotel and conference centre won't know that while Maffeo Sutton looks lovely, with the trees lit up at night and reflecting off the water, it's not necessarily safe to wander the area and out to the waterfront towards other businesses and dining options after dark. The ability to do that safely would be a major incentive to staying at the new hotel and visiting Nanaimo in general. Another submission referenced Monaco of Canada... Will there be adequate parking? Added to the area there will be hotel guests, people attending events at the conference centre, employees, clients/customers, residents with multiple vehicles, various vehicles to service and supply the businesses and residents, grounds maintenance, recycling trucks, emergency services etc. Existing area buildings generally provide one parking space per unit, whereas households often have two cars. It's unrealistic to expect most households will have only one or none. This puts huge pressure on Prideaux and Mill Street to provide parking. Mill Street is very narrow. Parking along it has already reduced traffic to single direction. I've seen fire trucks down there, and one car parked too far from the curb would slow or possibly block access. Snow this winter and last actually made Mill Street impassable in either direction for a short time due to stuck vehicles and tow trucks blocking what little space there already is. The development would bring more vehicle traffic mixing with increased bicycle and pedestrian traffic accessing the improved pathways. Could Mill Street be a large enough cul-de-sac to provide turn around space rather than have vehicle traffic able to run through into the new development? I read this suggestion in another submission as well. There are</p>

other areas of Nanaimo that have done this, keeping pedestrian and bicycle access open. It could also decrease traffic noise for those of us already living in homes along Mill Street and Prideaux, especially if there are any new businesses with late closing hours. It's a little unclear what types of businesses the categories listed allow. I am in favour, and hope there will be thoughtful mitigation to some of the growing pains the development will cause. Thank you.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: New form entry is submitted - Public Hearing Submission
Date: Wednesday, May 17, 2023 10:54:24 PM

[Public Hearing Submission](#)

Submitted on 17 May 2023, 10:54 PM

Your Name	John Segal
Your Address	[REDACTED]
Bylaw Number or Subject Property Address Which You Are Addressing Your Comments	No. 4500.204 and No. 7355
Comments	<p>I live beside the properties listed on the proposed Bylaw No. 4500.204 and No. 7355. I am opposed to the proposed Bylaw No. 4500.204 and No. 7355, for the following reasons: 1) Density is much too high. The developments proposed by Millstone River Front Development (Terminal 1) and Ironclad Developments would increase the density of this area far too much for the area's roads. The Traffic Impact Assessment of July 29, 2022, by Watt Consulting (found on Nanaimo City's online Upcoming Hearings page), states on page 12 that these developments would include 990 new residential units. This assessment also lists a proposed 120 room hotel, and 12,000 sq. ft. of commercial space. This assessment has concerns about the increased vehicular traffic that these developments would create. Being a resident of this area for 20 years, I agree. I know how clogged the area's roads and parking are at present, and getting worse. In particular, the main access to these developments would be the intersection at Comox Rd. and Wallace St. This intersection is already frequently clogged, since it is only about 80 m. from busy Highway 1. A secondary access to the proposed development, along Mill St. and Prideaux St., to Comox Rd. is already overly busy. 2) There is no extra street parking in the area; certainly not for 990 new residential units, plus hotel and commercial buildings. There is presently next to no available on-street parking on the corridor of Mill St, Prideaux St., and Barsby Ave. Recent developments on these roads include apartment buildings with far less on-site parking than there are units, forcing many residents to park on the street, often at least a block away. For example, the building at 77 Mill St. has only 17 parking spaces for 57 units. Mill Street's on-street parking is always 100% occupied, and it is a narrow road, and essentially single lane, because parking is allowed on both sides. Also, customers of the business complex at the northwest corner of Prideaux and Comox park on Prideaux St. My own apartment building at 42 Prideaux has no visitor parking spaces, so our visitors and service providers must compete for on-street parking, or park in the business complex. 3) The proposed development's building heights are too high for this neighbourhood. My apartment building (42 Prideaux St.) is 4 storeys high, and the apartment next to mine is 3 storeys. The developer, at their public information session of March 16, 2022, indicated they would build 6 storey residential buildings adjacent to my building. Our view would be gone. I have an alternative suggestion for developing these properties: We have a great opportunity for collaboration</p>

between Nanaimo City and Snuneymuxm First Nation. We could build a development with a more reasonable density, that also includes affordable housing and First Nations features that honour their heritage, attract tourists, and look great as a gateway to downtown. This would also contribute to reconciliation. And also retain a good-sized parking lot, for the crowds at our various waterfront events. That old hotel parking lot is full during dragonboat races, Silly Boat Festival, Sea Festival, etc. Thanks very much for this opportunity!

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Hearing](#)
Subject: Proposed development old Howard Johnson site
Date: Thursday, May 18, 2023 10:13:44 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Hello Mayor and Council,

I cannot stress enough how important this development is for our city.

My name is Craig McBride, and I own and operate the Tim Hortons at the corner of Wallace and Comox Street. Every day I witness problems associated with having a large vacant lot like the Howard Johnson site sit vacant.

We have a prime piece of land in full view of anybody that drives through our city that sits boarded up left to be a place for our trouble drug addicted Under-culture to take hold.

We also have a huge issue with our ability to supply housing to people, wanting to move to Nanaimo. This new development will provide tax base, customers, employment, base, and life back to our downtown area.

More housing supply will help bring down the overall cost of housing in our city. Rental accommodation is at its all-time high with cost because there is no supply. I understand that we have approved a lot of building permits to supply housing, but we must acknowledge that it is not enough.

A large scale development like this on a prime piece of land does not come around often. This has been needed for many many years, and I strongly urge this project be approved.

If anybody has any questions for me, I am happy to discuss any issue.

Craig McBride
Tim Hortons

[REDACTED]

--

Craig
Tim Hortons
Nanaimo

From: Carol Hill
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Rezoning Application RA000475
Date: Thursday, May 18, 2023 11:17:13 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Rezoning to mixed use.

My concerns are as follows:

- too many units 761 higher end rentals (not integrated rentals for all income groups) for the area.
- Options needed for renters and hotel guests. Walking, biking, transit and/or vehicles.
- Cut this area out of the mix and all will require transit to attend any function at Maffeo Sutton Park. A location loved and used daily and weekly by so many people in this City. Summer through Spring all sorts of events and celebrations happen there.
- Making parking unavailable in a big hurry will feel like a hindrance to the joy we all get living here. I live over this area and year in and year out have watched and been part of this cycle that is Nanaimo.
- Before we excile 4 wheels, create infrastructure and transit to adequately provide other options. I used transit for many years in Winnipeg and Calgary. It was quick and practical. Here you can drive most places in 15-20 minutes. The bus takes infinitely longer. Mostly because of needing more than one bus to get from a to b.
- Rapid growth in the last 2 years has made us rapidly disfunctional. Swimming so fast leaves little time for reflection.
- Servicing larger numbers of citizens requires infrastructure we don't presently have here. Adding more housing does not necessarily add bodies needed to service this ever growing population. Saying yes to all building without inserting requirements that those building to include units for more than the upper end rental market. You need all brackets of income here in this expanding City and they need a place to call home.
- An example this week came from the BC government that they were going to be sending cancer patients to the US for treatment. We presently have unwell people travelling to Victoria and the mainland for treatment. And we want to throw many more people into this bursting basket of issues.
- Downtown and elsewhere in Nanaimo we have the addicted and unhoused dealing with their day to day in many ways. This issue will not end soon for them or for the businesses, police and emergency services daily having to attend and help as best they can.
- Lastly, perhaps this huge undertaking could be done in stages. Not all at once. Too much - too quickly. Winnipeg built Portage Place a development to bring all businesses indoors over 40 years ago and it has destroyed the downtown in Winnipeg. There are no business that are not government related from Main Street to Portage and Memorial Blvd. It has been an unmitigated disaster and still is today.
- It is a truth about building for tomorrow requires leaps yes but also honouring the people and gems that already exist and cannot be replaced.

Your Honour and Council - Thank you for all you do for this City truly, it is much appreciated.

Sent from my iPad

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Hearing](#)
Subject: Opposition to rezoning application RA475
Date: Thursday, May 18, 2023 11:48:00 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Sent by Greg Klein

[REDACTED]

Re: Rezoning Application RA475—444, 450, 500 Comox Road, 55 Mill Street and 1 Terminal Avenue, Land Use Contract Discharge Bylaw 7355 and Zoning Amendment Bylaw 4500.204

I'm re-sending this submission from September 29, 2022, because the city's online contact form removed all line-breaks from the previous version, making it hard to read.

More importantly, the previous city council didn't bother to read written submissions received by September 29, 2022. That's evident by the obvious surprise of all previous council members on that night, when one of the proponents informed them of the Snuneymuxw's opposition. Had those council members bothered to read the written submissions, as was their responsibility, they would have already known about the band's opposition.

Excessive density threatens affordable housing

I oppose the rezoning application.

Obviously something has to be done with that area. It's a neglected space with lots of potential. But this proposal calls for density that's unnecessary for Nanaimo's organic population growth and detrimental to affordable housing. The proposal will continue a recent Nanaimo trend that repeats Vancouver's mistakes.

There are a number of problems, but I'll focus on how excessive density inflates housing costs—both the cost of buying and renting a home.

Developers and their supporters promote higher density through misinformation about Nanaimo's population growth and rental vacancy rate. In fact new development largely causes Nanaimo's

population growth. It mostly results from affluent retirees attracted by real estate hype. Their spending power pushes rents and purchase prices beyond what local people can afford.

That's very similar to the problem facing Vancouver and other cities. It's been documented by academics like Andy Yan of Simon Fraser University and Patrick Condon of the University of British Columbia. Both of them have analyzed how higher-density rezoning inflates property prices, assessments and rents, often beyond what local people can pay.

Condon points out that Vancouver "has added more housing units per capita than any city in North America over the last 30 years, yet housing prices have increased faster in Vancouver than any other North American city."

He has also stated that the main beneficiaries of higher-density rezoning "are the land owners and speculators."

As for rental vacancies, Nanaimo does have a low vacancy rate overall. But we have a surplus of rental vacancies in the higher-price bracket. If you have the money, you have a choice of apartments today in the immediate vicinity of this rezoning proposal, as well as other parts of the city.

Another problem is that a lot of so-called "apartments" end up being sold as condos.

Some of the apartment-style condos aren't even being marketed as homes. They're marketed as investments for out-of-town speculators. For example Re-Max is currently marketing condos at 20 Barsby Avenue, very close to the rezoning proposal, as investments to rich out-of-town speculators.

If Re-Max is doing that for Barsby Avenue, other realtors must be doing the same for other Nanaimo properties.

Furthermore higher-density rezoning is contagious. It's used to justify the demolition and redevelopment of nearby neighbourhoods. Again, this has been shown in Vancouver and other cities. Higher-density becomes the standard, driven partly by higher property assessments as well as higher expectations from landlords. Developer-friendly councils decide that nearby streets and neighbourhoods are "under-developed." Modest three- and four-storey rental buildings get rezoned and demolished for higher-density buildings.

They're much more expensive. That'll be one outcome of this rezoning proposal. And it'll be a city-wide problem.

I'd like to briefly mention the environmental effects of higher-density development. Developers claim these projects respond to climate change. But studies done for Vancouver, Surrey, Victoria, Seattle and B.C. Hydro have found that lower-density housing results in fewer greenhouse gas emissions. Developers have been greenwashing their self-serving proposals.

Additionally, this council isn't considering the cumulative effects of Nanaimo's development boom. It's unprecedented and it's happened entirely under the current council. You've fast-tracked two other rezoning applications that are huge by Nanaimo standards, Bowers/Green Thumb and Sandstone, as well as a lot of other significant proposals. You're also expressing interest in demolishing and redeveloping downtown. Most of these projects and proposals take place along a north-south route on or near Terminal Avenue. You're not giving nearly enough consideration to the effects of so much development on traffic and a host of city services, let alone affordable housing.

Of course something has to be done with the Howard Johnson area. Right now it's nothing more than an overflow parking lot for Mill Street, which is already overcrowded due to bad council decisions. But this proposal is just plain wrong. It's unnecessary for Nanaimo's organic population growth and it threatens affordable housing. It only furthers the agenda of real estate speculators and developers.