

Public HearingJune 29, 1999

A Public Hearing of the Municipal Council of the City of Kelowna was held in the Council Chamber, 1435 Water Street, Kelowna, B.C., on Tuesday, June 29, 1999.

Council members in attendance were: Mayor Walter Gray, Councillors A.F. Blanleil, M.I. Bremner, R.D. Cannan, C.B. Day, R.D. Hobson, J.D. Leask, J.D. Nelson and S.A. Shepherd.

Staff members in attendance were: Acting-City Manager/Director of Planning & Development Services, R.L. Mattiussi; Acting-City Clerk, G.D. Matthews; Current Planning Manager, A. Bruce*; Special Projects Planning Manager, H.M. Christy; and Council Recording Secretary, B.L. Harder.

(* denotes partial attendance)

1. Mayor Gray called the Hearing to order at 7:00 p.m.
2. Mayor Gray advised that the purpose of the Hearing is to consider certain bylaws which, if adopted, will amend "Kelowna Official Community Plan (1994-2013) Bylaw No. 7600" and "Zoning Bylaw No. 8000", and all submissions received, either in writing or verbally, will be taken into consideration when the proposed bylaws are presented for reading at the Regular Council Meeting which follows this Public Hearing.

The Acting-City Clerk advised the Notice of this Public Hearing was advertised by being posted on the Notice Board at City Hall on June 11, 1999, and by being placed in the Kelowna Daily Courier issues of June 21 & 22, 1999 and in the Kelowna Capital News issue of June 20, 1999.

The Acting-City Clerk further advised anyone in the gallery attending the meeting for Bylaw No. 8421 (Z99-1013 – David & Tanya Newman and David Eric Newman – 412 McLennan Crescent), that the bylaw had been withdrawn from this public hearing and that the application would be re-advertised to a new date.

3. INDIVIDUAL BYLAW SUBMISSIONS

- (a) Bylaw No. 8435 (TA99-007) – Kettle Valley Development Ltd. - South End of Chute Lake Road - To amend the text of the City of Kelowna Zoning Bylaw No. 8000 in the CD2 – Kettle Valley Comprehensive Residential Development zone as follows:
 - (i) Add "participant recreation services, indoor" as a Principal Use permitted to allow a gym facility within the Village Centre;
 - (ii) Replace the words "senior citizen" with "congregate housing" and "apartments" with "apartment housing" to reflect the existing definition in the Zoning Bylaw.

The Current Planning Manager indicated the property on a map displayed on the overhead projector and advised that the applicant is proposing to construct a fitness facility within the basement of a commercial building in the Kettle Valley Village Centre.

The City Clerk advised that no correspondence or petitions had been received.

Mayor Gray invited the applicant or anyone in the public gallery who deemed themselves affected to come forward or any comments from Council.

There were no further comments.

- (b) Bylaw No. 8434 (OCP98-021) – Glenmore Highlands Area Structure Plan No. ASP97-001 – Ekistics Town Planning Inc. (Paul Rosenau) – THAT section 13.6.1

of Kelowna Official Community Plan (1994-2013, Bylaw No. 7600 be amended to include the future extension of Union Road as a General Commercial Development Permit Area;

AND THAT Map 15.1 (Generalized Future Land Use) of Kelowna Official Community Plan (1994-2013), Bylaw No. 7600, be amended to acknowledge the adoption of the Glenmore Highlands Area Structure Plan, with amendments generally outlined as follows:

- (i) Chapter 5
Update **Map 5.2 – 20 YEAR MAJOR ROAD NETWORK PLAN** to show the proposed extension and re-location of Union Road;
- (ii) Chapter 13
Update **Map 13.2 – Areas Subject to Development Permit Designation** to add the “General Commercial and Industrial Development Permit” designation to the properties abutting the proposed Union Road re-location and extension;
- (iii) Chapter 15
Amend **Map 15.1 – Generalized Future Land Use** to change the future land use designation of a number of properties in the Glenmore Highlands Area Structure Plan area;

Amend **Map 15.1 – Generalized Future Land Use** to expand the boundaries of the Area Structure Plan No. 4 (Glenmore Highlands) to include Lot A, Sec. 9, Twp. 23, O.D.Y.D., Plan 1763 located on Begbie Road; the Southwest ¼ Sec. 16, Twp. 23, O.D.Y.D., located west of Glenmore Road North; and part of the Southeast ¼ Sec. 17, Twp. 23, O.D.Y.D., located east of Bennett Road; and

Amending Section 15.1 Designations by incorporating the Glenmore Highlands Area Structure Plan dated March, 1999 as amended by Council on May 31st, 1999 into the OCP as Appendix 17.

The Special Projects Planning Manager advised that the Glenmore/Clifton/Dilworth Sector Plan was adopted by Council in November 1998 and it includes direction for the Glenmore Highlands Area Structure Plan. The Glenmore Highlands Area Structure Plan provides a further level of detail and identifies potential future land uses that are proposed to be adopted into the Official Community Plan (OCP). The OCP projects future growth for the Glenmore Highlands at 765 units over the 20 year timeframe of the OCP and estimates total build out at 1,200 units, based on the existing zoning that was adopted in 1984. Since then, additional lands have been added to the area increasing the estimates for total build-out from the 1,200 in the OCP to 2,300 units.

The Special Projects Planning Manager advised that Council’s policies direct how the Area Structure Plan (ASP) process should evolve. The first draft of the ASP was received in August 1997 and then was forwarded to the Advisory Planning Commission (APC) who supported the ASP subject to conditions some of which have been addressed in the second draft of the ASP, and others that will be addressed in the zoning, subdivision and development permit process. The Glenmore Highlands ASP is in two phases, one phase within the 20 year OCP timeframe and the other phase outside that timeframe. The APC is the first opportunity for the public to have input into the proposal and revisions were also made in response to input from the public. The work that has been done as part of the ASP is significant and includes a traffic impact assessment, a geotechnical and hydrogeological analysis, a groundwater management assessment, a road alignment study, a stormwater management plan, a commercial/retail analysis, an environmental impact analysis and a visual impact study.

The Special Projects Planning Manager noted that the purpose of this public hearing is to consider an amendment to the OCP and it is important that a number of development principles are understood and discussed and that direction is set for further planning work for the zoning and development permits that will follow. After the public hearing, presumably there would be an understanding on how to proceed with the major development issues for processing the zoning, subdivision and development permit applications. A portion of the property under development is already zoned for single and multi-family residential development.

The Special Projects Planning Manager indicated the ASP boundaries on a map displayed on the overhead projector and advised that GlenWest Properties owns approximately 75% of the ASP area, the City of Kelowna owns approximately 10%, and the balance of the ASP area is comprised of a number of holdings by other land owners. The other land owners did not participate in the ASP but they have the opportunity to comment on the ASP at this public hearing as the OCP amendment would have an impact on the entire ASP area.

The Special Projects Planning Manager noted that at the Regular Meeting held on May 31, 1999, staff recommended that a portion of the ASP area be designated as being beyond the 20 year OCP planning horizon because of concerns that it may not be realistic for the entire development to occur within the 20 years. This has now been done and amendments will be required to the City's 20-year Servicing Plan based on the new boundary.

The Special Projects Planning Manager advised that in addition to areas of residential development there are large areas of open space with a trail network to link those areas of open space. That trail network has been modified based on staff input and the map reflects those amendments. There are different categories of residential land uses proposed. The rural residential, low density would not require rezoning as the existing zoning would be adequate. Any increase in numbers of units in this area would be limited through the subdivision process and the concerns that would have to be addressed through that process would include the steep topography, slope stability, septic disposal, substandard private access road, and loss of rear yard privacy.

The Special Projects Planning Manager advised that the park space identified conceptually in the ASP exceeds OCP park space standards. She noted the applicant has used a different strategy than what is in the City's Wetland Strategy to rate the wetlands and proposes to fill certain of the wetlands. A visual impact analysis has been prepared, wildlife corridors are proposed throughout the ASP area, and there has been an analysis of fire hazard on the property. There are no outstanding issues regarding the provision of sewer to the area; the City will be the water provider and the developer will have to extend water to the area and upgrade the main capacity where necessary. If the Glenmore Ellison Irrigation District is used as an interim water provider, development cost charges would still be payable to the city. The applicant has provided a drainage basin report and some of the concerns City staff have relate to the impact of drainage on existing wetlands. The initial traffic impact study was prepared on the basis of the entire development area coming on-stream within the 20 year time horizon and was prepared with certain assumptions being made regarding other development applications currently instream and unresolved. The nature of these assumptions were cause for concern about whether the anticipated impact of the entire development potential was realistic. The worse case scenario would 4-lane High Road versus 2 lanes anticipated and potentially 6 lane Glenmore Road and 6 lane the North End Connector versus 4 lanes anticipated for both. The difficulties of establishing what the appropriate base assumptions are have been addressed through the phasing. The next steps, should Council support the proposed phasing breakdown, would be to re-evaluate the traffic impact study using more realistic assumptions and, through the revision of the traffic impact study, feed that through the OCP and the 20-year Servicing Plan for this sector for changes to the DCCs. Adoption of the subject OCP amending bylaw would be withheld pending the results of that study and amendments to the DCC bylaw. Strict

adherence to the subdivision bylaw may create some difficulty for hillside development in some areas. At the conceptual level, the arterial road that extends through the regional park leading to McKinley Road may not be the best alignment and will still have to be considered further.

The Special Projects Planning Manager recommended that the maps attached to the bylaw be amended (i) to indicate that portions of the City-owned property would remain designated as 'open space' instead of 'city park', (ii) to designate certain upper ridge areas owned by GlenWest as 'open space', and (iii) to indicate that the north end of the arterial road would terminate at its last intersection instead of being extended to enter the regional park so that the future alignment would be yet to be determined.

The Special Projects Planning Manager responded to questions of Council advising that a portion of the Land Rover properties would be within the 20 year planning horizon and a portion would be beyond the 20 years timeframe; the new Zoning Bylaw 8000 permits a higher density in the Highlands than was permitted by Zoning Bylaw 4500; about 1,900 units could be achieved within the existing zoning boundaries without any rezoning; it would be appropriate for the public to also comment at this public hearing on the future use of the City-owned land that is included in the Glenmore Highlands ASP; the proposed ASP proposes filling two wetlands and the details of that filling would be subject to MOA approval of appropriate permits; the City's Wetland Management Strategy ranks the wetlands and identifies a Development Permit and Development Variance Permit process to argue filling for enhancement versus mitigation and that is what is proposed through this ASP.

Council expressed concern at the letter from the Ministry of Environment being late and the MOE's position with regard to wetlands 10a and 10b being contrary to what is being recommended by staff.

The Acting-City Clerk advised that the following correspondence and petitions had been received:

- letter from K.W. Baxter, 313 Clifton Road North, expressing concern that the ASP area includes three lots directly behind his property that he has been told cannot be developed without having frontage on Clifton Road.
- letter from Marten Gruenwald, 2160 Long Street, suggesting the Glenmore Highlands be retained for public open space.
- letter from Patricia Westheuser, president of the Central Okanagan Naturalists Club, opposing the proposed filling of wetlands and the applicant's use of their own strategy for rating wetlands.
- late letter of opposition from Heather Whittaker, 17-1099 Hillcrest Street, asking that the Glenmore Highlands be retained for public open space.
- late letter of opposition from Gillian Barany, 404 Viewcrest Road, expressing concerns about traffic and the loss of wetlands and asking that the Glenmore Highlands be protected and made into a park.

Public HearingJune 29, 1999

- late letter from Roland Gebauer, 224 Crossridge Crescent, asking that the City acquire a substantial property in the north-east section of the Glenmore Highlands, including the major ponds and associated shore areas as an ecological reserve and park.
- late letter from Alex Morrison, chairman of the North Glenmore Residents Society, circulated along with the first page of a 716 name petition asking that the City acquire a substantial property in the north-east section of the Glenmore Highlands, including the major ponds and associated shore areas as an ecological reserve and park.
- late letter from the Ministry of Environment referral committee expressing concern about the wetland infilling that is proposed, the use of wetlands for storm water retention/detention ponds, locating proposed roads and subdivisions close to wetlands, and outlining what must be done to protect the wetlands, watercourses and bird habitat prior to and during construction.
- Late letter submitted just prior to this meeting from the directors of the Okanagan Mission Residents Association asking that development of the Glenmore Highlands only proceed in strict accordance with the City's current bylaws and adopted policies for hillside development and preservation of wetlands and natural areas.

Mayor Gray invited the applicant to come forward or any comments from Council.

Gerhardt Blenk advised he is a citizen of Germany and that he owns GlenWest Properties which represents approximately 80% of the Glenmore Highlands. He purchased the majority of the property in 1995 after a number of meetings with the former mayor and various City staff. During the course of those and other meetings it was confirmed that a large portion of the Glenmore Highlands was already zoned for urban development and could be developed based on the existing zoning. However, instead he agreed to enter into the Area Structure Plan process because he knew he was venturing into difficult terrain and because he felt it was his responsibility to balance the interests of the city with the economics of this very long-term project. The process has been expensive and time consuming; 4 years and over \$1 million later the plan is complete. Mr. Blenk advised that he undertook the ASP process with the expectation that he would receive Council's support and the residents of Kelowna's support for the new plan. There has been a lot of give and take during the ASP process and City staff should be commended for achieving the best plan possible for the city. Mr. Blenk added that he grew up in the southern part of the Bavarian Alps in a place similar to the Highlands and it is his vision to create a development that integrates nature and a place for people to live, and where he hopes he and his children will one day live.

Paul Rosenau, Ekistics Town Planning, discussed the planning process so far noting the ASP and area sector plan were being prepared simultaneously. A working group of key community representatives was struck early in the process to participate in the evolution of the ASP and that was done with the support of City staff. When he first visited the site with Mr. Blenk in July 1995, it became evident that no proper inventory had been done on the site because some of the areas already zoned for urban development were lands that were undevelopable and other lands that were developable were missed. That led to their request for permission to undertake an ASP.

Mr. Rosenau advised that the development potential for the lands identified in the ASP for potential development within the 20 year planning horizon is 2,051 units. The 1983 zoning was based simply on land ownership boundaries; the proposed new zoning boundaries are based on environment, topography, and market analysis. Every effort has been made to consider the landowners' perspective and work with all the interested community groups and local residents to reach the best plan. Site analysis work that was undertaken included a comprehensive physical and environmental review of the area, slope analysis work, a detailed environmental features map to identify and rate areas of sensitivity, and a hydrology study to look at all the major ridges and catchment areas.

Mr. Rosenau reviewed the park standards outlined the OCP and advised that the ASP preserves 50% of the total area as park and open space which is far in excess of what is required. The Baker property and a portion of the Land Rover property are now within the 20 year servicing plan boundary and the upper ridge is proposed to be beyond the 20 year horizon. The total ASP area could accommodate 2,740 residential units or 6,800 residents if all the lands were developed to their maximum potential. The phasing plan illustrates 5 phases of development over a period of 25-30 years with 1,943 units proposed within the 20 year servicing boundary and 1,100 units over the next 10 years.

Mr. Rosenau advised 6 of the 18 wetlands identified are proposed to be entirely filled; each are small and completely dry in low water conditions. Two larger wetlands are proposed to be partially filled; the fill for wetland 10b would be outside the permanent water body and an equivalent area would be excavated so the entire area remained the same and wetland 10a would be half filled. These wetlands would be filled in order to provide the substantive area needed for a viable village centre. Approximately 90% of all the wetland areas would be retained. Mr. Rosenau explained the 3-stage treatment process that is proposed to prevent oils, solvents, litter and other water borne pollutants from polluting the natural wetlands and advised that MOE guidelines would also be followed for managing storm water treatment. He advised that the primary access to the proposed development would be from Union Road and Cara Glen Way with minor accesses from Begbie Road and Rio Drive. The two arterials intersect in the village centre. The need for the north/south road to function as an arterial has been debated with the City's engineers. All off-site improvements are expected to be at the expense of the developer through DCCs. To address fire hazard concerns, the intent is to first assess insect infestation and implement a treatment program, and then to undertake a fire hazard assessment. The visual analysis that was done indicated minimal impact and visual mitigation techniques would be applied throughout the site and particularly in the environmentally sensitive areas.

Tim Bekhuys, consultant, gave an overview of the environmental assessment process that was undertaken with the help of registered professional biologists, landscape architects, professional engineers and geoscientists, noting their opinions differ from the City's on what is high, moderate and low value for the wetlands on the site, and the B.C. Environment's opinion was different again. Mr. Bekhuys outlined the mitigation and compensation strategies for those sensitive areas they could not avoid impacting (10a, 10b, Walroy Lake and Blair Pond) and reviewed the proposed habitat restoration, creation and enhancement strategies for the wetlands. He also outlined the next steps for additional work to be done, including a continued hydrological and water quality monitoring program.

Public HearingJune 29, 1999

Mayor Gray invited anyone in the gallery who deemed themselves affected by this application to come forward.

Bob Beairsto, 934 Nassau Crescent, commented that the Glenmore Highlands has the potential of being a Stanley Park for Kelowna and encouraged Council to consider whether it would be possible for the area not to be developed and still be fair to the present owners.

Norman Major, president of the South Glenmore Neighbourhood Association, advised they agree with the comments in the Planning Department's report to Council regarding traffic, density and storm water management. The impact of the traffic funnelling from this development into existing intersections is of particular concern. He noted that wetland areas are still being discovered in the Glenmore Highlands and asked that development not proceed until the property is fully understood. He commented that he had not been able to obtain a copy of the letter from the Ministry of Environment but that much weight should be placed on the letter. Further, an unobstructed wildlife corridor should be provided with no roads for the animals to have to cross in order to access water and the vegetation that would be of interest to them. He also said he would prefer that the proposed north/south arterial road did not go through the City-owned property when it could be a great park.

David Taylor, director with North Glenmore Residents Society, advised they are not in favour of the plan to develop up to 2,700 units and nor did they support the 1,500 unit development plan 2 years ago. What Glenmore needs is more parks. A 716 name petition was submitted March 6, 1998 indicating support for the City to acquire a substantial portion of the north-east section of the Glenmore Highlands, including the major ponds and associated shore areas, as an ecological reserve and park. The proposed development would negatively impact the wetlands in the Highlands and would cause unsightly scarring on the hillsides. Increased traffic is also of concern with the addition of more than 4,000 automobiles. Mr. Taylor submitted a copy of his presentation to the Acting-City Clerk.

Don Wilson, director of Central Okanagan Naturalist Club, expressed concern that the City's Wetland Management Strategy is not being followed by the developer. The amendments proposed to the wetland strategy are not minor. The Naturalist Club has been reasonable in dealing with this developer. They have reluctantly agreed to 6 of the wetlands disappearing but they cannot support compromising wetlands 10a and 10b. The Club submits that unless the ASP is defeated as proposed, the effect will be to nullify the City's Wetland Management Strategy and the destruction of wetlands in Kelowna will continue. Mr. Wilson also commented that 100 m is barely wide enough to support pasturing birds, let alone wildlife and he questioned whether the abutting residents would agree to not have fences and allow free movement of wildlife in their yards.

Corey Singleton, Clifton Highlands Community Association, advised their three issues of concern are (1) 2,700 housing units would put too much pressure on the environment (2) the traffic impact on Clifton Road and (3) the visual quality of the development particularly at the ridge line that can be seen from Clifton Road and the lake. He also indicated preference for the City property at the south end of the ASP area to remain City-owned, undeveloped and without roads so that people have to hike to get to it.

Margaret Lunam, 144 South Clifton Road, submitted and read a presentation on behalf of Kevin Ade of Friends of Brandt's Creek who was unable to be at the meeting, noting she is also a member. Their concerns are the potential pollution and erosion of the creek corridor and they ask that this development proposal be denied.

Otto Schwab, 42 Altura Road, was concerned that providing a 150-200 ft. wide fire barrier for the houses on the top ridge would mean taking out half the trees going up the slope, and that would mean soil erosion, floods, etc. The inherent liability from sewer lines being filled with sludge would be an ongoing cost to the City. He urged Council to contact the City of Calgary about their Ranchlands Development where the hills are half the size of those in the Glenmore Highlands and every year there are floods and mud slides there and the development has become a huge liability to all citizens in Calgary to pay for. He submitted that the Glenmore Highlands should logically be considered as park and suggested it maybe cheaper for the City to buy the Highlands or consider trading 300 acres somewhere else in the city in exchange for all but maybe the 300 acres that are safe to develop.

Jim Fenton, 2540 Sexsmith Road, was concerned about the potential traffic impact on Sexsmith Road and increased air pollution with the additional 4,000 cars. He was also concerned about potential displacement of the deer population into the orchard areas. He also encouraged the provision of affordable housing.

Pat Westheuser, resident of Lakeview Heights and president of the Central Okanagan Naturalists Club, submitted that this ASP is nothing but a proposal for urban sprawl couched in environmentally friendly language and that it should not be incorporated into the OCP. Their concerns included the proposed development on the rock outcroppings and on slopes over 30%, critical areas for wildlife are not identified, no fire risk assessment has been done yet, the visual impact, and liability to the City for approving a plan where a known risk went unaddressed. She advised that they would like a comprehensive park plan in the Glenmore Highlands and for the developers to respect their own environmental assessment.

Cec Dillabough, speaking on behalf of the Central Okanagan Naturalists Club and the KLO Neighbourhood Association, discussed the importance of wetlands in taking impurities from the water and advised that the Naturalists Club cannot accept the developer filling or tampering with wetlands 10a or 10b. He noted that the developers left enhancement out of their wetland plan and suggested that mitigation measures need to be established before this project goes any further.

Brenda Wemp, 378 Clifton Road North, circulated copies of her presentation, and advised she was speaking on behalf of herself and a newly formed coalition called Friends of the Glenmore Highlands. They are concerned that the proposed development compromises the natural environment, about the potential conflict with wildlife as the animals are displaced, and the net loss of natural open space from what was shown based on the former zoning. How a fire would be dealt with and the controversy about the wetlands and whether the Ministry of Environment would issue the required permits were also raised as issues of concern. She suggested that the Glenmore Highlands are topographically unsuited for the type of development proposed and asked that the proposal be rejected and the area retained as much as possible in its natural state for park use.

Mr. Aime Beaulieu, 2025 Huckleberry Road, suggested that solution is to petition the provincial and federal government to acquire the funds to buy the land from the developers.

Public HearingJune 29, 1999

Linda Forner, advised she is a resident of Rose Valley on the west side, and spoke on the importance of protecting our drinking water. She was opposed to the developer's intent to destroy wetlands and then recreate them and maintained that the higher and middle elevation wetlands are the main filtering systems for Okanagan Lake and that we are polluting the lake by destroying these wetlands.

Peter Thompson, representative of the Friends of the South Slopes, stated that their main concern is that the proposal is contrary to the City's Wetlands Management Strategy and the City of Kelowna Official Community Plan. Amendments to the OCP should only occur when it is proven there is strong community support.

Gordon Hay, 1521 Cara Glen Way, commented that the back yards of the proposed single family residential lots need to be big enough for the families to enjoy.

Ed Henkel, 202b Drake Road, clarified that when this application was considered by the Advisory Planning Commission (APC), he abstained from voting and that the comments he would be making are his own opinions and not those of the APC. He also advised that he was on the working committee that was involved with this project over the last 3 years. He spoke against the requirement for a north/south arterial road to move traffic through the Highlands from Clifton to downtown arguing that not all traffic will want to go south and that building a major highway through the village centre is contrary to the intent of the village centre concept to allow residents to function with less use of the automobile, and that without the arterial road the wetlands could maybe be preserved. He expressed strong opposition to the road that is proposed to service the most easterly ridge north of the GEID reservoir, and suggested that fencing should be provided to keep people from trespassing onto adjacent ALR lands and that it would be a big mistake to create a hard edge around the pond next to the village centre. Raised walkways would be better, with some viewing areas like at the Maude Roxby or Rotary marshes so people can see the wildlife without destroying the vegetation. He also noted that the developer has attempted to keep the 4x4s out but as the area builds up and services go in it will be increasingly difficult to keep people off the rest of the property without installing fences.

Hanne Gebauer, 224 Crossridge Crescent, appealed to the developer and the City to preserve the Glenmore Highlands as a natural park.

Harry Almond, 1745 Haug Avenue, commented that in the past there has been no snow lower down for x-country skiing and that it would be unwise to tinker with the natural drainage of the Glenmore ponds.

Imre Nagy, resident of the central Kelowna area, commented on the need to preserve lands around lakes and main watercourses and suggested transferring some of the development rights from the Glenmore Highlands to the lands in the north end of the Glenmore Valley that were originally proposed for exclusion from the ALR.

Mayor Gray invited the applicant to respond to issues raised.

Paul Rosenau commented that after 4 years and \$1 million it is hard to hear the comments being made given the extensive process that was undertaken. Every effort has been made to work with the residents and community interest groups. He advised he agrees with almost every one of the concerns raised by Ed Henkle and that they will consider his suggestion for a boardwalk rather than a hard edge

around the pond next to the village centre. He commented that he would rather not see the wildlife corridor cross an arterial road either, that in their opinion traffic patterns will change more to east/west instead of north/south and that their project engineer has assured them that the traffic that would be generated at full build out would not require an arterial road, certainly not a divided a road with a 70 km speed limit.

Mr. Rosenau advised that although the sector plan only permits 10,000 sq. ft. of commercial space they could justify up to 48,000 sq. ft. and they propose to pursue that. He noted that the staff recommendation to enlarge the neighbourhood park on the top ridge came as a surprise. That would result in a loss of 22 acres/ 110 units and they would have a hard time agreeing to that, particularly when park requirements are already exceeded. The detailed drainage assessment work confirms that the ponds can handle storm runoff without creating a flooding event. Mr. Rosenau encouraged the City to bring forward new road standards that are more sensitive to hillside developments, and asked that Council make a decision regarding the Union Road and Cara Glen Way intersection alignments and that Council debate the necessity for an arterial road on the site. He also suggested that Council consider retaining the City-owned land to the south as park.

Mr. Rosenau responded to questions of Council advising that they were already committed to their own criteria for evaluating wetlands when the City's Wetland Management Strategy was adopted, it was not their intent to set a precedent for not using the City's wetland policies, about 80% of the 1,100 units proposed for construction over the first 10 years would be single family, and road grades would be 9-13%

Mr. Rosenau indicated he would provide City staff with the following:

- analysis of their numbers re the multi-family units permitted by Bylaw 4500 versus Bylaw 8000;
- analysis of the amount of open space on slopes over 30% and the amount of development land over or under 30% slopes;
- the proposed rules within development bubbles on lands over 30% slope (sometime before the rezoning stage);
- identify all the wildlife habitat areas (other than the corridors that have been identified) and identify the rock outcrops that would remain undisturbed.

Staff were directed to arrange an informal workshop session with Council to further discuss issues such as the necessity for an arterial road through the development, the road standards in the City's subdivision bylaw, the staff recommendation to enlarge the neighbourhood park on the top ridge, and the proposed Cara Glen Way and Union Road intersections.

Council debated whether or not to terminate the public hearing on this item and finally agreed to put it to a vote.

Moved by Councillor Nelson/Seconded by Councillor Bremner

P579/99/06/29 THAT the Public Hearing for Bylaw No. 8434 (OCP98-021 – Glenmore Highlands Area Structure Plan No. ASP97-001 – Paul Rosenau/ Ekistics Town Planning Inc.) be terminated.

Carried

Councillors Hobson and Shepherd opposed.

Mayor Gray noted now that the public hearing is terminated any further communication on this application by the developer or the public must be through staff.

There were no further comments.

Public Hearing

June 29, 1999

4. TERMINATION:

The Hearing was declared terminated at 2:11 a.m.

Certified Correct:

Mayor

BLH/bn

Acting-City Clerk