

Public HearingJanuary 25, 2000

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, January 25, 2000.

Council members in attendance were: Mayor Walter Gray, Councillors A.F. Blangleil, R.D. Cannan, B.A. Clark, C.B. Day, B.D. Given, R.D. Hobson, J.D. Nelson* and S.A. Shepherd.

Staff members in attendance were: City Manager, R.A. Born; City Clerk, D.L. Shipclark; Director of Planning & Development Services, R.L. Mattiussi; Current Planning Manager, A.V. Bruce; Long Range Planning Manager, L.V. Foster; 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 City Clerk advised the Notice of this Public Hearing was advertised by being posted on the Notice Board at City Hall on January 7th, 2000, and by being placed in the Kelowna Daily Courier issues of January 17th and 18th, 2000, and in the Kelowna Capital News issue of January 16th, 2000, and by sending out or otherwise delivering 371 letters to the owners and occupiers of surrounding properties between January 7th and 8th, 2000.

3. INDIVIDUAL BYLAW SUBMISSIONS

- (a) Bylaw No. 8497 (Z99-1057) and OCP Amendment No. OCP99-020 – Madan & Nirmal Kanda; and Narinder & Devinder Johal (Len Suchocki, Chriscan Enterprises Ltd.) – 4049 Lakeshore Road - THAT the Future Land Use Designation on Map 15.1 of the City of Kelowna Official Community Plan (1994-2013) Bylaw No. 7600, be amended by changing the designation of Lot A, Sec. 6, Twp. 26, O.D.Y.D, Plan 38749, located on 4049 Lakeshore Road, Kelowna, B.C., from the Single/Two Family Residential designation to the Multiple Family Residential – Low Density designation;

AND THAT City of Kelowna Zoning Bylaw No. 8000 be amended by changing the zoning classification of Lot A, Sec. 6, Twp. 26, O.D.Y.D, Plan 38749, located on 4049 Lakeshore Road, Kelowna, B.C., from the RU1 – Large Lot Housing zone to the RM2 – Low Density Row Housing zone.

The Current Planning Manager referred to maps, elevation drawings and an artist's rendering of the proposed development as he presented an overview of the application and noted the following:

- The applicant proposes to develop 6 units of row housing, consisting of four 2-storey units and two single storey units.
- The applicant will likely stratify the units and they will likely either be sold or rented to family members.
- The row house units would be arranged on the site in a "U" shape with the enclosed garages completing a rectangular arrangement of buildings enclosing a landscaped interior courtyard.

Public HearingJanuary 25, 2000

- Access to the development would be from a single driveway off Lakeshore Drive.
- A signage feature and pedestrian plaza feature are proposed at the entrance of the development.
- The Advisory Planning Commission did not support the application on the basis that the density was too high in relation to the surrounding area.
- The applicant has made design changes throughout the process to respond to technical comments received and to improve the compatibility of the design in relation to the surrounding properties and streetscape.
- Many attributes of this project fit in with the surrounding neighbourhood and given that Lakeshore is a major road in the City's road network system, higher density use of the subject property can be endorsed.

The City Clerk advised that the following correspondence had been received:

Support:

- letter from Barb Theyer, Chairperson for Strata Council at 4053 - 4059 Lakeshore Road, (provided the owners preserve the existing trees on the property line.)
- letter signed by Dwayne Taron, 4040 Belmont Road and Allan Jones 4036 Belmont Road
- letter from Tiia Meere, tenant at 4053 Lakeshore Road

Opposition:- Rental units would reduce property values, the proposed development exceeds the density of surrounding developments, overflow vehicles would park on the roadway, and the proposal contravenes the Official Community Plan.

- letter from James Vogan, 635 Pimlico Road
- letter from George Hyde, 4028 Belmont Road

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

George Gowlland, architect for the project:

- The development has been designed to be a transition for the residential units surrounding the project.
- From the street it is single storey stepping back to 2 storey.
- Density is based on units per ha and would be the same or slightly less than what exists on the adjacent property to the immediate south.
- The entire development is on a single lot, not on 2 lots as indicated in one of the letters of opposition.
- The proposed development is about $\frac{3}{4}$ of the allowable density on the subject property.

Len Suchocki, applicant:

- He and his wife own Chriscan Enterprises and they intend to build the proposed development and hold it as a long term rental property. He and his wife would manage the development while living off-site.
- Chriscan has won two housing awards in Kelowna.
- Financial viability is high on the list of priorities for Chriscan Enterprises. Six units is a compromise but remains viable.
- There are already other well maintained and managed rental properties in the neighbourhood.
- The existing shrubbery on the property would be eliminated and replaced with landscaping consistent with the landscape plan presented. The row of trees along the south property line was of concern to the strata council of the 4-plex to the south; it appears from preliminary review that the row of trees can be saved but if any are destroyed during the construction process, they would be replaced.
- RV parking is not required for this size of development.

Public HearingJanuary 25, 2000

- All six units meet main floor handicapped accessibility criteria and two of units meet accessibility criteria on 2 levels.

Public Hearing

January 25, 2000

Ron Crosby, 4004 Belmont Road:

- Opposed the application on the basis that approval could set a precedent for the property north of the subject property and the Fairview Golf Course property to also develop to a higher density.
- The higher density housing would have a negative affect the price of houses in the area.
- On-street parking is already a problem along that stretch of Lakeshore Road.
- Rental units are of concern.
- The potential negative impact of drainage on the surrounding area.

Staff:

- Clarified that the Fairview Golf Course property has already been approved for RM5 and RM3 development with a park component along the northerly boundary.
- The applicant would construct the sidewalk along the frontage of the property with the proposed development; the remainder of the road improvements would be at a future date.

There were no further comments.

- (b) Bylaw No. 8499 (Z99-1026) – Park Avenue Properties Inc., Brian Draper & Dale Draper (Pauline Draper) – 2034, 2046 and 2056 Pandosy Street - THAT City of Kelowna Zoning Bylaw No. 8000 be amended by changing the zoning classification of Lot 1, Block 8, D.L. 14, O.D.Y.D., Plan 348 except Plan 14193; Lot 2, Block 8, D.L. 14, O.D.Y.D., Plan 348; and Lot 16, Block 6, D.L. 14, O.D.Y.D., Plan 348, located on 2034, 2046, and 2056 Pandosy Street, Kelowna, B.C., from the RU1 – Large Lot Housing zone to the RU6b - Two Dwelling Housing with Boarding and Lodging House zone.

Councillor Nelson declared a conflict of interest as part owner of a property within the notification radius of the subject property and left the Council Chamber at 7:32 p.m.

Staff:

- The purpose of this Public Hearing is to deal with the Land Use proposed on the subject property. If this application is supported by Council, a Heritage Alteration Permit (HAP) would be considered concurrent with Council's adoption of the Zone Amending Bylaw.
- The applicant proposes to demolish or remove the existing buildings and construct a separate boarding and lodging home on each of the three lots.
- Each boarding and lodging home would contain 10 bedrooms, 9 for rental and one for the manager.
- Each building would have a different façade and all have been designed in accord with the Heritage Conservation Area guidelines.
- The facility would be restricted to seniors although the zoning bylaw allows any age.
- A common parking area would be provided in front of the buildings with access from two locations off Pandosy Street.
- The lots are deep and provide for a large common open space area in the rear of the buildings.
- The Community Heritage Commission does not support the application on the basis that it does not conform to objectives of the Abbott/Marshall Street Heritage Conservation Area guidelines.
- The Advisory Planning Commission does not support the application because they support preservation of the old school house building and they feel that sensitive redevelopment can be done.
- The tree inventory indicates that 5 trees would be removed from the most southerly lot and 6 trees would be removed from the middle lot.

Public HearingJanuary 25, 2000

- The proposed land use is deemed to be consistent with current Planning documents/policies although some aspects of the Heritage Alteration Permit are still of concern to staff.

The City Clerk advised that a summary of the correspondence received by the Advisory Planning Commission on this application has been circulated for Council's information. In addition, Council has received copies of the following correspondence and petitions received as a result of the advertising for this Public Hearing:

OPPOSITION: - The proposal does not maintain the existing single/two family residential and historical character of the area; two class 'C' heritage homes would be lost; contravenes the intent of the Abbott/Marshall Heritage Conservation Area; reduces the integrity of heritage resources and cultural value through the use of "mock heritage", sets a precedent for future speculative land purchases and developments, destruction of heritage areas is irreversible, concerns related to a seniors home that was constructed last year on Marshall Street, negative impact on the immediate neighbours and the future of the designated heritage conservation area, negative environmental impact, a dangerous precedent would be set for over-building, and inappropriate land use in the heritage area.

Letters of Opposition received from:

- J. Elise Clark, 1847 Maple Street
- Lin Merchant, 1868 Marshall Street
- Wayne Ross, Kelowna South-Central Association of Neighbourhoods
- Mark Heck, Kelowna South Central Association of Neighbourhoods
- Alexander & Fleur Campbell, 443 Cadder Avenue
- Brenda Fowler, 451 Cadder Avenue
- Norman & Anne Loyd, 450 Cadder Avenue
- Keith & Judy Standing, absentee owners of 455/457 Park Avenue
- Lucille Cameron, 2053 Long Street (2 letters including a copy of letter addressed to the applicant)
- Stephen Thomson, 334 Beach Avenue
- Gertrude Lee, 2063 Doryan Street
- L.B. Greenwood, 1815 Maple Street
- Danny Miller, 356 Park Avenue
- Stephen & Brenda Thomson, 334 Beach Avenue
- Dave McClellan, 341 Glenwood Avenue
- Ron & Jill Schad, 2040/2042 Doryan Street
- Brenda Bachmann, 1812 Marshall Street
- Deborah Helf, 1813 Marshall Street
- Petition of Opposition bearing 87 signatures

Form Letters of Opposition signed by the following:

- Bob Huff, 637 Burne Avenue
- Kate Dewynter, 1985 Knox Crescent
- Brenda Fowler, 451 Cadder Avenue
- Andre de Zwaan, 545 Burne Avenue
- Dan Miller, 356 Park Avenue
- Vera Stewart, 324 Park Avenue
- Annette Turgeon, 314 Park Avenue
- Bob Marriage, 424 Park Avenue
- Dave Thomas, 343 Cadder Avenue
- Greg Herman, 2020 Keller Place
- Dale Onrait, 2030 Keller Place
- Kay Pettman, 2050 Long Street
- Hans Birker, 409 Cadder Avenue
- Pete & Anne Loyd, 450 Cadder Avenue
- Pat Munro, 368 Cadder Avenue
- Leslie McArthur, 2021 Keller Place

Public HearingJanuary 25, 2000

- Mary Ferguson, 2031 Keller Place
- Patti Gerem, 2010 Keller Place
- Ernest Coe, 2041 Keller Place
- Lorna McLaren, 2079 Pandosy Street
- Derry Loughrey, 471 Cadder Avenue
- Keith & Judy Standing, 457 Park Avenue
- Stuart Kircher & Rosalyn Harder, 649 Burne Avenue
- Sheila MacLeod, #2 - 609 Burne Avenue
- Ron Hartwig, #2 - 609 Burne Avenue
- A. Galt, 585 Burne Avenue
- Wendi Mueller, 440 Cadder Avenue
- Lionel Wace, 359 Cadder Avenue
- Peter Chataway, 369 Cadder Avenue
- Titiko & Christa Tschcheidse, 479 Park Avenue
- Rondeau Brown, 2030 Doryan Street
- Robert Cichocki, 1221 Kelglen Crescent/2030 Doryan Street
- Judy Billington, 374 Park Avenue
- Adrian Diemert, 387 Park Avenue
- R. Warren Lee, 474 Cadder Avenue
- Jocelyn Lipkovits, 383 Beach Avenue
- Lois Strange, 310 Park Avenue
- Eileen Haines, 315 Cadder Avenue
- M.E. Treadgold, 2045 Long Street
- J. Anderson, 278 Beach Avenue
- Ray Struffell, 2041 Abbott Street
- J.A. Stuart, 349 Burne Avenue
- Katharina Kotulla, 2031 Long Street
- Shirley Clarke, 1935 McDougall Street
- Lucille Cameron, 2053 Long Street
- Audrey Skelton, 1826 Abbott Street
- Carol & Wayne Bridges, 1866 Riverside Avenue
- Ronald & Lois Ellis, 434 Royal Avenue

CONCERN:– Location of access to parking and the number of parking stalls proposed, compatibility of the development with the neighbourhood, loss of green space.

Letter of Concern received from:

- Jane Matejka, 278 Beach Avenue

The City Clerk further advised that the following **late** correspondence had been received and circulated to Council:

OPPOSITION:- The integrity of the heritage conservation area would be compromised, commercial intrusion into the single-family neighbourhood, demolition or destruction of two significant heritage properties, the applicant's position that no response was a positive response to their mail-out, a 10 bedroom home does not conform in an RU1 zone.

Late Letters of Opposition received from:

- Steve & Brenda Thomson, 334 Beach Avenue
- Jon Harling & Janet Billington, 374 Park Avenue
- Beverley & Gerry Burland, 464 Cadder Avenue
- Michael Griffin, 2021 Abbott Street
- Mr. & Mrs. J. Hawkey, 896 Westpoint Drive

Public Hearing

January 25, 2000

SUPPORT

Late submissions of Support:

- 15 copies of a questionnaire circulated in the Centennial Street neighbourhood
- 3 sets of petitions/form letters bearing a total of 85 signatures

Letters from:

- Ed & Mildred Draper, 3442 Moberly Road
- Calvin Bardal, 3453 Moberly Road
- Margaret Wort, 581 Lawrence Avenue
- John & Marie Jordheim, 910 Nassau Crescent
- Doris Vistner, 1035 Borden Avenue (Borden Manor)
- Olive Lafeiver, 1035 Borden Avenue (Borden Manor)
- I. Rignall, 3775 Lakeshore Road
- Shirley Kadin, owner/operator of a Personal Care Home in Saskatchewan
- Mrs. M. Schultz, #212 - 650 Lexington (Borden Manor)
- Peter Krutow, #110 - 877 KLO Road

Mayor Gray invited the applicant to come forward.

Pauline Draper, applicant:

- Advised that she is a realtor, not a developer.
- Her husband bought 2034 Pandosy in 1992 and she purchased the other 2 properties in 1994 before the Abbott Street Heritage Conservation Area was established. The properties were assembled with the intent of developing a 42 unit apartment building.
- Pandosy was not intended to be included in the Abbott Street Heritage Conservation Area and the border was to be behind the subject properties.
- In 1996/97 the properties were listed for sale. At that time two offers were received and both were withdrawn because both developers decided it would take too long to rezone the property.
- Yesterday she received documents from a group indicating intent to purchase the properties for the same or similar uses that are proposed by this application. No purchase price was noted and there was no deposit.
- The two heritage buildings on the property do not fit in with the proposed building plan, functionally or economically. Efforts to give the buildings away or have them moved to another location have been unsuccessful.
- If it would get this application approved, the former school house could be moved to the rear of the larger lot (the one furthest south) and the building could be restored for use by the residents of the proposed facilities. However, there would have to be 65% restitution of the costs of restoring the building (i.e. a trust fund could be set up and restoration work would start when there were sufficient funds available). Restoration costs are estimated at \$155,000.
- 11 trees would be removed and replaced with 18 trees and shrubs and other landscaping.
- This type of seniors care home is better than many of the seniors care homes and there is great need for this type of facility in Kelowna.
- The proposed building design meets the form and character requirements of the heritage guidelines and would give character to the area and increase the value of properties in the neighbourhood.
- Residents of these facilities are quiet, law abiding citizens who generally do not have cars and have very few visitors.
- Older people do not mind noise and they love to sit and watch traffic activity.
- The average age would be about 74 years old.
- There would be a lot of open space with a parklike setting for the residents.

Public HearingJanuary 25, 2000

- Currently each lot has its own driveway. If a duplex was built on each lot there could be 6 driveways, the proposed development would have two driveways for the 3 homes.
- The lots are nearly ½ acre each in size and the location is prime for this type of facility.
- This type of facility helps take pressure off the institutional type homes that are less desirable;
- There are three care homes in a row on Centennial Street and of the 39 homes on the street only 5 people were aware that there were 3 such facilities in a row. There are also 3 duplexes in a row across the street from the care homes on Centennial.
- Why restore a former school house to new condition when it is on private property and would not be accessible to the public?
- Displayed slides showing the mixture of land uses in the area and on Centennial Crescent.
- A mail-out survey of the neighbourhood re 3 care homes versus 3 duplexes on the site resulted in about 15% response.
- Referred to recent articles in the Courier re heritage buildings in the community.
- An offer to work with FRACAS through a mediator was refused.
- Each of the proposed care homes would be operated independently and each would do their own grocery shopping; there would be no service vehicles to the development.

Staff:

- Clarified that of the 3 care homes on Centennial Street, two have 5 bedrooms for rent and one has 3 bedrooms for rent. One care home is for profit and the other two are non-profit, self-supporting homes.
- A previous letter sent to the applicant from the Planning Department indicating support for multi-family housing on the subject properties was based on the long range forecast of the day.
- Of the 3 buildings on the subject properties, the former school house building was identified on the 1983 heritage inventory as a category 'b' and the building on the most northerly lot was identified as a category 'c'.

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

Karen Epp, owner of rental property in Marshall Street area:

- Supported the application based on her experience with a care home across from her property.

Margaret Wort, 581 Lawrence Avenue:

- Supported the application on the basis that care homes provide a family-like atmosphere and improve the quality of life for many of the residents, the residents make good neighbours, and the close proximity of the subject property to critical care services.
- She suggest that the heritage buildings be moved to another site where they can be restored and enjoyed by the public.

Jon Harling, 374 Park Avenue:

- Opposed the application suggesting that the subject property was purchased as part of a land assembly in order to increase its potential for rezoning and development, and submitting that the property will likely be listed for sale once it is rezoned.
- Suggested that the properties should retain their present RU1 zoning and be sold for what they are worth under that zone and that if this application is approved, a precedent will be set for other developers to request similar rezonings.

Public HearingJanuary 25, 2000Lois Carter, Central Avenue:

- Supported the application on the basis that there is a need in Kelowna for assisted living for seniors and the location is prime.

Dennis Purell, shareholder with Kevin Bird in Park Avenue Properties:

- Read a letter of support from the operator of Comfort for Living on Laurier Avenue advising that they held an open house so the neighbours could see the facility and everyone who attended had positive comments. After 4 months of operation they have received great support and cooperation from the neighbourhood.

Ron Schoch, 2040 & 2042 Doryan Street:

- Read a letter from his neighbour Robert Cichocki, 2030 & 2032 Doryan Street, opposing the application because it would alter the character of the neighbourhood, the Heritage Advisory Commission and the Advisory Planning Commission are not in support, a precedent would be set for other non-conforming development, and the developers are just trying to maximize profit. Mr. Cichocki also indicated support for preservation of the heritage buildings on the site.
- Opposed the application and asked that the developer be told to develop the subject properties within the existing zoning.

Steve Thomson, 334 Beach Avenue:

- Opposed the application on the basis that it would compromise and weaken the integrity of the Heritage Conservation Area.
- The proposed development would be a commercial intrusion into a predominantly single family neighbourhood.
- No single family residence has 10 bathrooms and 7 parking stalls.
- Concern about the extent of commitment to restore the school house with sensitivity when the applicant is considering it more as a nuisance.
- A precedent would be set for future similar applications.
- There is no guarantee the property would not be sold and used as other than a seniors care home.

Raymond Gilmurray, 2043 Doryan Street:

- Opposed the application on the basis that it would negatively impact the value of his property.

David Williams, 781 Rowcliffe Avenue:

- Opposed the application on the basis that a Heritage Conservation Area is not the right place for boarding and lodging homes, potential parking problems.
- Suggested the applicant sell the property based on its current zoning.

Valerie Halford, representing Friends & Residents of the Abbott Street Heritage Conservation Area Society (FRACAS):

- FRACAS has made 3 presentations to the Advisory Planning Commission and 4 to the Heritage Advisory Commission on this application and each time the applicant raised different new issues. FRACAS has well over 100 members.
- Indicated on a map the results of a door-to-door survey of the households in the Abbott Street Heritage Conservation Area when, over a period of 2 weeks, 273 signatures and 73 letters were obtained from residents opposing this application.
- Displayed recent photos of the subject property to show the trees and the condition of the existing buildings.
- Displayed photos of other properties in the conservation area that have been restored and of heritage buildings that have been lost.

Public HearingJanuary 25, 2000

- The two largest houses FRACAS could find on Pandosy Street were 2,300 sq. ft. and just over 3,000 sq. ft. in size; the proposed boarding and lodging homes would be 5,000 sq. ft. and therefore not in character with the surrounding area.
- There is an entire block of large lots in the Abbott Street Conservation Area and the residents are concerned about the precedent approving this application would set.
- Cited figures and statistics to support the contention that there are enough institutions in the Abbott Street Conservation Area already.
- The mediator suggested by the applicant was a local realtor who has a boarding and lodging house listed for sale.
- FRACAS has obtained a quote indicating that the old school house building could be restored for \$65,000 to \$84,790.
- Unrestored heritage buildings are of more interest to perspective purchasers than restored buildings.
- Heritage buildings should not be relocated from their original site. Provincial grants are reduced when the buildings are moved and when the buildings are moved to heritage parks, the parks become dumping grounds for unwanted buildings.

Gwen Marsh, 2053 Doryan Street:

- Opposed the application suggesting that the applicant has allowed the condition of the property to deteriorate in order to get the neighbourhood to accept what is proposed just to get the sites cleaned up.
- There is no assurance that what would actually be developed would be a seniors care facility.
- The heritage buildings should be preserved.

Joyce Broome:

- Read a letter of support from her husband who has a medical office at 486 Cadder Avenue.

Shirley Clarke, 1935 McDougall Street:

- Opposed the applicant on the basis that the proposed homes do not meet with the heritage guidelines for the area or the existing single family character of the neighbourhood.
- Told of her experiences as one of the people who took around a petition.
- People likely thought the Guisachan Heritage Park and the Benvoulin Church buildings were not restorable yet both have been beautifully restored.
- The heritage buildings on the subject property should be restored.
- Asked that the subject application be denied.

David Anderson, 278 Beach Avenue:

- Concerned about precedence.

Reginald Krutow:

- Expressed support on behalf of his father who lives in an apartment type complex on K.L.O. Road and who feels that he would be more at home in the environment the proposed type of facility would offer.
- The location is good being close to the hospital.

Peter Chataway, President of Central Okanagan Heritage Society:

- Read a letter of opposition saying that the rezoning is unacceptable without a heritage revitalization agreement to control building design, etc.
- The 21 parking stalls would change the character of the area as would loss of trees.
- The Central Okanagan Heritage Society has attempted to work with the applicants but they have chosen to proceed with this application without consultation.

Public HearingJanuary 25, 2000

- The existing heritage structures and landscaping should be preserved.
- A residential component is mandatory on the subject property, as with the Guisachan and Benvoulin sites; adaptive re-use is necessary to generate the revenue to create a sustainable entity and retain the heritage buildings.
- The proposed buildings would not fit on the 3 lots without a variance of the side yard setback requirements.

Staff:

- Clarified that the applicant has agreed to modify the building design to meet the side yard setback requirements and therefore no variance would be required.
- Clarified that Heritage Revitalization Agreements are required when the use or density is to be altered to other than what is permitted by the zoning regulations.

David Marshall, 1953 Knox Crescent:

- Opposed the application and asked that the heritage buildings be preserved.

Marietta Lightbody, 2302 Abbott Street:

- Read a letter from Mark Flett, Kelowna resident, asking that Council impose the conditions imposed on the conservation area.
- Read her own presentation telling of her memories growing up in Kelowna and asking Council to deny this application and preserve this heritage area.

Pauline Draper, applicant:

- Responded to comments from the gallery advising that the heritage buildings on the site are just a shell; the entire inside is gone.
- The lots are deep with no rear access so they are unique.
- Park Avenue Properties would not have bought the subject properties if the buildings had been in good shape.
- The 3 lots are owned by two separate owners and there are reasons why the lots are not being consolidated.

Staff:

- Clarified that if this application is supported by Council, a major Heritage Alteration Permit would be required and it would be considered by Council concurrent with adoption of the zone amending bylaw.
- The Heritage Alteration Permit is processed similar to a Development Permit; public input is received through the advisory committees or through letters.
- Explained why minor changes are not referred back to advisory committees for a second time.

There were no further comments.

4. TERMINATION:

The Hearing was declared terminated at 12:10 a.m.

Certified Correct:

 Mayor

 City Clerk

BLH/bn