

---

**CITY OF KELOWNA**

**MEMORANDUM**

---

**Date:** October 2, 2003  
**File No.:** OCP03-0002

**To:** City Manager

**From:** Planning and Corporate Services Department

**Subject:** Additional Information Required for Council Consideration

---

**1.0 RECOMMENDATION**

THAT Municipal Council defer further consideration of Official Community Plan Amendment Application No. OCP03-0002 until such time as the applicant has provided the additional information listed in this report and City staff reports back to Council with their review of the additional information.

**2.0 BACKGROUND**

At the Regular Meeting of Kelowna Municipal Council on Monday September 29, 2003, the following recommendation was passed by Council:

THAT staff report back in two weeks with further information with regard to capital costs and infrastructure funding for the project proposed in conjunction with Official Community Plan Amendment No. OCP03-0002 (Grant Gaucher for Bertha & Douglas Flintoft – McKinley/Finch Roads) and with respect to the City of Kelowna 20- Year Financing & Servicing Plan.

Carried  
Councillor Clark opposed.

Staff further commented that they would report back initially with an estimation of the work required to produce the financial implications for this project with regard to the 20 Year Financing and Servicing Plan.

**3.0 PROPOSAL**

**3.1 Review of Issues**

Review of the 20 Year Servicing Plan and Financing Strategy has just been completed and in fact was presented to Council for consideration the same day as the subject application. The 20 year plan is linked directly to the Future Land Use designations and Growth Management policies of the Official Community Plan and indirectly to the Regional Growth Strategy. The Official Community Plan also incorporates network planning for infrastructure servicing based on the growth management policies. As the subject properties as currently designated as Future Urban Reserve, they are deemed to be beyond the scope of any urbanised development within the 20 year time frame of the Official Community Plan and, consequently, the 20 Year Financing and Servicing Plan. **This means that none of the infrastructure required to service the proposed development, nor any of the contributory analysis from the proposed**

**development for City wide infrastructure has been modelled into the current 20 Year Servicing Plan and Financing Strategy.** It should be noted that the most recent review of the 20 year plan was a very extensive update that was in progress for more or less three years.

Staff have taken the position that it is not realistic to commence a revision to the 20 Year Servicing Plan and Financing Strategy before it has been adopted and therefore, the analysis identified as required to be provided by the applicant is based on the assumption that the proposed development is to be considered as an incremental increase in the overall development projected over the next 20 years.

There are four major components of “hard” infrastructure that should be further analysed.

### **3.2 Roads and Transportation**

It is recommended that the applicant provide a full traffic impact analysis, based on terms of reference agreed to jointly by the City and the applicant’s consultant, that addresses the following components.

- i) By project phases, the required on site road network;
- ii) By project phases, the new road networks required off site within the City of Kelowna;
- iii) By project phases, road network linkages required beyond the City of Kelowna boundaries (i.e. Lake Country);
- iv) By project phases, upgrades to existing road networks within the City of Kelowna;
- v) By project phases, upgrades to existing road networks beyond the City of Kelowna

Once this analysis has been completed, the roads and transportation requirements must be evaluated in comparison with the scheduled capital projects indicated in the 20 Year Servicing Plan and Financing Strategy. The evaluation must determine what additional or incremental works are necessary to ensure that the networks already contemplated at the end of the 20 year horizon are not compromised by the additional demand resulting from the proposed development. The evaluation must also determine the maintenance costs for the additional road and transportation infrastructure that would normally be assumed by the City once the works are complete.

To provide some example of the scope of this work, portions of Glenmore Road and the North End Connector are contemplated to be built to a six lane standard prior to development being considered in the area north of McKinley Landing. The review would have to consider which of these road improvements would have to be completed immediately, and which could be phased. We would need to provide this information to the applicant before proceeding to Public Hearing.

### **3.3 Sanitary Sewer**

There is long term modelling (50 year plan) for sanitary sewer networks within the City of Kelowna. Sanitary Sewer service to the subject properties has been forecast to be provided through a sewer main extension along Clifton Road to McKinley Landing. The applicant has indicated in preliminary reports that the subject property could be serviced through connection to either the Glenmore Trunk Sewer or the College Trunk Sewer via Quail Ridge. At this time, both of those trunk mains have been fully committed with existing and planned growth. It is therefore staff’s position that these are not viable options to service the subject properties.

The applicant must provide a feasibility study, based on terms of reference acceptable to both the City and the applicant’s consultant, to provide sanitary sewer service to the subject property. Key issues that must be addressed are;

- i) By project phases, the complete infrastructure requirements to provide sanitary sewer service to the subject property that does not compromise the projected capacity requirements for existing and planned growth already contemplated by the 20 year plan;
- ii) By project phases, the impact on the existing sewer treatment facility and the incremental impact on the need for a new sewer treatment facility;
- iii) By project phases, the land requirements and estimated costs for the additional infrastructure network;
- iv) By project phases, the projected annual maintenance costs for the required infrastructure.

There are several peripheral issues related to the provision of sanitary sewer. If sanitary sewer is to be provided from the City's treatment facility to these lands, it will likely need to be extended through or past additional properties that are identified as Future Urban Reserve by the Official Community Plan. The existence of sanitary sewer in these areas will undoubtedly create expectation by land owners that they should be granted development opportunities in advance of the current growth management strategies. The applicant has indicated that to alleviate this concern, he will design the sanitary sewer such that there is only capacity for his proposed project. This scenario would mean that not only is the infrastructure being installed long before it had been contemplated, but it would provide no long term capacity for the eventuality when growth is appropriate in these areas. In essence, the infrastructure would have to be replaced or resized in the future.

An alternate solution would be to provide for an independent treatment solution on site. There are also many implications that would have to be studied for this solution including:

- i) Full environmental impact assessment for treatment and discharge of sanitary sewer effluent;
- ii) Long term liability and maintenance of a stand alone treatment plant;
- iii) Impacts of removing the subject property from the ultimate sewer service area from a financial and efficiency perspective for both the sanitary sewer network and the current and proposed treatment facilities.

For Council's information, the 50 year sanitary sewer plan estimated the trunk extension along Clifton to McKinley Landing to be approximately \$15 million in 1997 dollars.

### **3.4 Water**

The city wide servicing plan between the City and various Improvement Districts identifies this area to be serviced by Glenmore Ellison Improvement District. It will be important to verify with GEID of their commitment to service this property and ultimately the other properties in this area since this will largely preclude the City from establishing a standalone water utility for this area if GEID was not in a position to do so.

### **3.5 Storm Water Management/Drainage**

This component of infrastructure will have to be contained and disposed of on site. It is not anticipated that the proposed development would contribute any impacts to the City of Kelowna provided an acceptable storm water management plan is put in place prior to any development occurring on site. The applicant has prepared preliminary studies to address this issue.

#### **4.0 SUMMARY**

The Planning and Corporate Services Department remains very concerned about the implications of the proposed development on the financial and infrastructure impacts that the City of Kelowna would be faced with prematurely should this proposal be supported by Council and developed within the applicant's proposed timeframe. This report does not examine the "soft" infrastructure impacts such as fire protection and police services nor does it address private utility impacts. It should also be noted that the studies requested are for investigation purposes and the finding of the studies will not necessarily lead to final solutions.

---

Andrew Bruce  
Manager of Development Services