

A Special Public Hearing of the Municipal Council of the City of Kelowna was held in the Kelowna Community Theatre, 1375 Water Street, Kelowna, B.C., on Thursday, January 15, 2004.

Council members in attendance were: Mayor Walter Gray, Councillors A.F. Banleil, R.D. Cannan, B.A. Clark, C.B. Day, B.D. Given, R.D. Hobson\*, E.A. Horning and S.A. Shepherd\*.

Staff members in attendance were: City Manager, R.A. Born; City Clerk, A.M. Flack; Director of Planning & Corporate Services, R.L. Mattiussi; Manager of Policy, Research and Strategic Planning, S.K. Bagh; Planner-Long Range, G. Stephen; Director of Financial Services, P.A. Macklem; Director of Works & Utilities, J. Vos; Transportation Manager, R.W. Westlake; Traffic & Transportation Engineer, H. Thompson; Parks Manager, J. Creron; Parks Planning & Administrative Supervisor, D. Lange; Deputy City Clerk, S.C. Fleming; and Council Recording Secretary, B.L. Harder.

(\* denotes partial attendance)

1. Mayor Gray called the Hearing to order at 7:07 p.m.
2. Mayor Gray advised that the purpose of the Hearing is to consider a bylaw which, if adopted, will amend "Kelowna Official Community Plan (1994-2013) Bylaw No. 7600", and all submissions received, either in writing or verbally, will be taken into consideration when the bylaw is presented for readings by Council.

The City Clerk advised Notice of this Public Hearing was advertised by being posted on the Notice Board at City Hall on December 29, 2003, and by being placed in the Kelowna Daily Courier issues of January 5 and 6, 2004, and in the Kelowna Capital News issue of January 4, 2004.

The correspondence and/or petitions received in response to advertising for the applications on tonight's agenda were arranged and circulated to Council in accordance with Council Policy 309.

3. PLANNING BYLAW CONSIDERED AT PUBLIC HEARING
- 3.1 **OCP Amendment – Housing Distribution; Future Land Uses, Future Roads and Financing**
- 3.1 PURPOSE OF OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN AMENDMENT BYLAW NO 9096 IN GENERAL TERMS:

**To update policies and mapping as follows:**

Update text and all maps to reflect updated time frame of 2000 to 2020; replace Map 7.1 with a revised Map 7.1-Natural Environment/Hazardous Condition DP Areas; add a new Housing Policy 8.1.22 and renumber all the remaining policies: New Housing Distribution; amend existing Housing Policy 8.1.36 as follows: Apartments and Townhouses; insert a new map into Chapter 8-Housing: Map 8.1-New Housing Distribution; insert Table 8.1-New Housing Distribution; replace Map 12.1 with a new Map 12.1- 20 Year Major Road Network and Road Classification Plan, including amendments to the proposed one-way couplet; replace text in Chapter 19-Future Land Use; replace Map 19.1 with a new Map 19.1 – Generalized Future Land Use; replace text in Chapter 20-Financing the Plan– Generalized Future Land Use; replace text in Chapter 20-Financing the Plan.

Mayor Gray outlined the procedure, noting first there will be presentation by City staff, then the City Clerk will acknowledge correspondence and petitions received, and then the Chair will call on the speakers who have registered on the speakers' list. Speakers will be limited to 5 minutes in accord with Council Bylaw No. 7906. After all members of the public have been heard a first time, speakers will have an opportunity to come forward again.

Councillor Shepherd declared a conflict of interest following the receipt of legal advice late on January 14, 2004 from the City Solicitor and following further advice from her own solicitor on the matter. The conflict involves an ownership interest in a commercial building on Lakeshore Road and the potential impact a one way couplet could have on commercial operations in that building. Councillor Shepherd left the meeting at 7:20 p.m.

A gentleman in the gallery suggested that all of Council has a conflict as members of the community. Council disagreed.

Staff:

- Provincial legislation sets out what must be included in an OCP and a public hearing must be held to make any changes. A major review of the OCP is undertaken every 5 years or whenever substantive changes are necessary. This is the second half of the 5-year review of the 1995 OCP. The first half dealt primarily with policy revisions that were adopted by Council in 2002. The parts of the OCP that are being considered tonight were not reviewed in 2002 because they all directly or indirectly relate to the one-way couplet and Council wanted more information before finalizing the OCP. That analysis is now complete so these matters can now be considered. Housing Distribution, Future Land Uses, Future Roads and Financing are the 4 main issues for consideration tonight.
- The City of Kelowna population today is estimated at 100,000 and staff anticipate that will increase by 50% by 2020.
- Housing Distribution: Residential uses account for about 1/3 of the City's landbase. The OCP supports construction of more land efficient housing in our town centres and also provides for new single family homes in suburban neighbourhoods. The current OCP projects that 67% of new housing would be in apartments and townhouses; that number is being reduced to 53%. The OCP outlines the revised housing projections and how they would be distributed throughout the community.
- Future Land Uses: Changes have been displayed in detail at various open houses and on the City's website as well on a map on display in the lobby of City Hall. Identified new park sites being added to the future land use map.
- Future Roads: Kelowna residents have indicated (88%) that they would like the City to reduce dependence on single vehicle use. For the immediate future there is strong demand for roads and the road network map identifies improvements to eight main roads. The map also includes some refinements to the north/south one-way couplet and includes a Water Street connection to Pandosy Street just south of the highway instead of connecting to Ellis Street in order to help traffic flow along the highway by freeing up more green (light) time.
- Financing: The OCP identifies how the land use pattern of the OCP will be serviced and how those services will be paid for. Updates reflect the OCP timeframe from 2013 to 2020 and includes both taxpayer funded projects and developer funded projects. Costs for developer assisted projects have been reduced from \$592 million to \$490 million. The largest share of those costs continue to relate to road network expansions. The 20 year servicing plan and financing strategy and the DCC bylaw are consistent with the OCP that is before Council tonight.
- Several minor housekeeping amendments include revising the maps to reflect current subdivision patterns, slope information within Area Structure Plans, and clarification of policies that affect the Development Permit area map.

Public Hearing

January 15, 2004

- The public input process has been going on for a long time and included many open houses, etc. The couplet was of particular public interest.
- The bylaw was forwarded for review by the Regional District of Central Okanagan, the District of Lake Country and the Agricultural Land Reserve Commission after first reading to comply with Provincial requirements.

Councillor Hobson joined the meeting at 7:50 p.m.

The City Clerk advised that the following correspondence and or petitions had been received between the date of notification of the Hearing (January 4, 2004) and 4:00 p.m. this afternoon, and noted that everything has been circulated to Council and is available for public inspection in binders placed in the Theatre lobby.

**ONE WAY COUPLET:**

**Letters of Opposition**

Al Harrison, 3914 Claxton Court  
 Robert Decloux, Rowcliffe Avenue  
 Ken Webster, Urban Development Institute  
 Barb and Gary Ellis, 808 Dehart Avenue  
 Deborah Helf, 1813 Marshall Street  
 Brenda Bachmann, 1812 Marshall Street  
 Stephen Kabella, 606 Sherwood Road  
 Sylvia and Chester Szarko  
 Hans Birker  
 Birk Hoehn and Nancy Pells, 1891 Water Street  
 Eileen Montgomery, Kelowna  
 Paul Tomelin, 857 Morrison Avenue  
 Stanely Tessmer, Tessmer Law Office  
 R. Soste, 4050 Beach Ave, Peachland  
 Patricia and Ronald Fazackerley  
 Bill & Irma Peters, 2824 Capri Road  
 Frank Hogel, 2002 Ethel Street  
 Lawrence Schneider, #204-1920 Burtch Road  
 Dave Dakers  
 Jeanne & Therese Menu  
 Lannea Parfitt, 1638 Ethel Street  
 Harvey Benson, 664 Royal Pine Drive  
 Benjamin Bissett, 385 Scarboro Road  
 Mon Desir (Elise Clark), 1847 Maple Street  
 Brenda Fouter, 451 Cadder Avenue  
 John Zeger (Citizens for Responsible Community Planning)  
 Robert Chichocki  
 Dorothee Birker, 1874 Etherl Street

- Opposed because of concern that the property values of downtown Kelowna residents will decrease; property values of the Westside (Westside taxes not remitted to the City of Kelowna) will increase; the impact on Heritage Conservation areas, the downtown core and South Pandosy; pedestrian traffic would be inhibited; the adverse impact on businesses on Pandosy Street and in the downtown; it is inappropriate for a major traffic corridor to dissect the city; negative impact on the person friendly atmosphere in the downtown; the lighting system on our current highway needs to be changed to allow traffic to flow continuously down the highway; negative impact on downtown parking/economy; creates traffic confusion for tourists and locals; the public information meeting hosted by the DKA on January 13, 2004 failed to provide positive supportive evidence for the couplet; more highways generate more traffic which generate more pollution of the environment; emergency vehicles may have a more difficult time getting to an emergency on one way streets; two-way traffic should be tested after the new Okanagan Lake crossing is in place; further alternatives

should be studied before the one way couplet is implemented; would take away Kelowna's natural beauty; negative impact on residents' property, homes and livelihood; concern for safety of children playing with increased traffic in front of their homes; the downtown will no longer be a quiet and quaint neighbourhood to live in; decrease in the quality of life; and two bridges may be more efficient.

- Suggesting that a 6-lane bridge be built south of the sawmill aligned with the railway right-of-way and ultimately connected to the proposed North End Connector; the North End Connector be constructed; construct an eastern bypass of Rutland from Highway 33 to the Airport area; widen the existing bridge; create a second crossing to decrease traffic grid lock; build several bridges to allow for alternate choices of lake crossings; charge a toll to help pay for costs of a more advanced bridge; change the timing of traffic lights on the highway; elevate the bridge near Westbank to allow sailboats continuous access passing underneath without a lift span; eliminate left turns off Highway 97 between Abbott and Ethel Streets; reintroduce ferries on the lake; improve transit systems in Kelowna and out to Westbank; better signage on Highway 97.

### **Letters of Support**

Ian Greenwood, 2127 Long Street  
Margaret Tom Rothery, 670 Paret Place  
Diane Lister, 615 Osprey Avenue  
Robert Levin, 696 Thorneloe Road

- Supporting the couplet as the most economic and most desirable solution for traffic problems on the highway; suggesting that a downtown traffic by-pass route is also important to remove truck traffic and north bound traffic off the highway; Pandosy and Richter would still be a pleasant place to walk, shop and live providing that there are sidewalks and the speed limit is 50 km/h.

### **Letter of Clarification**

Shirley Staley regarding comments on the South Pandosy Revitalization and views of Pandosy merchants on the one way couplet.

### **FUTURE LAND USE UPDATES:**

#### **Re Expansion of Knox Mountain:**

#### **Letters of Support**

Jim Tanner, 474 Carona Crescent  
Maureen Lisle, 396 Clifton Road  
Chris Cowan, 1835 Upland Avenue  
Shelley Wood  
Pat Rosinski, 730 Walrod Street  
Marie McIntosh, 824 Manhattan Drive

- Supporting expansion of the park because it would contribute to the unique natural and recreational character of Kelowna and providing natural wildlife corridors; once land is developed the original environment and fragile natural landscape is lost; more recreational space will be needed due to Kelowna's anticipated growth; easy access to an outdoor area with no need to drive; decrease in interface areas resulting in decreased fire risk; developments above the city are expensive to service; the public is already using the privately owned undeveloped areas adjacent to the park; the park needs to be large enough to sustain wildlife; would increase green space for the residents and tourists.
- Willing to pay higher taxes to purchase and maintain the land.
- Asking that the City preserve the area between Knox Mountain and McKinley Landing Road in its present state.

**Re Strathcona Walkway:****Letter of Support**

Ian Middler, 1947 Abbott Street, supporting opening as much of the beach as possible to local and visiting pedestrian traffic.

**Letter of Opposition:**

Brent Therrien, 2500 Abbott Street, opposed because it is the wrong location for a boardwalk, safety concerns with the bottleneck effect that would be created at the Maude Roxbury Bird Sanctuary where the sidewalk would be reduced in width, and loss of green space with the parking lot being put into Kinsmen Park.

**Re Field Road:****Letter of Opposition:**

Laurel Zaseybida, Director of Avalon Community Consulting Alliance, submitting that land in the Field Road area should be developed and that the A1 zoning designation is inappropriate.

**Re Springfield Road – Plan B15221:****Letter of Opposition:**

E.J. (Ted) Callahan, President Argus Properties, opposed to changing the future land use map from C.D.P. to Agriculture and Park since the initial draft because it is inappropriate and misleading to be designating private land as Public Park.

Mayor Gray acknowledged emails that had been sent to members of Council that he noted were received between September and December 22, 2003 and advised that all had been recirculated to members of Council.

Mayor Gray invited the speakers who had indicated on the Speakers' List that they wished to address Council on the issue of Housing Policy Distribution to come forward.

**Housing Policy Distribution:**

Keith Funk, New Town Planning:

- The item he had intended to raise was dealt with today by Planning Department staff and so he now had nothing to bring forward on this item.

Gillan Barany, Viewcrest Road:

- Concerned about where the level of the lake will be in 20 years as most homes in the Okanagan Mission area are or will be serviced with water from the lake yet there are no plans to augment water supplies.

Mayor Gray invited anyone not on the Speakers' List who wished to speak on the issue of Housing Policy Distribution to come forward. There was no response.

Mayor Gray invited the speakers who had indicated on the Speakers' List that they wished to address Council on the Future Land Use issues, including Parks, to come forward.

**Future Land Use:**

Bill Bowering, Friends of Knox Mountain Park:

- The park is extensively used by a diverse group of people. Two immediately adjacent properties, one to the immediate north of Paul's Tomb and the other the 'Boppart' property west of Clifton Road should be acquired and added to the park.
- The proposed change to the future land use designation of the Boppart property to Multi-Family should be rejected. Until the proposed use of the land is examined in more detail, the designation should not be changed.
- Encouraged Council to purchase the property at a fair price and extend the vision for the park by adding this property to the park and advised that he had obtained a petition signed by over 700 persons in support of the acquisition and expansion of Knox Mountain Park.

Carl Hare, representing Clifton Highlands Community Association:

- The present designation of the 'Boppart' property is for lots a little over 2 acres in size. That present designation was selected as having the least detrimental affect on the area. Would prefer that the entire property be preserved as greenspace, ideally as part of the park. Alternatively, would like at least at 5-7 acre lots sizes.
- Asked that the future land use designation of the 'Boppart' property remain unchanged in the OCP.

Margaret Lunam, Friends of Knox Mountain Park:

- Suggest the City dip into its reserve funds to buy the Boppart property to add to the park.
- Drainage and sewage solutions that have been implemented by the City to handle problems from Magic Estates have infringed on the park boundaries.

Ken Campbell, Boppart Court:

- The future land use designation of the Boppart property was green (Park and Open Space) in 1995 but then the public was told that the City could not colour it green unless the City had plans to buy it. For that reason, the future land use was changed to its current zoning which allows minimum 2 acre lot sizes. The proposed amendment would allow a higher density.
- Proposals by the owners to subdivide to smaller lots have been denied three times by the Advisory Planning Commission. The Boppart property is all that is left that is not slated for development. Changing the future land use serves no purpose. Urged Council to leave the future land use of the property as is.

Barry McCullough, Friends of Knox Mountain Park:

- Knox Mountain Park is the 'Stanley Park' of our city and the jewel of our city.
- Urged Council to leave the future land use designation of the Boppart property as is, and move aggressively toward purchase of the land.

Marnie Sullivan, Friends of Knox Mountain Park:

- Reiterated comments by previous speakers urging Council to purchase the Boppart property for expansion of the park.

Debra Sures, Atwood Place:

- The proposed waterfront walkway (from Strathcona to Kinsmen Parks) would increase the likelihood of environmental damage to the park and beach and would not improve security. The proposed walkway would be a safety issue for families with young children.
- The community already has access to the waterfront. Not all beaches along the lake should have a walkway.
- A 20 ft. wide paved walkway is not as good as walking in the sand on the beach.

- Homeowners living on the waterfront look after the beach at no cost to the City.
- Tourist activity would increase with a walkway. Tourists like the natural appeal of virgin beaches and clean water.
- The Maude Roxby Bird Sanctuary appeals to nature lovers and they prefer the beach over a 20 ft. wide walkway.
- Supports Walley Lightbody's recommendation to continue the Abbott Street recreational corridor further south instead.

Walley Lightbody, Abbott Street:

- Presented his proposal to Council a few weeks ago and was at the subsequent Council meeting when City Parks Department staff responded to his brief.
- Staff want more public access to the waterfront but they already have undisturbed access along the whole area where the walkway is to take place.
- His family has lived on the waterfront for 65 years and they want to keep the property in the family, the way it is now.
- Staff should be directing their attention to the properties where people are impeding public access with docks and retaining walls.
- It is unfortunate that the proposed OCP amendments are all in one bylaw. Councillor Shepherd was elected and should have a right to speak on the issues other than the couplet.

Cec Dillabough, Central Okanagan Naturalists' Club:

- Supports the request by the Friends of Knox Mountain Park for the City to purchase the Boppart property as park.
- The Naturalists' Club agreed with putting the existing walkway around the Maude Roxby Bird Sanctuary and still agree with it for controlled access to the sanctuary. They also agreed that a walkway along the lakeshore would be important but did not envisage that the walkway would be 20 ft. wide which would be rather imposing on the bird sanctuary.

Staff:

- Clarified that the walkway would be a boardwalk to a maximum 12 ft. (4 m) in width through Maude Roxby; the consultant could still recommend reducing that width. The rest of the walkway cross-section would be approximately 5.5 m wide with 3 m intended for walking adjacent to the lake and the remainder designated for bikes and rollerbladers, etc.

Kevin Ade:

- Supports the opinions already expressed regarding uses pertaining to water and to Knox Mountain Park.
- The history of development in this region leaves a lot to be desired. 85% of the wetlands have been lost and we have lost community which has been sacrificed to other interests due to mismanagement. Mission Creek was destroyed by straightening it out and what was done to it and we are doing that with the roadways now. Enlarging a road in a residential area increases traffic. Has seen nothing in the proposed amendments to reassure him on these questions. Community desires are being sacrificed to outside interests.
- The OCP should be a plan to overcome the difficulties that we have created for ourselves; to learn from our mistakes in the past.

Anne Laurie, Abbott Street:

- Opposed to the proposed walkway between Strathcona and Kinsmen Parks; agrees with Walley Lightbody's proposal. The proposed walkway would have a detrimental impact on Kinsmen Park which has no sandy beach but provides lots of trees for shade as a refuge for the elderly and families. These citizens may find it difficult to move out of the way of bikes and rollerbladers. The park is also used for weddings and church services; it is now a safe place for citizens who are nervous with fast-moving activities. The proposed walkway would upset this balance. There are other parks where fast moving activity can occur.

- Support extending the Abbott Street recreational corridor to Gyro Park, keeping the bikes and rollerbladers on the road, and preserving the park and beachfront for relaxation.

Larry Serko. Avalon Alliance:

- The two properties at 3999 Field Road and 4025 Field Road were removed from the Agricultural Land Reserve in July 2003 and the owner would like to develop the property which has its own self-sustained private sewer system. Would like the future land use designation of these two properties changed from A1 to residential development.

David Cram, Abbott Street:

- The bylaw should be split so that Councillor Shepherd can participate in the proposed amendments other than the couplet.
- Opposed to the proposed walkway from Strathcona to Kinsmen Parks. The owners of the waterfront properties in that area have never discouraged beach access to the public. The residents have enhanced the beach and people enjoy the beach in its natural state which is how it should be left.
- Support extending the Abbott Street recreational corridor further south.
- Imposing the proposed walkway on the owners of the waterfront properties sends a negative message to the property owner and is an unjust reward for having provided friendly public access to the beach all these years.
- Wants people to use the sandy beach the way it is; has no intention of giving up his riparian rights.
- Suggest using the money allocated to the waterfront walkway project to buy the Boppart property.

Dr. Cliff Henderson, Francis Avenue:

- Concerned about the safety of children in Strathcona Park if the proposed waterfront walkway proceeds. Strathcona Park is a park for families with young children and it is inconceivable that Parks staff would design a walkway like what is proposed. Has not met anyone outside of Parks staff that supports the walkway.
- Asked that the walkway not be included in the OCP.

Dr. Arkinstall, Lakeshore Road:

- The Citizen's Survey indicated that 82% of respondents want access to the waterfront; however, people say they would like to go to the beaches but in fact most do not go.
- Council has been given due warning that the boardwalk could create a hazard and if a child is hit by a rollerblader now, the City could be liable having been made aware of the liability being created.

Ian Middler, 1947 Abbott Street:

- Supports the proposed walkway and encourages Council to open up as much local beach as possible to the public.
- The proposed walkway would make public access easier and more obvious.

Gordon Jennens, McDougall Street:

- Has lived on the lakeshore for well over three quarters of a century and beach access has been a big pain in the neck. The general public has a right to the beach. Instead of spending more money on parks, let the public have the use of the waterfront.



Keith Funk, New Town Planning Services:

- It is not in the public interest to change the Rural Agricultural designation in order to limit specific parcel sizes.
- Would like to see the height restrictions in the Commercial section of the bylaw completely removed and left to the discretion of Council.
- Discouraging development on slopes in excess of 30% is not appropriate where sewer is available. Suggest modify the statement in the OCP to allow development on slopes greater than 30% subject to engineering assessment.

Brian Woinoski, 2228 Abbott Street:

- Would be directly affected by the proposed Strathcona walkway with the waterfront walkway on one side of his property and the Abbott Street recreational corridor on the other.
- Putting up unnatural barriers such as concrete retaining walls hastens the erosion of beaches. Need to find a way to have our walkways and cycle paths while having a beach that people can walk on 12 months of the year.
- Would prefer a softer attempt at reinstating what used to be a very nice beach in the Strathcona area.

Michael Roach:

- There is demand for improved boat launch access to the lake. The OCP should include a firm timeline for improving boat access at Sutherland Park.

#### **Transportation/Couplet and Financing Chapter:**

John Zeger, Citizens for Responsible Community Planning:

- Rapid uncontrolled population growth is behind many of our problems. Growth rate is cancerous rather than graceful as stated in the OCP. The optimal size for a city is 50,000 to 100,000 population, beyond that inefficiencies increase. Reality has shown that traffic congestion and air pollution is worse in larger cities.
- Urge Council to put a limit on the number of building permits issues per year in order to limit growth, to redesignate all high density residential future land uses to medium density residential, and to allow more time for the public to debate the proposed OCP revisions.

Steve Kabella, Sherwood Road:

- The one way couplet system will not solve the problems. Need to adhere to transportation planning principles and transportation planning should be for 100 years and longer.
- Two bridges would be more efficient and less disruptive than one-way couplets. Need to commence action on a second crossing, a bypass of the downtown core; and get on with road works such as the North End Connector, extension of Spall to Benvoulin; etc.
- Must limit growth.

Ken Webster, president of the Urban Development Institute (UDI):

- UDI generally supports the proposed amendments but concerned about the RM4 zone being moved from low density transitional to a medium density category – would cause applications for amendments that otherwise would not be required.
- It is important for the viability of the development industry to implement the new DCC bylaw this February.
- UDI supports proceeding with the carriageway for connecting Water Street with Pandosy, continued 2-way traffic on Richter and Pandosy, and providing what is required for the bridge crossing which is necessary for continued viability of our region. Suggest that the City wait until after completion of the bridge project to determine whether a one-way couplet is needed and to look for more universally acceptable solutions to the couplet.

Otto Litke, resident from the west side of the lake:

- The proposed new bridge design will not relieve west side traffic jams. If we allow the existing bridge replacement to be a first priority, it will be a long time before we get a second crossing or a much needed bypass.
- Outlined what he would like to see in order to negate the need for a couplet and achieve the goal for improved traffic movement.

Valerie Hallford, FRAHCAS:

- Read a letter from Trevor Benson and Nora Blaney, Lakeshore Road, regarding Councillor Shepherd's business interest as it relates to the one-way couplet proposal
- Suggested that Councillor Blaneil should be declaring a conflict of interest as owner of a business that is in direct competition with a downtown business that could be impacted by the one-way couplet proposal.

Cherie Hanson, president of the North End Residents Association:

- Would like the north end to become a vital part of tourism in Kelowna.
- Should be design guidelines for homes in the north end.
- Heavy traffic brings pollutants and high chloroform counts in Sutherland Bay waters.
- Need to create walkable neighbourhoods instead of hostile streetscapes.
- Urged Council to stop the couplet and look for alternatives. Council is creating a legacy and bad choices cannot be bought back.

Dr. Arkinstall, Lakeshore Road:

- The one way couplet should have been the first issue for public input. It is getting late and the majority of the people that came were here for that issue. A lot of the people have already had to leave.

Steve Shoranick, MKS Resources Inc.:

- Development and building houses and creating jobs is what people talk about when they talk about Kelowna growing.
- Council has to decide whether or not a couplet is needed. Whichever way Council decides, people will not be happy.
- Unless the couplet is approved, it sounds like the financing package may not be able to proceed. Urged Council to not delay the financial part of the OCP.

Staff:

- The one way couplet has been identified as a project in the 20 year servicing plan. If the couplet project does not go ahead, then an alternative project would have to be identified in order to keep the funds that were allocated to the couplet included in the servicing plan.

Steve Shoranick:

- The development community cannot put everything on hold until the City resolves which access to do. Need to adopt the financial package the way it is now.

Anne Pope, 587 Oxford Avenue:

- A bridge (second crossing) joining into Manhattan Point would create the same situation as exists now.
- Need a long term vision.

Pat Monroe, KSAN:

- Widening streets from 2 lanes to 4 lanes destroys neighbourhoods. Opposed to the 4-laning that is proposed in the OCP over the next 20 years.

## Michael Neil, Watt Road:

- Disappointed at the process used to push the one-way couplet.
- Suggesting that the bridge project will not proceed without the couplet is a scare tactic.
- Couplet alternatives were construed to look unaffordable or silly.
- The rest of the world is dismantling their one-way streets.
- Do not want speeding streams of automobiles on one way streets.
- The character of our beautiful city is being ruined.
- Scrapping the Pandosy/Water Street connection would save millions of dollars and would ensure Pandosy would not be spoiled.
- Spending a lot of money just to get a couple of extra seconds of green light time on the highway.

## Wayne Pearce:

- The OCP is flawed; not enough public input.
- Opposes the one-way couplet and the 4-laning of Lakeshore Road and wants those removed from the OCP for now and forever.
- The transportation map showed Ethel as a 2 lane street; now it is shown as a 4-lane street – there has been no public input on that change.
- Have to think long term – not 10 or 20 years but 50 years. The proposed bridge would provide a lower level of service and a one way couplet would just move traffic problems from Abbott to Gordon.
- A one-way couplet would not be good for the community and the couplet proposal should have been put to a referendum.
- Urged Council not to let the Province dictate to them.

## Council:

- Agreed that the debate of the OCP bylaw will not be tonight but rather at an upcoming Council meeting, due to the lateness of the hour (11:05 p.m.).

## David Lovell, president Kelowna South-Central Association of Neighbourhoods:

- Opposed to the couplet and 4-laning proposals. Road changes would have more impacts that would be fair. Support signal synchronization and dual left turn lanes at some intersections instead.
- Transit services are being cut back, no park and ride on the west side, etc.; makes the goals of Transportation Demand Management in the OCP unbelievable.

## Randy LaRue:

- Opposed to the one-way couplet proposal but supports improving north/south traffic flow with two-way traffic movements.
- Merchants on Bernard, Lawrence and Leon were not considered by the consultant when he assessed potential loss of business. Assessment of the downtown has been inadequate. Where is the City's due diligence on the businesses in the downtown area? Where are the impact studies and the plans to rebuild and redevelop the downtown? They should be part of this OCP so the downtown businesses can fully look at this.
- Suggest that the consultant's estimates of downtown business losses because of the couplet are low and will be substantially higher.
- Asked for another impact study looking at the downtown area.
- Seniors would avoid shopping in the downtown area because of confusion with one-way couplets.
- The downtown area is dying and nothing has been said tonight to indicate what the City will do to help the downtown merchants.
- Downtown business owners who will be impacted by the one-way couplet system feel like they being considered to be acceptable casualties.

## Jim Horn

- Was told that the bridge has to be replaced so that the sailboat owners do not have to wait to go under the bridge. The bridge's maximum capacity is almost exceeded today. Need to get our three MLAs to help us get the second crossing.
- The problem is larger than couplets and the bridge and the study area for the impact analysis. The problem is the increasing congestion from one end to the other on Highway 97, not just in the downtown. The Province created the problem and they need to resolve it by providing a second crossing. Meanwhile, the Province could resolve problems by making improvements on Highway 97 such as restricting left turns off of the highway and synchronizing traffic lights.
- Made a number of suggestions for improving traffic.

## John Hertay:

- Opposed to the one-way couplet based on personal experience in Edmonton when within 9 months of the street becoming one-way all of the businesses failed. Read a letter from Dennis Wilson, former alderman in the City of Lloydminster saying couplets worked well but that was because people stopped frequenting businesses on one way streets and traffic went elsewhere.
- Couplets would be a serious blow to the commercial viability of the downtown businesses. Estimates of their losses are conservative.
- Suggest remove the couplet from the OCP and take all the data the City and Province has and put it out to traffic professionals for a better answer.

## Gerry Holleti:

- Owner of a business in downtown Kelowna.
- The City needs to take responsibility for Harvey Avenue (Highway 97) so that traffic on the highway can be managed properly.
- The public and the business merchants do not want one way couplets.

## Debbie Helf, Marshall Street:

- Opposed to the Water/Pandosy connection which would destroy that neighbourhood. Clearly everyone is against it so confident Council will vote against it.
- Appealed to Council to reject the one way couplet and 4-laning of Lakeshore.

## Jennifer Forrest, 1973 Knox:

- Outlined highlights of studies she has seen on one way couplets, all concluding that two way is better than one-way corridors.
- Suggested that maybe the planning staff need a background in sustainable planning or some education in that regard.

## Roy Valcey:

- The public opposed the couplet and 4-laning of Lakeshore in 1995 yet both were put into the OCP.
- The South Pandosy businesses would all be impacted at a cost of \$6.4 to \$12.8 million per year. The impacts on residents would be enormous too.
- Asked that Council delay the one-way couplet to consider alternatives and consider holding a referendum.

## Carol Holton, Pandosy Street:

- Owner of a business in the South Pandosy and concerned that the impact of a one-way couplet would be detrimental to business and the citizens of Kelowna.
- Urged Council to follow the experience of other communities that are changing one-way couplets back to two-way streets and to take the time to process the options.

**Bill Travers, Pandosy Street:**

- Owner of a downtown business on Pandosy that would be impacted by the one-way couplet.
- Purchased the business because in the downtown core. Want to grow with the downtown core but cannot sustain the loss of revenue with the couplet.
- Traffic travels faster on one way streets and will create a hazard for families and their children.
- The one-way couplet would be the death of the downtown core.

**Barbara Hill:**

- Independent businesses are good; the owners live here and the profits stay here.
- Works at a supermarket on Pandosy Street that has been in her family for generations.
- The South Pandosy business district should not have to suffer the consequences of trying to solve the bridge problem.
- The South Pandosy merchants paid for the revitalization of South Pandosy and suffered the loss of business during construction.
- The one way couplet would destroy the South Pandosy business district.
- 4-laning Lakeshore and the couplet are the cheapest options but not the best.
- Need to lobby the Province for more money to fix the highway.

**Clint McKenzie, executive director of the Downtown Kelowna Association (DKA):**

- The majority of the DKA members are concerned about the negative economic impact of the couplet on the downtown area and feel there are better options that show promise.
- Asked that Council continue to examine alternatives and push the province for an alternative solution.
- Asked for a further economic impact analysis of the downtown area.

**Bonnie Bates-Gibbs:**

- Representing the Board of Directors of the Kelowna Chamber of Commerce.
- There is time between now and when the bridge is completed in 2008 to study all options. If the couplet proceeds, it should not be extended past Cadder until an impact analysis is done on businesses in the South Pandosy area and must look at ways to mitigate the impact on businesses in the downtown.
- Support the need for a new bridge and realize traffic issues have to be resolved but need to look for an alternative to the couplet.

**Larry Calvin:**

- Nobody wants the couplet and it is not going to work.
- Suggest redirect the money for the couplet toward construction of a relocated North End Connection that would connect to a second bridge.

**Dr. Arkinstall, Lakeshore Road:**

- Likened the one-way couplet and bridge issue to current problems with the medicare/health authority fiasco.

**Terri Birker:**

- Congestion is on the highway not the streets of downtown yet the proposed couplet solution would be negatively impacting the downtown to fix the problems on the highway.
- Pedestrians need more green light time, not cars.
- A one way couplet would be a short term solution and a lot of businesses would lose.
- Urged Council to stand up to the Province and push them to the right solution.

## Hans Birker:

- The majority of Council's constituents are in opposition to the couplet proposal.
- Urged Council to listen to their constituents and abandon the band-aid solution the couplet represents and direct staff to find a modern progressive solution rather than an antiquated solution.

## Al Barnes:

- Projects should have a cost benefit analysis and an economic analysis that includes all of the costs.
- Urged Council to direct staff to look at the total picture and do a serious financial analysis of the one-way couplet proposal.

## Jamie Brown:

- Constituents are asking Council to try to find another way and to not do that would result in great loss between the citizens, Council and City staff. It takes years to build the trust from the public.
- Urged Council to remove the couplet from the OCP and direct staff to find a better solution.

## Al Barnes:

- A couplet would lengthen his route considerably to the downtown locations where he recreates and does business. Others would be similarly impacted.
- The proposed couplet would increase congestion both on the highway and in the downtown area.
- Need more east-west routes to get local traffic off the highway.
- Suggested potential changes to roads to improve traffic routes.

## Mike Jacobs:

- The Province is committed to build Sea to Sky privately for the 2010 Olympics and that means there will be no money for Kelowna. Many projects that have been announced already will be delayed because of the money issue.
- The bridge needs to be replaced. Taxpayers are reaching a limit and cannot afford a \$60 million project to reach a solution.
- Supports the UDI suggestion to do a Pandosy/Water connection now but with two-way traffic. However, suspect that road will fail by 2011.
- Should convert Lawrence and Leon back to 2-way streets.
- Suggested solutions for handling traffic in the event that the couplet turns out to be the only viable solution.

## Ian Sisett:

- Roads are all interconnected. Change one and the flavour of the neighbourhood is changed.
- Urged Council to learn from the experience of others, find out what the people want and then do it.

## Sylvia Jennens:

- Suggested that building a second bridge from the Bear Creek area on the west side of the lake to Poplar Point on the east side would be less disruptive to traffic during construction and would solve the transportation problems. Could pay for the bridge using tolls. The Regional District of Central Okanagan and the residents on the west side of the bridge are creating a lot of the problem and should share some of the costs.
- Need to synchronize the traffic lights between Gordon Drive and Abbott Street.

## Gordon Jennens:

- The Bear Creek area to Poplar Point would be the best location at the least cost for a second lake crossing. His idea for a tunnel was new technology and the best thing for our lake but the Province kept on making the tunnel bigger and bigger until the cost made it unfeasible.

Liz Jarvis:

- Need to build a second bridge, with a toll if need be.
- Opposed to the couplet proposal.

Paul Currie-Johnson:

- Cyclist safety would be compromised with couplets.
- One way street patterns would create a safety concern for emergency vehicles to enter intersections.
- Pedestrians quit using the streets when traffic is busy and the result is an increase in crime.
- One-way couplets encourage speeding traffic.

Anne Laurie:

- Opposed to the couplet proposal because it would severely damage the ambience of Water Street and Padosy from The Grand to Padosy; the inherent traffic congestion; and the only access to the hospital would be via a one-way street.
- Need to encourage pedestrian traffic. Pedestrians are less likely to walk on one-way streets because traffic is moving more quickly making the road appear unsafe.

Valerie Hallford:

- Displayed pictures of one-way and two-way streets in the City of Toronto to illustrate the difference between the ambience on the streets.
- The proposed one-way couplet would be the death of the city.
- FRAHCAS has been opposing the one way couplet since 1998 because of the negative impact on the Abbott Street heritage area. That position has not changed, despite the leaflet that was circulated with local papers to educate the public on traffic flow options.
- Urged Council to remove 4-laning of Lakeshore and the couplet from the OCP.

Paul Tomelin:

- Congestion on the bridge and on the highway is a major problem.
- Opposed to a one-way couplet which would be detrimental to area residents and businesses.
- An elevated throughway above Highway 97 would be the most practical solution and could be paid for by imposing tolls.
- Drop the proposed North End Connector because the NEC would draw unnecessary traffic into residential areas and by Bankhead School.
- Eliminate the need for use of the lift span with permanent boat passage on the west side of the lake.
- Build 2 bridges side by side.
- Outlined what he sees as solutions to all the transportation problems.

Dorothee Birker, 1834 Ethel Street:

- Concerned about the community as a whole. Encouraged Council to take time to find a better solution.

Public Hearing

January 15, 2004

4. ADJOURNMENT:

Moved by Councillor Hobson/Seconded by Councillor Given

**P042/04/01/15** THAT the Public Hearing be adjourned to Monday, June 19, 2004, at 1:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber of City Hall.

Carried

The meeting adjourned at 3:04 a.m.

Certified Correct:

---

Mayor

---

City Clerk

BLH/am