

A Special Public Hearing of the Municipal Council of the City of Kelowna was held in the Council Chamber, 1435 Water Street, Kelowna, B.C., on Monday, January 19, 2004.

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

Council members absent: Councillor S.A. Shepherd (conflict of interest).

Staff members in attendance were: City Manager, R.A. Born; City Clerk, A.M. Flack; Manager of Policy, Research and Strategic Planning, S.K. Bagh; Planner-Long Range, G. Stephen; Parks Manager, J. Creron; Transportation Manager, R.W. Westlake; Traffic & Transportation Engineer, H. Thompson; and Council Recording Secretary, B.L. Harder.

(\* denotes partial attendance)

1. Mayor Gray called the Hearing to order at 1:30 p.m.
2. Mayor Gray advised that the purpose of the Hearing is to reconvene the Hearing that was adjourned at 3:04 a.m. on Thursday, January 15, 2004 in considering 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 proposed bylaw is presented for reading at the Regular Council Meeting which follows this Public Hearing.

Council will now hear from the people who signed the speaker's list but could not stay late enough to be heard, followed by others in the community who deem themselves affected who have new information that Council has not yet heard. Council debate will occur following the conclusion of the public hearing. Speakers are reminded of the 5 minute time limit for submissions to Council.

The City Clerk advised the 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 today's agenda were arranged and circulated to Council in accordance with Council Policy 309.

Councillor Cannan entered the Council Chamber at 1:38 p.m. and took his place at the Council Table.

3. INDIVIDUAL BYLAW SUBMISSIONS3.1 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.

Councillor Blanleil advised that the City Solicitor has determined that he is not in a conflict of interest because of his business interests and will continue to participate in the decision-making for the subject bylaw.

Councillor Day advised that the City Solicitor has determined that he is not in a conflict of interest as a developer and large property owner in the City of Kelowna and will continue to participate in the decision-making for the subject bylaw.

Councillor Hobson advised that his family also has a large development property within the City but that on the advice of the Solicitor he too would continue to participate in the decision-making for the subject bylaw.

The City Clerk advised that the following correspondence and or petitions had been received since the Public Hearing adjourned on January 15, 2004:

**Map Updates: Nil****Housing Policy/Distribution: Nil****One Way Couplet:****Letters of Opposition:**

Janet Smith

Kim Milnes, (resident of Vancouver)

Sylvia Jennens, 1978 McDougall Street

Darla Wiebe, 4116 Lakeshore Road

J. D. Longhurst

- Opposed on the basis that improving the current bridge is a “band-aid” solution; the one-way couplet would destroy the heritage character of the area, cripple downtown business, and create a loss of community connection; Kelowna taxpayers are footing the bill for west side residents; and suggesting that a new bridge be constructed from Bear Creek to the Poplar Point area to link up with the North End Connector.

Public HearingJanuary 19, 2004**Letters of Support:**

David Langton, 2240 Charleswood Drive  
 Ron and Asako Herrewynen, 390Uplands Court  
 Dawn Walker  
 Abe Friesen, 2-840 Lanfranco Road

- Supporting on the basis that one-way traffic is more efficient for achieving continuous traffic flow and would not adversely affect downtown businesses.

**Letters of Suggestion:**

Robert Decloux, 816 Rowcliffe Avenue  
 W.J and G.B Cooke, 548 Francis Avenue

- Suggestions for transportation options and street improvements.

**Letters of Opinion:**

Marc Whittemore, 205-1690 Water Street  
 Bill Harrison, 31-545 Glenmeadows Road  
 Darrell Kinner, 4331 Lysons Crescent  
 Dr. William W. Arkinstall

- Urging Council not to sacrifice the downtown community because the City feels "hostage" to the Provincial Government; and to support Ken Webster's idea of widening the bridge and synchronizing the traffic lights on Harvey, test it out and if bottle necks still occur, then look at alternatives.
- Information regarding the couplet is confusing to the public, which makes it difficult to make educated votes.
- Staff only seem to be concerned about cars and traffic, should focus on the working and living conditions of all of Kelowna's citizens.
- There has been no discussion on "alternate" plans about rerouting traffic.

**Future Land Use Updates:**Knox Mountain Park**Letters of Support:**

Tyler Dyck  
 Gerry Ring and Linda Sawchyn, 1497 Ayre Avenue  
 Darla Wiebe, 4116 Lakeshore Road

- Asking that Council maximize wild forest/parkland by adding to Knox Mountain Park.
- Linear parks along the waterfront need to be protected.
- Keep green space for younger and future generations in the downtown core.

Strathcona Walkway**Letter of Opposition:**

Darla Wiebe, 4116 Lakeshore Road

- The proposed walkway would have a negative affect on property values and cement walls are aesthetically unpleasing. Need to retain green space.

Change in Designation of Stockwell Avenue**Letter of Opposition:**

Dirk van Ulden, 1404 Graham Street

- Keep heavy traffic away from residential neighbourhoods, the increased traffic would be unsafe for pedestrians and children playing.
- Downtown residents choose to live in the downtown area, choosing not to put another vehicle on the road by using the downtown amenities.
- The change in designation is contrary to the City of Kelowna's Urban Centre Development Policies.

**Financial: Nil****General: Nil**

Mayor Gray invited those people in the public gallery who had signed the speakers list to come forward, followed by comments of Council.

Elise Clark:

- The people have provided well-thought out alternatives to the one-way couplet. Hope that the presentations Council heard at the Public Hearing on January 15<sup>th</sup> had the desired affect.
- The one-way couplet would be very harmful to our city. Moving traffic efficiently is not the only factor to be considered. Need to weigh the impact that has been demonstrated in other communities on the business community.
- The one-way couplet would increase traffic through residential neighbourhoods.

Ted Grimwood:

- Not directly affected by the one-way couplet but passionate about his concern for the neighbours and businesses that would be adversely affected.

Daphne Moore, 178 Mathison Place:

- Owns a business in the downtown and lives in an area that would be impacted by the one-way couplet.
- The proposed changes to Abbott, Water and Pandosy Streets will create traffic chaos for the local residents.
- Concerned that the decision on the one-way couplet has already been made.
- Urged Council to see that the one-way couplet is a road to disaster and that there are viable options.

Ian Graham, resident of Westbank:

- Encouraged Council to move toward a second crossing now and not proceed with the couplet.

Willa Brooks, 258 Riverside Avenue:

- The proposed Pandosy/Water connection would put a major road through a beautiful heritage area of the City.

Wes Kmet, 1110 Hillcrest Street:

- Spoke in support of the North End Connector to ease the traffic problem and questioned when it will be built.
- Traffic is inherent to big cities.
- The proposed one-way couplet would shake up traffic all the way up to Gordon Drive.
- Need a slower process to resolve the couplet issue.

Helen Schiele, 2681 Abbott Street:

- An alternative to the couplet could be to designate one lane as a bypass over Rutland to the bridge, just for through traffic.
- Could charge anyone who does not live in the Valley for the right to pass through the city.

Jim Cooke, 548 Francis Avenue:

- Need to plan and think beyond the term of the present OCP.
- Suggest Council set aside the issue of traffic congestion and the proposed Okanagan Lake bridge for 6 months to 1 year and establish a standing committee to develop 5, 20 and 50 year plans.
- Establish a special levy from the property owners of Kelowna (15% of individual tax bills) over the next 5-10 years that would be dedicated to addressing traffic issues within the city. The special levy should start this year.
- Inform the Ministry of Transportation that more time is needed to resolve the issues.
- Provincial funds should be committed to the City of Kelowna regardless of the alternative selected.

Lanna Garrison, 1028 Cushing Court:

- Opposed to the one-way couplet. Just because the couplet is the best solution so far does not mean it is the right solution. Need more time.
- Good decisions also involve long term planning; hopefully there will be long term thought about what will happen in future (i.e. increases in pollution from increased traffic).
- Smart Growth BC is a group that helps communities develop sustainable long term plans and they may be able to help Kelowna.
- Would like to see the City's response to the 10 points that the NOW Society has come up with for why they are opposed to the one-way couplet.

Michael Irwin, 806 Burne Avenue:

- Questioned why Council would develop a cultural district and then drive a stake through the cultural district with the proposed traffic patterns.
- Suggested that Ellis Street be the substitute for Water Street, on the north side of the highway instead of destroying the Lake Avenue neighbourhood.

Rosemarie Gottschaleg:

- Owns a business on Bernard Avenue.
- The one way couplet will not solve traffic congestion on the highway, nor will the 5-lane bridge because for one reason tourism will increase with all the publicity world-wide last year.
- The downtown is the heart and soul of a city. Improvements made over the years in downtown Kelowna give it great potential to become a model downtown in north America. Now it seems like Council is willing to destroy that ambience in the downtown.
- Fast one-way streets are not child friendly or friendly for seniors.
- Even a perception that things are not good downtown will keep people away. Adding two major one-way streets doubles the negative impact instantly.  
Do not understand how Council can accept that downtown businesses could lose 20-30% in income as a viable option. The downtown merchants have helped to make downtown what it is to day.
- The traffic problem is not downtown, it is on the highway. There will always be traffic problems and they can be alleviated but not eliminated
- A second lake crossing is needed now, not in 10 years.
- Do not spend money improving the existing bridge.

Don Graham, Okanagan Mission Residents Association:

- Two of the Association's members attended the City's financial planning session this fall. It was said that the City would save a lot of money by getting away from a big pipe solution for storm drainage. With the removal of that solution, residents in the Mission are concerned with the solution that will replace that, particularly since the forest fire. Would appreciate a large scale solution to that.
- Concerned about the 4-laning of Lakeshore and the couplet.

Anne Hulse, Scallywags Junction, 293 Pandosy Street:

- The affects of the one-way couplet would be devastating to many and would kill any hope of a thriving business. Suggest that if any Councillors had a business in the Pandosy or downtown area, they would be objecting too.
- Lakeshore Road should be kept as a scenic drive and not 4-laned; Gordon Drive is the obvious better choice.
- Implored Council to listen to constituents and not dismiss their reaction. The decision Council makes will have a far reaching impact on the residents of Kelowna. Need to find the best solution and that is not the couplet. Keep the emphasis on community and neighbourhood creation.

Coralie Susser, 2435 Fairhall Road:

- Owns a business in Tutt Street Square and would be indirectly affected if the couplet proceeds.
- The community perception is negative. How the January 15<sup>th</sup> Public Hearing was structured was insulting. 98% of the people were there to speak about the couplet yet that was the last item on the agenda for discussion.
- There is a lot of confusion that the Province is pressing Council to remedy the perceived traffic problems with the bridge, and that the couplet has been in the OCP for over 8 years and the public should have objected before now if opposed. Need to be able to trust that Council has looked at every possible remedy before deciding.
- Encouraged Council to consider that this is not the time to make the decision and to set up a committee as suggested by Mr. Cook with representatives of the community that would be affected by the couplet and to have a lot more discussion and a more serious look at other possible solutions.

Mo Rajabally, 940 Bartholomew Court:

- Does not see that traffic is a problem in Kelowna; Highway 97 is the problem and the bottleneck at each end.
- Urged Council to take more time to make their decision.
- A second crossing would be a better solution.

Carol Halton, 2820 Pandosy Street:

- The Cedar Avenue land use planning area is currently under moratorium - understand the Pandosy guidelines will allow higher buildings - concerned that the view of established development could be negatively impacted.
- Opposed to the couplet and would like it removed from the OCP.
- Suggested how traffic could be changed (leaving everything two-way) to solve the problem.

Cliff Moore, 1619 Pandosy Street:

- Seems like the couplet is proposed only to satisfy the Ministry of Transportation's condition for improving the bridge. Construction of the bridge is scheduled for 2008 - the government will likely change before then and the bridge plan may be lost.
- Recent improvements to the bridge were done at huge expenditure. Any more money would be better spent providing the second lake crossing. With the density projections in the OCP one lake crossing cannot possibly work.

Rita Milne, 1206 Trevor Drive:

- Owns a business in the downtown.
- The people who take the time to come out and sit in the gallery to address Council should make a difference and be listened to. Urged Council to listen to the people who came out on January 15<sup>th</sup> and take the couplet out of the OCP and find a better alternative.
- Need to educate people moving from the South Mission to the downtown to use Gordon Drive.
- The movement of traffic on the highway is the responsibility of the Ministry of Transportation.

Ian Taylor, 781 Wardlaw Avenue:

- The couplet would destroy the community in the south end of the city.
- There would be no traffic problem if it was just local traffic on our roads. It is the transport trucks that are causing the problem and damaging our roads.
- The highway is the problem of the Province.
- Extend Guisachan through to Benvoulin and 4-lane Benvoulin.
- Get the Province to give the City carte blanche to take any property in the city out of the Agricultural Land Reserve.

Steve Kabella:

- Highway 97 should be part of the National Transportation Grid.
- Suggested an alternative route for the North End Connector and a second crossing that would allow sailboats to pass underneath without need for a lift span.

John Zeger, 1421 Sutherland Avenue:

- Speaking on behalf of Citizens for Responsible Community Planning, a local group of about one dozen concerned citizens.
- The public wants more time to debate this issue and for the planning process to be more meaningful.
- Suggested that the matter of the couplet be decided by public referendum.

Michael Neil:

- Commented on the negative impacts of proceeding with the Water/Pandosy connection as a two-way road. Benefit needs to be compared to leaving Pandosy as it is and using Water Street as an entry exit from the bridge with an advanced turn green light.
- Opposed to 4-laning Lakeshore Road.
- If there is not going to be a second lake crossing then the development of interchanges will have to be considered and the Province will have to recognize that it is fair to share in those costs.

David Marshall, 5090 Southridge Drive:

- Moved out of the Abbott Street Heritage Conservation Area out of frustration because Council was not protecting the heritage area.
- The people coming to these meetings care; the people not coming to the meetings probably do not even know about the couplet issue.
- Enough people are concerned that the couplet not go ahead that it should be put on hold and have another look at alternatives. Council ought to be telling the Provincial and Federal governments what they are hearing from the public.
- Urged Council to not make the decision to 4-lane Lakeshore Road hastily; Lakeshore Road should remain a neighbourhood road.
- Maybe a referendum is a good idea.
- Kelowna ought to learn from other cities that have been dealing with similar problems.

Peter Schultz:

- The couplet idea is not a good solution economically.
- The sensible alternative would be to go with selective access to the highway. The Province is supportive of that if it resolves the traffic congestion problem. Selective access would not cost anything, and if interchanges or other changes are needed down the road, they could be done as required. Selective access would steer traffic naturally to routes that people find get them to the highway easiest and quickest.
- If there were no left turns off Pandosy onto Harvey, there would not be traffic congestion on Pandosy.

Roy Hulse, 5020 Killdeer Road:

- Concerned about discussing important issues that are in the OCP at the eleventh hour like this.
- Suggest allowing left turns from Gordon Drive onto Harvey and widen the junction to see how that works.
- Remove 4-laning of Lakeshore from the OCP and retain Lakeshore Road as a neighbourhood road.
- The traffic congestion at Harvey and Pandosy, Richter and Abbott is caused by traffic coming down Springfield Road to get onto the highway. It is not traffic from the South Mission area.

Bob Runnalls, Pooley Road:

- Also owns property in the downtown area.
- Adamantly opposed to a one-way couplet and does not agree with making Water Street one-way north of the Highway.
- The Ministry of Transportation (MOT) is responsible for the traffic problems on the highway and MOT should say there can be no left turns onto the highway between Richter Street and the bridge.

Paul Currie-Johnson, 772 Sutherland Avenue:

- One way streets have no lane for emergency vehicles to use to get through intersections and could be a detriment to emergency vehicle response times.
- The couplet would limit the ability to evacuate the neighbourhoods in the South Mission should the need arise.
- The couplet would reduce property values and detrimentally impact the neighbourhoods south of Harvey, especially in the heritage conservation areas; residents and businesses would suffer.
- The couplet is the wrong solution and should be removed from the OCP.

Wilhelmina Brown, 320 Strathcona Avenue:

- Urged council to keep working on these plans until the public is pleased.

Randy LaRue, 1634 Casorso Road:

- The assessment for commercial property he owns in the 200 block of Lawrence Avenue has already gone down and the couplet will reduce property values further.
- The downtown area is suffering in a major way but there are no tax waivers or DCC reductions as incentives to develop in the downtown.
- The Okanagan Valley would be in serious trouble if there was a catastrophic failure of the current or any future bridge. That needs to be stressed with the Province in pushing for a second crossing. Need to pursue the second crossing now and then we can work toward replacing or improving the existing bridge.

David Lovell, Lawrence Avenue:

- Worried about one way streets in pedestrian and cyclist oriented areas of the city.
- The City has been trying to get more residential into the downtown and downtown Kelowna is supposed to be a people place. Widening roads attracts more traffic and discourages pedestrians.
- Opposed to the couplet plan and 4-laning of Lakeshore Road.



Gordon Jennens,

- A tunnel is the solution for a second lake crossing from Bear Creek to Poplar Point and a tunnel can be done for less cost. We are wasting our time adding more traffic onto Harvey Avenue.

Barbara Hill, Lakeview Market:

- Concerned that the impact of the couplet on South Pandosy will be detrimental for businesses.
- Believes in the town centre concept and investing in the town centres to keep them alive.
- A 3-laned one-way Pandosy Street would send shoppers to Costco and larger chain stores and kill the smaller businesses. Need the middle lane on Pandosy for people to pull into when they want to turn left.

Mike Haines, 1421 Sutherland Avenue:

- Suggest that Council's decisions will be flawed if based on the numbers in favour and against the couplet on Thursday.
- Asked council to remember that the vote they make today will reverberate throughout the community for years to come.

Valerie Hallford, Park Avenue:

- Traffic travelling from the South Mission to the downtown should be directed to Gordon Drive instead of going through residential areas. Residents who have chosen to live close to town so that they do not have to drive should not be penalized with the air pollution and traffic from the South Pandosy area.
- The solution is not to build bigger and better roads but to make many options available - alternative methods and routes.
- The grid lock on Pandosy is caused by traffic coming from Landmark Square down Springfield Road to get to Pandosy or to get to Abbott via Park Avenue. The proposed north/south couplet solutions would not solve that problem.
- Opposed to building the Pandosy/Water connection with 2-way traffic. The additional traffic would destroy the neighbourhood in that area. The residents of the area feel very strongly that this is not a solution.
- Questioned why Council would want to put a race track past the hospital.
- Urged Council to remove the one-way couplet, the 4-laning of Lakeshore and to not substitute the connection of Water/Pandosy in the OCP.

Michelle Neil co-owner of Mosaic Books downtown:

- The grid lock is on the highway onto the bridge, not the side streets (Richter or Pandosy).
- Instead of the couplet, people can use Benvoulin and Gordon and KLO – they will migrate there naturally.
- Lives in the South Pandosy area and would not walk his dog down Pandosy or send his children across Pandosy Street once the road is 3-laned.
- Opposed to the couplet and to the boardwalk extension – would like to see the waterfront stay natural.

Cherie Hanson, 557 Okanagan Boulevard:

- The demographics for a successful cultural centre is mainly older people but they will not come if the traffic situation is dangerous. A proposed couplet would not be good for the cultural centre.
- Suggest time the traffic lights so that Richter, Gordon, Spall and Highway 33 are the long stops. Turns onto the highway should be limited during rush times. Successful transit can make a great deal of difference too. Can relieve the pressure with shuttles and park and rides. Can have run lanes too – they work beautifully.
- Should consider holding town hall meetings at least once a month so citizens can give direct input to Council. It would save time for everyone in the long run.

Staff, in response to some questions of Council:

- The proposed future land use designation for the Boppart property is similar to the surrounding properties that have been developed. The proposed change would provide the benefit of the property developing to an urban level of services and would provide for a public trail system along the top of the cliff.
- Explained various options that have been considered for resolving traffic problems.
- Project that the proposed couplet would work well for 20 years.
- The intention of the proposed waterfront walkway is to ensure year-round public access. The walkway would be maximum 5.5 m in width and the boardwalk through Maude Roxby would be up to 4 m wide. The walkway is shown on the future land use map as a concept. The design can be phased but still provide potential for widening in future.
- The intent of the couplet was to address the need to move traffic fluidly to the bridge between Abbott and Richter.
- The Ministry of Transportation wants the traffic solutions in place at the time the new bridge is operational. We probably have 2 years or so to come up with alternatives to the couplet. At the current time MOT is asking the City to enter into an agreement to say the improvements, whatever they may be, will be in place.
- The Ministry of Transportation advises that the proposed bridge upgrade should last until 2025 and beyond that a second crossing would be needed. The existing bridge has reached its capacity now.

4. TERMINATION:

The Hearing was declared terminated at 7:16 p.m.

Certified Correct:

---

Mayor

BLH/am

---

City Clerk