

---

# CITY OF KELOWNA

## MEMORANDUM

---

**Date:** April 22, 2004  
**File No.:** OCP03-0002  
**To:** City Manager  
**From:** Planning and Corporate Services Department  
**Subject:** Supplemental Information Requested by Council

---

### 1.0 RECOMMENDATION

THAT Municipal Council not consider Official Community Plan Amendment No. OCP03-0002 (Grant Gaucher for Bertha and Douglas Flintoff – McKinley/Finch Roads).

### 2.0 BACKGROUND

Municipal Council Originally deferred initial consideration of the OCP Amending Bylaw application at a regular meeting on September 29, 2003. On October 6, Council endorsed a recommendation for staff to report back to Council with supplemental information, to be provided by the applicant and reviewed by City staff, regarding the potential infrastructure impacts of an approved development contemplated by the current OCP amendment application.

The applicant submitted consultant reports regarding transportation impacts, sanitary sewer extension and the provision of a community water system. The applicant also provided staff with reports regarding an economic impact study, a resort hotel feasibility study and a retail assessment. These economic studies were not considered as part of the staff review as the economic studies were focused on the resort operation and not on financial impacts regarding the infrastructure requirements.

The information provided by the applicant can be used to identify some of the major off-site infrastructure requirements that are beyond the current scope of the 20 Year Servicing Plan and Financing Strategy. However, this information is of a general nature as it is in response to a conceptual plan. In some cases there are issues that were not analyzed but can be expected to need further review should Council approve the OCP amendment as requested by the applicant. Furthermore, the application before Council is for a change in land use policy and does not represent an actual change in land use as opposed to a rezoning application. Therefore, the staff analysis and the consultant's information may or may not be the level of detail Council is looking for but it is useful in identifying the potential scope of the proposed development.

The Planning and Corporate Services Department has not changed the negative recommendation found in the original report (considered September 29, 2003). However, recognizing that the alternate recommendation provided in the original report would essentially be another way to stop the applicant's proposal, there are now two alternate recommendations for Council to consider at the end of this report.

### 3.0 SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

#### 3.1 Transportation

The applicant retained Ward Consulting Group to prepare a Traffic Impact Study for the proposed Vintage Landing Wellness Centre. The consulting report has been reviewed by the City's Traffic and Transportation Engineer and his comments have been considered in forwarding this information. It should be noted that there are some aspects of the methodology used to prepare the traffic impact study that would require further review should the proposed development proceed to the rezoning stage.

The major upgrading requirements as identified by the consultant are summarized on a map attached to this report as Schedule B. In summary, the following list of road requirements are either not within the 20 Year Servicing Plan or they need to be advanced in timing such that there would be additional cost to delivering the upgrades. It is staff's position that, should this development be supported, it is the clear understanding that any additional costs to delivering the required transportation upgrades would be the sole responsibility of the developer in addition to Development Cost Charges.

##### Development Impacts

- A second access to the site (Slater or Finch Roads) would be required by 2009.
- Upgrading of McKinley Road with improved geometry and cross section concurrent with the first phase of development. Although not mentioned in the report, this is planned by the City beyond 2020 on a new southerly alignment, connecting with Glenmore Road at the north end of the landfill site. As this work would be required by the development at first phase, it would be at the developers cost.
- Four laning of Glenmore Road from McKinley Road to Union Road by 2011. The report proposes upgrading Scenic Road but the City would prefer to route traffic to Union Road, an arterial road, with Scenic Road remaining a minor collector road. This widening is not required in the 20 Year Plan and is therefore the developer's responsibility.
- Upgrading of Scenic/Valley Road route needs to be done by 2008. The City would require Union and Valley to be upgraded to arterial standards and this is advancing the planned need by 3 to 8 years. A developer contribution would be assessed to cover the costs of bringing these improvements into place prematurely.
- Intersection improvements to Cross, Kane and Yates Road with Glenmore Road.

##### Items for Further Review

- Elements of the road network on Highway 97 at Airport Way, University Way and Sexsmith Road. Complicating these issues is the Gateway discussion which is ongoing.
- Impacts on the overall network in and around the Glenmore Valley will be effected by the extension of Clifton Road to McKinley and the future extension of the main north south arterial road through Wilden (Glenmore Highlands).
- The North End Connector (NEC) has not been included in the report. The need for a grade separated interchange at the NEC and Spall Road is not currently in the 20 Year Plan but may be triggered sooner with this proposed development.
- Timing of development. The report used a straight line or fixed rate of growth of background traffic at 4% per annum. If developments that are envisioned within the 20 year timeframe advance quickly, the relative timing of improvements needs to be reviewed.

### **3.2 Sanitary Sewer**

The applicant retained Protech Consulting Engineers to prepare a Sanitary Sewer Design Brief which was reviewed by the City's Waste Water Manager (see attached Schedule C). Although relatively thin on details, the report did indicate that a sanitary sewer routing can be achieved through a combination of gravity and force mains to connect to the existing Glenmore Trunk Sewer Main. The route used for the design brief indicates the main traversing private property that would roughly follow the ultimate alignment for McKinley Road as discussed under the Transportation section above. There are also no details on the proposed lift stations and pump station nor detailed elevations. In general, the design must maximize the amount of gravity sewer mains and minimize the length of forcemains. Any lift stations and/or pump stations that are proposed to be part of the public (City) system must be reviewed to ensure that they are designed to City standards including failsafe mechanisms.

The existing main from Union to Scenic on Glenmore will have to be replaced with a larger pipe as development comes on stream. The design brief also included a schedule for extending sewer service into McKinley Landing at an estimated cost of approximately \$15,700.00 per lot. There was no information regarding design for this work, only quantity surveys.

The Waste Water Manager has indicated that all of this sewer work would be at the developer's cost. He has also indicated a preference to ensure the main is designed to accommodate the development flows and the flows necessary to service McKinley Landing. Cost recovery options for servicing McKinley Landing would not involve the City.

The consultant's report did not analyze the impact of this development on the downstream sewer treatment plant capacities. Based on the flow rates provided by Protech, when fully developed, the proposed development would generate approximately 5.2 million litres per day of sewer discharge. While this amount of flow will not require the second sewer treatment plant to be built prior to 2020, it may require the planned expansion at the existing treatment plant to be built up to 5 years earlier than planned. This expansion is estimated at approximately \$29 million and advancing the construction date by five years would have significant financial ramifications to the City. If the development proceeds, design work for the expansion may have to be initiated as early as 2006 in order to have the capacity in place for the flows expected by 2010 with this development.

### **3.3 Water**

The subject property is within the future service area of Glenmore-Ellison Improvement District (GEID). As such, the applicant retained the services of Kerr Wood Leidal Consulting Engineers through GEID to prepare a report on conceptual water servicing (see Schedule D). The report has been reviewed by the City's Water Manager. The intent of the City reviewing the plan was to ensure that GEID would be capable of servicing not only this development but future development lands in this general area of the city. Otherwise, the City would have to consider other alternatives for the ultimate water service to the northern portion of the city. The City's Water Manager has indicated that the plan, while conceptual, is satisfactory to meet the long term objectives.

The consulting engineer's report indicates that the plan is conceptual and is contingent on GEID implementing a water supply from Okanagan Lake. They stress that by providing a conceptual plan, GEID is not making a commitment to service the lands with water and that the conceptual plan is based on a cooperative servicing strategy. The report identifies that the upsizing requirements over the GEID demands on a new

Okanagan Lake intake system to supply the proposed development lands would be in the order of \$2.1 million. There is no mention of irrigation requirements for the golf course. All on site delivery systems would be at the sole cost of the developer while GEID would be prepared to negotiate cost sharing on system components that provided mutual benefit to both the subject properties and the remainder of the GEID service area.

#### **4.0 CONCLUSION**

The information provided by the applicant and the review by City staff has provided a conceptual overview of the infrastructure requirements that would be directly attributable to the development proposal. Clearly, a more detailed review of each component would be required should the application advance to the rezoning stage. The applicant has indicated that he is prepared to address the magnitude of costs associated with the works that have been identified.

There are two elements of this review that staff must bring to Council's attention. Firstly, there has not been any financial review of the impact of accepting the new services into the City's maintenance program. While it may be acceptable to the developer to agree to installing the infrastructure, the City will be responsible to maintain at least the road and sanitary sewers once installed. Furthermore, no analysis has been done to determine if Development Cost Charges will be impacted by this development proposal, nor could this work be done without a specific development proposal.

Secondly, by allowing the proposal to proceed as essentially a stand alone development proposal, there is quite likely economies of scale that are being missed by not knowing what the ultimate development potential in this sector of the city is. Without a sector plan for this area, it is virtually impossible to know what the ultimate servicing requirements will be nor will a financing strategy be able to be formulated.

The staff report that was considered by Council on September 29, 2003 provided for an alternate recommendation that would require a sector plan to be prepared in order to consider this proposal. While still a sound alternate position, staff realize that the alternate recommendation would essentially be another way to turn the application down as the applicant has indicated that this proposal would not survive the length of time required to conduct a sector plan. Therefore, should Council support this proposed land use designation in the absence of a sector plan, a second alternate recommendation is provided.

## 5.0 ALTERNATE RECOMMENDATIONS

### Alternate Recommendation #1 (original)

THAT Municipal Council defer consideration of OCP Bylaw Amendment No. OCP03-0002 until such time as a Sector Plan for the North McKinley area has been completed.

### Alternate Recommendation #2 (new)

THAT Municipal Council consider OCP Bylaw Amendment No. OCP-0003 (Grant Gaucher for Bertha and Douglas Flintoff) on portions of; NW ¼ of Section 21, Township 23, ODYD, Except Plans DD24364 and 18403; SW ¼ of Section 28, Township 23, ODYD; NW ¼ of Section 28, Township 23, ODYD; and Fraction NE ¼ Section 29, Township 23, ODYD, Said to contain 91 Acres More or Less, as shown outlined on Schedule A attached to the report of the Planning and Corporate Services Department dated April 21, 2004 to change the Future Land Use Designation as shown on Map 19.1 of the City of Kelowna Official Community Plan from Future Urban Reserve to Area Structure Plan;

AND FURTHER THAT Municipal Council forward OCP Bylaw Amending application OCP03-0002 to a Public Hearing for further consideration.

---

Andrew Bruce  
Manager of Development Services

Approved for inclusion

R.L. (Ron) Mattiussi, A.C.P., M.C.I.P.  
Director of Planning & Corporate Services