

Public HearingMay 25, 2004

A Public Hearing of the Municipal Council of the City of Kelowna was held in the Council Chamber, 1435 Water Street, Kelowna, B.C., on Tuesday, May 25, 2004.

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

Council members absent: Councillor R.D. Hobson.

Staff members in attendance were: City Manager, R.A. Born; Acting City Clerk, S.C. Fleming; Manager of Development Services, A.V. Bruce; and Council Recording Secretary, B.L. Harder.

(\* denotes partial attendance)

1. Mayor Gray called the Hearing to order at 7:04 p.m.
2. Mayor Gray advised that the purpose of the Hearing is to consider certain bylaws which, if adopted, will amend "*Kelowna 2020 - Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 7600*", and all submissions received, either in writing or verbally, will be taken into consideration when the proposed bylaws are presented for reading at the Regular Council Meeting which follows this Public Hearing.

The Acting City Clerk advised the Notice of this Public Hearing was advertised by being posted on the Notice Board at City Hall on May 5, 2004, and by being placed in the Kelowna Daily Courier issues of May 17 & 18, 2004 and in the Kelowna Capital News issue of May 16, 2004, and by sending out or otherwise delivering 27 letters to the owners and occupiers of surrounding properties between May 5-6, 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. INDIVIDUAL BYLAW SUBMISSIONS

3.1 **3650 Finch Road, West of Slater Road, 1595 Glenmore Road North, 2010 McKinley Road**

- 3.1 Bylaw No. 9235 (OCP03-0002) – 622664 B.C. Ltd. – Grant Gaucher – Finch Road, West of Slater Road, Glenmore Road North, McKinley Road – To amend "*Kelowna 2020 - Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 7600*" by changing the Future Land Use Designation of the subject development area from Future Urban Reserve to Area Structure Plan to facilitate a proposed Comprehensive Commercial Resort and Wellness Centre, Vineyard Area, Golf Course Area, and Future Urban Reserve.

Staff:

- The applicant is proposing to develop the site with a comprehensive commercial resort that includes a hotel/conference centre, wellness centre, vineyard/winery, and golf course. The proposed Official Community Plan (OCP) amendment would allow for the generalized land uses proposed. The golf course would be designated Parks and Open Space and the resort and wellness centre as Commercial. The vineyard proposed on the northern portion of the property is a permitted use in the A1 zone and therefore is not part of this OCP amendment, nor are the areas that would remain designated as Future Urban Reserve.

Public HearingMay 25, 2004

- The OCP amendment also identifies the overall boundary of the lands included within the Area Structure Plan (ASP) area. The ASP will spell out in more detail the proposed land uses, servicing and other components of the proposal.
- The current OCP extends to year 2020. With that comes transportation, capital and servicing plans all tied to a growth management strategy which tries to predict what will be needed to accommodate the projected growth and ensures that the City can provide the necessary services. This area is currently unserviced and the City's capital and transportation plans do not envisage taking services to this site so the cost of extending those services would be put back on the applicant.
- Concerned that if the proposed project proceeds it could open the McKinley Landing area up for development prematurely.
- The application was considered and supported by the Advisory Planning Commission in August 2003, subject to the applicant completing an ASP.
- Council first considered the application in September 2003 when staff recommended that Council not consider the OCP amendment because the area is designated Future Urban Reserve. Future Urban Reserve is land not projected for development in the OCP 20 year planning horizon. It is a pool of land that the City is reserving for growth beyond the 20 year time frame. Council deferred further consideration of the concept pending receipt of additional information from the applicant regarding the impact of servicing the lands.
- Staff reported back to Council in April 2004 summarizing the servicing aspects of the concept. The report covered the development impacts on the transportation network, sanitary sewer infrastructure, and domestic water supply. The report also detailed some major improvements that would be required beyond the 20 year serving plan. Council adopted the alternate recommendation in that report, advancing the proposed OCP amendment to a Public Hearing, and staff report back with a further report in May 2004 putting that recommendation formally before Council for adoption.
- Staff provided a further supplemental report in May 2004 reiterating earlier positions and making it clear that consideration of this OCP amendment would be on the understanding that the applicant would be required to address the servicing issues such that there would be no impact on the 20 year capital and servicing plan. That allows Council to proceed without having to redo the City's 20 year servicing plan.
- Staff still do not recommend support for the OCP amendment.

The Acting City Clerk advised that the following correspondence and or petitions had been received:

**Letters of Support:**

- Wayne & Karen Reszitznyk, 2105 McKinley Road
  - Doug & Jean Flintoft, McKinley Landing
  - Sheila Clark & Guy Phinney, 2090 Bennett Road
  - Al Kuhn, 4000 Glenmore Road North
  - Robert & Diana Moyer, 1602 Bennett Road
  - Heather & Ted Taron, 1306 McKinley Road
  - Bill & Christina Street, 2100 Bennett Road
  - John & Evelyn Carr, 2160 Bennett Road
  - Hugh Culver, Marathon Communications Inc.
  - Brian Martin, Lake Country Family Practice Associates
  - Ken Bessason, Kelowna Chamber of Commerce
- Suggesting that the development will help with the economy and bring in additional taxes, bring needed infrastructure to the area, and be good for tourism.

**Letters of Opposition:**

- McKinley Landing Residents Association, 2630 Dubbin Road
- Sid Rowles, 1959 Cross Road
- Barbara & Roger Ball, 2064 Dewdney Road
- Joe Gordon, 2329 Dewdney Road (2 letters)
- Richard Drinnan, 669 Greene Road
- Gary & Denise Blake, absentee owners of a lot on Finch Road
- Marian & Ted Grimwood, 4574 Doeksen Road
- Dr. Michael Ertel, on behalf of the 3 medical consultants for the subject project
- Nick Finn & Heidi Schroter, 4102 Finch Road
- Robert Newby, 3702 Finch Road
- Jenice Lawrence

Opposed generally on the basis of increased heavy vehicle traffic and noise during the long construction period, increased traffic, and the application is at odds with the City of Kelowna OCP and 20-Year Servicing Plan.

**Neutral:**

- letter from the Glenmore-Ellison Irrigation District (GEID) asking that certain measures be taken throughout development to protect the McKinley Reservoir.
- letter from Tony Markoff, 744 Barnaby Road, not indicating whether in support or opposed.

Mayor Gray invited the applicant or anyone in the public gallery who deemed themselves affected to come forward, followed by comments of Council.

**Gail Temple, representing the applicant:**

- The property is 718 acres and easily accessed from the airport.
- The project would include a 200-suite chateau style hotel located at the waterfront along with a luxury spa and conference space, beach club units, a boat launch and marina village with waterfront restaurants, and hillside bungalow units clustered around the main hotel. The entire resort would be interconnected with pedestrian trails. Phase 1 of the wellness centre would be about 60,000 sq. ft. in size with a focus on preventative medicine. The retreat centre would be around an existing wetland and would consist of a main lodge and up to 30 cabins. The main vineyard would be 40 acres; the visitor winery would be chateau style, and the championship golf course would comprise 150 acres at the south end where lands are flat and rolling. No permanent housing is planned for this project. The public would have full access to the trail system.
- Projected phasing envisages the main hotel and beach club facilities, 60,000 sq. ft. wellness centre, golf course, vineyard, public boat launch and trail system in phase 1; the marina village, retreat centre, and additions to the wellness centre in phase 2. All facilities would be available to the public.
- The entire shoreline is curved with rock bluffs on either end. The facility would only be visible from one residence and it is across the lake so the location will always feel remote.
- Outlined the road upgrades, on and off-site, that would be undertaken with the first phase of development, and at 50%, 70% and 80% build-out.
- The project would be serviced by sanitary sewer, sized for the development land only but with capacity to service the existing McKinley Landing.
- Two options are available for water service; McKinley Landing Waterworks and/or the Glenmore-Ellison Irrigation District.
- Economic impact during construction phase: \$577 million spent on direct construction, 682 full-time yearly jobs, total economic output \$1.28 billion.
- Property tax revenue to the City over the 10 year build-out projected at \$102 million.
- Infrastructure would be paid for by the developer, with no impact on DCCs and no impact on the City's 20 year servicing plan.

Public HearingMay 25, 2004

- Not losing future urban reserve, just realizing the potential on some of that land earlier than anticipated. The intent is to keep the golf course but the golf course land could be future urban reserve land bank. The balance of the lands remain in the future urban reserve.
- The property could be developed into 10 acre parcels but this proposal makes better use of the land.
- The Area Structure Plan would compliment a future Sector Plan for the area. The studies undertaken for this development would give City staff a framework for long term options for the McKinley Landing area.
- Asked for approval of the land use concept. Details would be worked out over the ASP and rezoning process.
- Outlined the analysis, assessments and studies that have been undertaken.

Sharene Young, 1875 McKinley Road:

- Spoke in support for the resort. OCPs can be amended and it would be easier to amend the City of Kelowna OCP and wait to do the sector plan when Council and City staff have more time.
- Many of the residents are frustrated because they feel bullied by the McKinley Landing Residents Association. Not sure how a few can publicly claim to represent the area when there has not been a clear vote with the association.

Noel Mulloy, 2088 Dewdney Road:

- Is a member of the McKinley Landing Residents Association and does not feel a bit bullied.
- Likened this application to a man wanting to get married and spending all the money and making all the arrangements before asking the woman and then expecting that because of everything that he has done she cannot turn him down.

Barbara Shave, 417-550 Yates Road:

- Not for or against the project.
- Is representing the water task force for the community water association. Concerned about water. The applicant has no agreement with GEID to supply water and at this point there is only a feasibility study to rely on.
- An 18 hole golf course, hotel, and all the other amenities will require huge water use. Would like to know where that water is going to come from.

Penny Harris, 3962 Finch Road:

- Purchased their property for the peace and serenity in the area. The integrity of the whole area would be ruined by the concept as it stands. Would have to deal with the noise and increased traffic from the marina; cannot imagine being in the middle of a medical treatment and hearing all that noise. If this is truly a wellness centre and not a disguised condo centre, then a marina has no place.
- The developer says the project has to be rushed because otherwise he could lose his investors and his target market is the baby boomers. As a baby boomer herself, is not impressed with the idea that in 20 years she will not be around.
- Questioned whether the business plan would be viable.
- Council should disband the Planning Department and save the taxpayers the cost if the intent is to ignore the OCP. The planners must be beginning to think their work is futile. They deserve the support of Council.

Jim Dukelow, 3972 Finch Road:

- A Sector Plan should be in place before this development is considered to be sure that what is proposed is the best use of the land and there should be no rush in developing it.

Public HearingMay 25, 2004Elizabeth Rambold, 737 Cornation Avenue:

- Supports the project; would like to see a hotel out by the airport.
- Would enjoy a day trip to the resort for health education.
- Would prefer to see larger projects such as this in a peaceful location, away from the hustle and bustle of our city centre.

Kathy Heffernan, 2505 Dubbin Road:

- Questioned why Council is in such a hurry to open up the OCP to the pressure of development. Need systematic and visionary planning and to not be in a hurry to tie what cannot be untied. Time passes quickly.
- Read comments from her sons (18 and 16 year olds) opposing the application and asking that the natural beauty of the Valley be preserved.

Walter Siemens, 4240 Glenmore Road:

- Operates the Glenmore poultry farm and is concerned about water. Needs water to keep farming but cannot afford to pay to extend water from GEID and Winfield Waterworks refuses to extend water to his property.
- The applicant is willing to extend the water and provide the services he needs and therefore he supports this application.

Ingo Grady, member of the Mission Hill Family Estate:

- The current access route from the airport is unsightly.
- Mission Hills Winery has over 125,000 visitors a year and they encourage all like-minded initiatives.
- This project would bring significant improvements to aesthetic appeal and result in enhanced pride among the McKinley Landing residents.

John Zeger, Citizens for Responsible Community Planning (CRCP):

- CRCP is a group of about 20 members with a self-imposed mandate to review the major planning proposals in the city and respond accordingly.
- The subject application would remove significant land from the future land reserve which should be maintained.
- The character of the neighbourhood would be irrevocably altered.
- Encouraged Council to deny the OCP amendment.

Tanya Stronig, vice-president of administration, Prestige Inns and Resorts:

- Supports the application. The proposed development would put Kelowna on the map as a resort destination, is in line with current health trends, and would benefit our tourism trade.

Shane Jamieson, 1892 Dewdney Road:

- Concerned about the financial impacts on all taxpayers in Kelowna.
- The project has been misrepresented to the City. Signs posted for the public indicate it is a wellness clinic; phase 1 to be built in 10 years. So, the wellness clinic would only be available for use by 2014. The health aspect seems like an after-thought and a small portion of what is proposed.
- If the applicants are allowed to bulldoze their way in then the City should allow anyone to develop on an ad hoc basis. It is insulting for the applicant to expect Council to fall for this tactic. The property will be attractive to any financier later on too.
- The consultant studies prepared by Grant Thornton and Kerr Wood Leidal are flawed and both are done with the intention of supporting the project. The taxpayers would be on the hook for the City's share if the developers went bankrupt and no taxes were to come in from this project. The present mill rate is subject to increases but there is no allowance for inflation or tax increases in the studies.
- The developers plan to use raw water from the lake for watering the landscaping. Phase 1 would use 1.3 million litres per day.
- The developers will make their profit and leave; they would not be running the facility.

Public HearingMay 25, 2004

- Need to insist on use of renewable energy sources for large size buildings.
- If the developers cannot find all the contractors they need locally they will be brought in from out of town so the jobs generated may not be a big benefit to the local community.
- The applicants are asking Council to rush this project through; staff do not recommend considering development in this area until 2020.

Chuck Poulsen, McKinley Landing resident:

- An Agriculture Canada guide that rates which properties could and could not grow good quality grapes rates the land on a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being the worst. The subject property is rated 5 with some of the land where the vineyard is proposed being rated worse than 5.
- The three medical doctors who were involved in the project have submitted a letter withdrawing their support.
- The local community are not behind the project.
- If the development proceeds, then suggest they build the golf course, the vineyard and the wellness centre first and then do the resort.
- The project has been dubbed a monstrosity on the lake.

Vic LeBouthillier, president of a health resort outside Mable Lake:

- Did a lot of research about wellness centres before opening his health resort.
- Does not know of any community in Canada that would not wish to have this type of facility – it is clean industry with a great economic impact.
- The project is modelled after existing successful world class wellness villages. Wellness is what will attract the people but a golf course is integral – people want amenities to go with the wellness centre.
- Supports the application. Change is inevitable and needs to be managed.
- Council has a responsibility to look at this globally. The Country is in a health crisis and the system of health care needs a revolution.
- The applicant's vision is health, not land development.
- Health care has to go private and this project offers health care solutions.

Charlie Harris, 3962 Finch Road:

- The development would destroy the peacefulness and tranquillity of the area and would set the stage for unlimited development along the lake.
- If this application is approved, then Council should eliminate the Planning Department and let the developers determine the course our community will take.
- The project could end up being high density apartments, a huge marina, or a favourite hangout for undesirable elements.
- Need more information regarding the environmental impact on wildlife.
- Asked that Council solidly reject this OCP amendment.

Brenda Elmore, 2722 Dubbin Road:

- Primarily concerned about the marina and boat traffic. There will be a great deal of boat traffic if a marina goes in; boat traffic can be loud and disruptive to the peace.
- Likes some of the ideas about the wellness centre but has serious reservations that it will end up being a hotel.
- Is well aware of the amount of noise people make when they do not live in the area.
- The taxpayers paid to have the OCP developed. Staff say the application is premature. The developer is in a hurry or his financing will disappear but the land will only go up in value. It is not fair to rush this application.
- Purchased their property a year ago for the peace and tranquillity. Were compelled to leave the Okanagan Mission area because of the traffic and the noise. Spent all their savings to buy here and this is causing her stress trying to protect her little piece of paradise.
- The vision for development of the subject property does not fit with her vision. Do not need a golf course or marina or a vineyard or a winery to have a wellness centre.
- Concerned that the developers will be starting something they cannot finish, like the Conservatory project in Glenmore.

Public Hearing

May 25, 2004

Public HearingMay 25, 2004Paul Latimer, 2765 Arthur Road:

- Realize that one day McKinley Landing is going to be developed; however, would like to see a Sector Plan for McKinley Landing and the surrounding area in order to know what the future holds and would like to have some input into the plan.
- It is ridiculous to compare the proposed wellness centre to the Mayo Clinic. Is a doctor himself and has seen the Mayo Clinic and the two centres cannot be compared.

Rob Moyor, 1602 Bennett Road:

- There is a small group of people in McKinley Land who have been quite vocal and are circulating a 30 page document that slanders his name to some point. That group of people does not represent the community.
- When he developed his property in McKinley he had more than half the people sign in support and anticipate that those same people support this proposal as well.
- This is an excellent development proposal. Does not think there is any doubt that the developer will build what is proposed. This type of development would be good for the City of Kelowna. Council needs to be courageous and stand in the face of opposition. Council amends the OCP almost weekly so that is not an issue. The key is having control over what goes on and Council has that.

Council noted that there were still many speakers to be heard and agreed that given the lateness of the hour, they would not call to order the Special Meeting that was scheduled to convene following the close of this meeting in order to give Council the option of giving the subject bylaw reading consideration.

Wayne Leonard, 2630 Dubbin Road:

- Is president of McKinley Landing Residents Association. A survey of the Association membership this past weekend indicated that the majority of the 62 respondents did not support this application and that the OCP should be adhered to. Was broadsided at the meeting by unexpected opposition. Only residents who have been members of the Association for 30 days and who have their dues paid up are permitted to vote.
- Precedent was established with the Moyor development.
- Sprawling development impacts the environment and the taxpayer.
- Information and analysis regarding the proposed development is inconsistent; too many issues lack substance and credibility. The estimated costs for developing a championship golf course are unrealistic. McKinley Landing is surrounded by developer owned property. If the area is to develop before the 20 year timeframe, would like to have a Sector Plan in place first so that the area residents can have a voice in the planning process.
- If this is approved, the developer would be exploiting the community resources for no return other than developer profit.

Krystaal Shzyourm, 894 Dehart Road:

- Is a massage therapist. Sees the wellness centre as an opportunity for practitioners involved in preventative health to work together.

Mohini Singh, 2115 Bennett Road:

- Vintage Landing has been the topic of conversation in McKinley Landing for a long time. The neighbourhood concern is about what would happen if the financing was lost midway through the project.
- Supports the project from an economic point of view as it will create jobs and bring money into Kelowna and because the developer would be making needed improvements to McKinley Road.
- This is a unique project that is new and novel to the City of Kelowna. Is satisfied to leave it to Council to ensure that environmental issues are appropriately addressed.



Public HearingMay 25, 2004Laureen Redman:

- Attended a City of Kelowna strategic planning session visioning to 2020. Two strong messages were delivered to City Planners; more growth and more opportunities are needed for our kids.

Wayne Reszitynk, 2105 McKinley Road:

- Proposed road improvements would make McKinley Road much safer for pedestrians and motorists.
- Improvements to water and fire services would reduce high insurance costs for homeowners in McKinley Landing.
- The applicant has a good reputation and a good record of being an honest developer who produces what he says he will develop.

Gary Lea, 1271 Monterey Crescent:

- The proposed wellness centre is a front end idea for health; the Mayo Clinic takes care of people after the fact. The centres are not intended to be similar.

John Drenka, 1304 McKinley Road:

- The proposed project would provide a net benefit for the community. McKinley Road would be realigned and upgraded, local infrastructure would be improved including sewer, diseased trees in the forested lands to the north and east would be harvested, and the development would provide an irrigated buffer to reduce fire hazard in the area.
- Vintage Landing is well thought out and diversified. Would rather see that than a 1,000 lot subdivision in future with little or no greenspace.
- Everyone he has spoke to about this application is in support.

Jack Peters, 669 Welke Road:

- The 1977 OCP was a 10 year plan that talked about the need for a North End Connector and a new Okanagan Lake bridge, in the long term because the cost was too high for the short term. Those same costs look low today. From a taxpayer perspective, suggest that Council give this application serious consideration, especially when it is at no cost to the City and given the economic benefit to the homeowners in the area.

Dave Roseberry, 2675 Arthur Road:

- The services brought in by this development would end at their property boundary, not in McKinley Landing.
- The residents need answers to questions about the Kokanee, size of the golf course, the location of the roads, etc. The only way the residents can be confident about when they will get sewer, sidewalks, roads, etc. and plan accordingly is through a Sector Plan.
- We need health centres but the proposed centre will give no relief on the health services.

Joe Gordon, 2329 Dewdney Road:

- Everything he had to say has either been said or is in his written submission. Corrected an error his written submission; Mr. Moyor was under foreclosure not bankruptcy.
- The applicant would not be bringing services to McKinley Landing. The services would be 4 miles away and then it would be up to the residents to bring them beyond that.
- The development would create massive traffic jams.
- The developer plans to pay all costs off-site if allowed more uses but the sewage treatment plant would have to be expanded earlier in order to handle the sewage. No confidence that off-site costs are being handled in the community's best interests. Off-site financial ramifications have not yet been fully addressed and the plans are vague.

Public HearingMay 25, 2004

- The three medical doctors who were involved are pulling out saying there is no support from the medical community for this project.
- The Grand Hotel and Okanagan Lake Resort both failed when they first opened, why would this resort be different? What is proposed will be strata titled condos.
- It will be difficult for the public to have confidence in any of the City's plans if this development is allowed to proceed outside the 20 year servicing plan.

Murray Rieter, 2265 McKinley Road:

- Joined the McKinley Landing Residents Association but because he was not a member for 30 days his opinion did not count. The results of the Association's survey are bogus and not representative of the community.
- Joe Gordon's submission is misleading and inaccurate, and some of the passages in the document are offensive. If projects required ultimate certainty, nothing would get done.
- Traffic could be an issue; the City needs to work with the developer to provide a second access to the site to divert construction traffic, maybe through Slater Road.

EXTENSION OF MEETING:Moved by Councillor Given/Seconded by Councillor Horning

**P512/04/05/25** THAT pursuant to Section 5.5 of Council Procedure Bylaw No. 9200, this Public Hearing be permitted to continue past 11:00 p.m.

CarriedRon Hockey:

- Plans have to be sustainable for the future.
- McKinley Landing is a long way out to extend services. This development may not cost the taxpayer anything but the next ten may.

Eric Heffernan, 2505 Dubbin Road:

- Disappointed in the studies produced by the applicant; a lot of points are conflicting.
- Need to plan for the area and look ahead; do not see the need to rush.
- Was one of the organizers of the survey of the McKinley Landing Residents Association membership. The question asked was whether they felt that the City should amend the OCP and a clear majority said 'no' or that they required more information. A common comment was "why the rush".

Liz Bennett, 2262 Bennett Road:

- Supports the resort going ahead. Plans have to change, especially in times of heavy growth. The resort would give the residents access to a beach in their own area, and a place to go to golf, have dinner, etc.
- The proposed development would be good for Kelowna. People opposed developments such as the Dolphins and Discovery Point that are now highly regarded.

Heather Rieter, 2265 McKinley Road:

- The Residents Association is emphasizing the negatives. Is a paid up member of the Association but was not contacted. The survey should have been done by an independent third party.
- It is not true that the developer is the only one who would win.
- The proposed project is unique and will protect more green space than would be retained if the land was subdivided into 10 acre lots.

Public HearingMay 25, 2004Julie Gordon, 2329 Dewdney Road:

- Her parents own property in West Vancouver; over the years prices have risen to the point where they can no longer afford to pay the taxes. She grew up skiing Whistler Mountain but can no longer afford to pay for the lift tickets. The proposed resort would increase property taxes for the McKinley Landing residents.
- Wants McKinley Landing to be a family community.

Doug Flintoft, 2010 McKinley Road:

- Supports amending the OCP as proposed. Does not need a Sector Plan to be in place in order to proceed with the proposed development.

Richard Drinnan, 669 Greene Road:

- Is an environmental consultant.
- Is opposed to the proposed development because it conflicts with the future land uses in the OCP. The consultant's reports are being used to advance the developer's business interests and are not in keeping with the OCP or in the public interest.
- The applicant bought the property knowing the City did not support commercial uses on the property. He has ignored the OCP and speculated that he will be allowed to rezone and flip the property and pocket the money. OCP and sector plans are developed with extensive public consultation process. The developer should be made to follow the rules.
- The cost estimates for the development have escalated from \$250,000 million to \$1 billion.
- The application has probably already cost the City \$100,000 in staff time and expenses.

John Gatschuff, 2046 Bennett Road:

- Has no vested interest in this proposal; however, supports the project because it would preserve significant areas of the property for enjoyment by future generations. The development would not be as high a density as could be expected if the land was just developed as a residential property.
- Joe Gordon's submission uses innuendo.
- Is concerned about the way the Residents Association is operating; he was a founder of the Association and they can waive the 30 day membership to be able to vote.
- The subject application should at least move forward to the Area Structure Plan and rezoning stage.

Don Graham, 718 Paret Road:

- President of the Okanagan Mission Residents Association.
- The OCP provides a clear outline of the City's intentions. Hopefully Council's decision comes out in support of the OCP.

Karen Slivar, 1940 Dewdney Road:

- Prefers the proposed development over 10 acre lots.
- Supports the application for the green space that is being preserved.

Peter Newton, 1301 Glenmore Road North:

- Supports the application proceeding. The proposed development would be clean and provide jobs.
- It would be brave of Council to go ahead with this because they will get a lot of flack.
- A Capital News survey regarding Vintage Landing indicated that 78% of the people who responded were in support and 22% in opposition.

Public HearingMay 25, 2004Fred Marshall:

- It is wishful thinking to hope that the subject property will remain the same for 20 years. Have to change when conditions change. Demand determines how the planning has to be.
- Need to give the applicant a chance to go ahead. Cannot predict the future with accuracy so no guarantee of the outcome.

Ron Hockey:

- It is the applicant's land to do with as he wants; the land is not designated as park.

Doug Bastion, Grant Thornton Accounting and Consulting team:

- Is a partner with the Grant Thornton Accounting and Consulting team and they rely on their professional reputation. They were engaged to look into tourism opportunities if the property was developed.
- A Feasibility study was done for the hotel and an Economic Impact study for the overall resort. The documents deal with different issues; cannot deal with one without looking at the other. The feasibility study supports the comments made in the economic impact study.
- If the City has an interest in the growth of tourism in this region and if a hotel and related amenities are part of that vision, then this project is a great opportunity to pursue that.
- A wide range of revenue sources are needed to support the development; otherwise the project would be doomed to failure.

Dr. Heather McEachern, psychologist:

- Is involved in the vision, in researching the professional expertise that is available to work together and make the wellness village real. The intent is not to create a centre like the Mayo Clinic. The proposed centre would be a holistic multi-level facility.
- The three doctors who withdrew their support for the project are illness oriented not prevention oriented in their approach to medicine.
- Urged Council to give the applicant an opportunity to see the project through to fruition.

Grant Gaucher, applicant:

- Golf courses are a permitted use within the Agricultural Land Reserve.
- Will determine the best option for water services at the next level of planning for the development.
- The project would be a commercial development that would bring with it road improvements and increased traffic. The project cost was initially estimated at \$250,000 million and that was increased to \$450,000 million after a detailed cost analysis was done. The \$1 billion was the estimated economic benefits.
- Has been talking to City staff for the past three years and has already done a lot of the work that would be required under the Area Structure Plan and some of that work would also be applicable to a Sector Plan.
- The vineyard and golf course would be in the first phase of development.
- The percentages referred to for triggering various road upgrades are based on the overall build-out over 10 years and would be market driven. By the end of 10 years, there could be 800-900 hotel rooms and the size of wellness centre could go up to 600,000 sq. ft.

Trevor Ward, Ward Consulting:

- Clarified that the percentages for triggering road upgrades are based on projections of the number of trips that would be generated by this development.

Dr. Heather McEachern, psychologist:

- 60,000 sq. ft. of wellness clinic can be quickly filled in the first stage.
- A variety conventional and complementary medical disciplines covering all aspects of preventative medicine would be working side by side in same building; a multi-disciplinary format with equal status among professionals.

Public Hearing

May 25, 2004

Public Hearing

May 25, 2004

Grant Gaucher, applicant:

- The proposed development does not include any residential component whatsoever and the balance of lands that remain designated for future urban reserve will be locked into that. Down the road, there may be some houses.
- The intent is to have a public/private partnership on a large portion of the foreshore, and so the public will have access to the lake through this proposal.

Staff:

- Clarified that portions of the project (i.e. the hotel) may be stratified and/or time shared; that would not mean that the development would be considered a residential project.
- The project must not affect DCCs or the City's 20 year capital plan.
- The Area Structure Plan would most likely result in a further amendment of the OCP.
- Processing an ASP typically takes 4-6 months but could take up to 6-8 months.

Tim Alexander, Timberlake Global Group and co-developer on this project:

- Has dual citizenship in Canada and the USA but spends a lot of time in the Okanagan Valley.
- It will be a Canadian company that does the proposed development, not Timberlake.
- All of the people on the development team are respected professionals in their field and are committed to the success of the project.

Gail Temple, representing the applicant:

- The proposal is for a world class destination resort.
- There would be tremendous economic gain for the City.
- This is the first step in the process. Asked that the application be allowed to advance to the ASP and rezoning stage.

4. TERMINATION:

The Hearing was declared terminated at 1:10 a.m.

Certified Correct:

---

Mayor

BLH/am

---

Acting City Clerk