

Public HearingOctober 19, 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, October 19, 2004.

Council members in attendance were: Mayor Walter Gray, Councillors A.F. Blaneil, 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: Acting City Manager/Director of Planning & Corporate Services, R.L. Mattiussi; Acting Deputy City Clerk, D.M. Fediuk; 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 7:05 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 "Zoning Bylaw No. 8000", 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 Deputy City Clerk advised the Notice of this Public Hearing was advertised by being posted on the Notice Board at City Hall on October 1, 2004, and by being placed in the Kelowna Daily Courier issues of October 12 & 13, 2004, and in the Kelowna Capital News issue of October 10, 2004, and by sending out or otherwise delivering 818 letters to the owners and occupiers of surrounding properties between October 1-4, 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. INDIVIDUAL BYLAW SUBMISSIONS

3.1 Zoning Bylaw Text Amendment – RU1h, RU4h and RU6h Zones

- (a) Bylaw No. 9306 (TA04-0008) – THAT City of Kelowna Zoning Bylaw No. 8000 be amended to add the RU4h – Low Density Cluster Housing (Hillside) zone and the RU6h – Two Dwelling Housing (Hillside) zone as outlined in Schedule "A" of the report of the Planning & Corporate Services Department dated September 14, 2004, and to clarify the wording for the RU1h zone as follows:

Section 13.1.6(d):

In RU1h zones the minimum setback from a flanking street shall be 3.0 metres, except that it is 6.0 metres measured from the back of curb or a sidewalk, whichever is closest to a garage or **carport** having vehicular entry from the front.

Staff:

- The amendments proposed are housekeeping in nature. Some properties in the first phase of the Kirschner Mountain development have been zoned to the RU4h and RU6h zones; however, as part of that rezoning process the actual zones were not included within the text of Zoning Bylaw 8000. The text amendment also corrects a typo in the RU1h zone by adding back into the text of the zone the end of a sentence that was inadvertently eliminated with the last amendment of that zone.

Public HearingOctober 19, 2004

The Acting Deputy City Clerk advised that no correspondence or petitions had been received.

Mayor Gray invited anyone in the public gallery who deemed themselves affected to come forward, followed by comments of Council. There was no response.

3.2 608 Coronation Avenue

3.2 Bylaw No. 9307 (Z04-0051) – Donald Tulloch – Coronation Avenue – THAT City of Kelowna Zoning Bylaw No. 8000 be amended by changing the zoning classification of Lot 49, District Lot 139, ODYD Plan 1037, located on Coronation Avenue, Kelowna, B.C. from the RU2 – Medium Lot Housing zone to the RU2s – Medium Lot Housing with Secondary Suite zone.

Staff:

- The request for rezoning is a result of a bylaw enforcement complaint and would legalize an existing suite in the upstairs of the dwelling.

The Acting Deputy City Clerk advised that no correspondence or petitions had been received.

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

Donald Tulloch, applicant:

- Indicated that he had nothing to add at this time.

There were no further comments.

3.3 857 Raymer Road

3.3 Bylaw No. 9308 (Z04-0054) – Andjefa Whitehouse & Stephane Archer – Raymer Road – THAT City of Kelowna Zoning Bylaw No. 8000 be amended by changing the zoning classification of Lot 2, D.L. 580a, SDYD Plan KAP73731, located on Raymer Road, Kelowna, B.C. from the RU1 – Large Lot Housing zone to the RU1s – Large Lot Housing with Secondary Suite zone.

Staff:

- The subject property was recently created through a subdivision application and the house is currently under construction. The rezoning would permit the development of a suite within the building.
- Staff have no concerns about adding a suite and there is adequate room to provide the required parking.

The Acting Deputy City Clerk advised that the following correspondence had been received:

- letter from Rosanne Nordine, 827 Raymer Road, objecting to the rezoning on the basis that the proposed secondary suite would result in increased traffic and add to the already inadequate parking situation in the area.

Mayor Gray invited the applicant or anyone in the public gallery who deemed themselves affected to come forward, followed by comments of Council. There was no response.

3.4 3381 Oliver Court

- 3.4 Bylaw No. 9309 (Z04-0058) – Albert and Edeltraud Schadek – Oliver Court - THAT City of Kelowna Zoning Bylaw No. 8000 be amended by changing the zoning classification of Lot 32, Sec. 16, Twp. 26, ODYD, Plan 24182 located at 3381 Oliver Court, Kelowna, B.C. from the RR3 – Rural Residential 3 zone to the RR3s - Rural Residential 3 with Secondary Suite zone.

Staff:

- The applicant is proposing to create a secondary suite in an accessory building at the rear of the property.
- Vehicular and pedestrian access to the proposed suite would be via an extension to the driveway along the east side of the existing home.
- The property is on a septic field and well water. The septic field is along the south property line and the well is located in the front portion of the property.
- The Public Health Inspector has given approval for the suite.
- The property is 2/3 of an acre in size; almost twice the size of other lots in the general area.
- There are other properties in the area with the 's' zoning designation – one is just one lot removed from the subject property.
- The Southeast Kelowna Sector Plan states that it is the City's policy to require that development NOT occur in the Hall Road area prior to the availability of sanitary sewer. However, the requirements for 's' zoning designations were reduced when the 's' zone was adopted and therefore staff recommend support.

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

Letters of Opposition:

- Heidi Glaser & Steve Allan, 3376 Oliver Court
 - Peter & Linda Olinger, 3478 Hall Road
 - Ed & Bonnie Loeppky, 3442 Hall Road
 - Ron Kabatoff, 3345 Jackson Court
 - Dawn Powell, 2490 Fairhall Road
 - Bill & Linda Knowles, 3371 Oliver Court
 - Ruth & Alex Recsky, 3145 Hall Road
 - John & Janet Baschzok, 3466 Hall Road
 - Rick & Jeanne Garner, 3331 Hall Road – LATE
- Opposed generally on the basis that there would be septic contamination, a negative effect on the character of the neighbourhood, loss of privacy, and an increase in traffic.

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

Pete Olinger, 3478 Hall Road:

- Concerned about health and safety. The septic tank on the subject property is directly in line with his well and two neighbour's wells and is not more than a couple hundred feet away. Also the soil is heavily clay based. Adding more demand on the already uncertain water supply could become expensive if the wells run dry.
- Would rather play it safe and stay with things the way they are until services are extended to the area.
- Was told when he bought his property a long time ago, that the lots were large because there had to be a separation between wells and septic.
- The residents in this area of the city have been told for the last 40 years that septic was coming in 10 year's time.

Public HearingOctober 19, 2004

Staff:

- The requirement for 100 ft. separation between the well and septic field is met.
- The septic fields are all in the rear of the properties and the wells in the front.
- The permit issued by the Health Officer for the suite includes a sketch showing the location for the new tank approved for the proposed building and notes that the existing septic field is large enough for the additional load.

Pete Olinger, 3478 Hall Road:

- Clarified that at least 3 of the wells, maybe 4, are not in the front yards but in the rear corners of the lots and are virtually in a direct line with the septic on the subject property.
- Concerned that the Health Officer may not know the locations of all of the wells and/or septic fields in this area.

John Baschzok, 3466 Hall Road:

- His property is abutting.
- Concerned about where the Health Officer is getting his information. The nature of the soil is such that it restricts the dissipating properties of the septic field. He and two of his neighbours have already had problems with their septic fields. Concerned that any additional septic fields could result in further deterioration and problems.

Ed Loepky, 3442 Hall Road:

- His septic field is 20 ft. away from the septic field on the subject property. Three years ago he had problems with his field. However, the City had no idea where the field was so he had to dig to find it before it could be rebuilt.
- The neighbour at 3430 Hall Road is having problems with his field now – the ground is saturated and is not accepting the amount of fluid that is going into it. Adding more is of concern.
- He is having problems with both water and sewer. About 6 years ago his well collapsed for no explicable reason and had to be redone.

Staff:

- Records regarding the location of septic fields are the responsibility of the Health Unit.

Daughter of the owners of 3490 Hall Road:

- The well on her parent's property is within 10 ft. of the rear property line and the septic is in the front yard.
- Their concern is not knowing how much water there is and what will happen when the water runs out or gets tainted.
- She just had to replace the septic field on her property and found that the field was at a level higher than the septic tank outflow pipe. Concerned this could be the case on other properties too and her parents are concerned about that too.

Steve Allan, 3376 Oliver Court:

- Purchased his property three month's ago; the property is directly adjacent.
- The house is now 30 years old and is still on the original system. With the extra load this would generate and the existing level of saturation of the soils in the area, concerned he could have to redo the field sooner and that his well water could become contaminated.
- Moved from Fuller Avenue in downtown Kelowna to get away from the suites and carriage homes.

Councillor Shepherd joined the meeting at 7:48 p.m.

Public HearingOctober 19, 2004Linda Knowles, 3371 Oliver Court:

- Concerned that a precedent could be set for the whole subdivision if this is approved.
- Chose to live in this area because of the larger lot sizes. Have been at this location for the last 17 years and concerned about loss of privacy and the extra cars that secondary suites would bring. This would be the second suite on four lots in the area. Each suite brings at least two more vehicles.
- The underground water supply is an unknown. Adding more homes in this environmentally sensitive area would have an impact on the water supply.
- There is a history of problems with the water. Interior Health does not always hear when wells become contaminated or dry up and people dig a new well.
- Their well is right on the property line shared with the subject property.

Bill Knowles, 3371 Oliver Court:

- The minutes of the Regular Meeting of Council dated July 27, 2004 indicate that a rezoning application for a suite at 3588 Spiers Road, which is about one mile from the subject property, was denied because of concerns about septic fields.
- This neighbourhood has more concerns about wells and septic than that neighbourhood and there are more residents expressing concern about this application than there were for that application.

Tom Smithwick, representing the applicant:

- The water and septic concerns in the Hall Road area have been known for some time.
- There are 4 people currently living on the subject property; the parents, their daughter and her son. If this is approved, the daughter and her son would move into the secondary unit in the back yard so that they could have independent living and still be there to help her parents.
- The amount of water consumption or septic disposal would not change because the number of people living there would not be changed. There would be no more vehicles than what there are now either.
- A test done on the well on the subject property indicated zero contamination.
- The septic field on the subject property is half the age of most of the septic fields in the area having been put in 15 years ago and it is more than twice the size that was required to ensure there never would be a problem.
- The Health Officer visited the site and based on his calculations (which he based on 5 bedrooms) the size of the field is more than adequate and there is no concern about the proximity of the field to adjacent neighbours.
- Pilling & Associates was hired to do an engineering analysis and their report also confirms that the septic field is in fact more than adequate for what exists and what is proposed.
- Displayed photos to show that the rear yard is substantially landscaped along the property boundary and that the accessory building would not be visually noticeable by any neighbours. The majority of the landscaping on the property would remain.
- Indicated on a map the location of the neighbours who have indicated support.
- Do not think this application would exacerbate the existing situation. The property has oversized everything including its well and the depth of the well.
- Although the concerns are real, they are not related to this property.

Staff:

- The Health Officer has not advised City staff of any concerns with wells or septic in the area.

There were no further comments.

3.5(a) OCP Amendment - 120/1134/1148/1158/1168 Bernard Avenue

3.5(a) Bylaw No. 9303 (OCP04-0011) – Lake Placid Developments Inc. (BKDI Architects) – Bernard Avenue – Map 15.1 of *Kelowna 2020* - Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 7600 be amended by changing the Future Land Use designation of Lot 3, D.L. 137, ODYD Plan 17333; Lot 2, D.L. 137, ODYD Plan 17857; and Lot B, D.L. 137, ODYD Plan 18052, located on Bernard Avenue, Kelowna, B.C., from the Single/Two Unit Residential designation to the Commercial designation.

See discussion under 3.5(c) below.

3.5(b) Adds CD17 – Mixed Use Commercial High Density Zone

3.5(b) Bylaw No. 9304 (TA04-0005) – Lake Placid Developments Inc. (BKDI Architects) – Bernard Avenue – THAT Zoning Bylaw Text Amendment No. TA04-0005 to amend City of Kelowna Zoning Bylaw No. 8000 by adding the CD17 – Mixed Use Commercial High Density Zone as outlined in the report of the Planning & Corporate Services Department dated August 10, 2004.

See discussion under 3.5(c) below.

3.5(c) 120/1134/1148/1158/1168 Bernard Avenue

3.5(c) Bylaw No.9305 (Z04-0046) – Lake Placid Developments Inc. (BKDI Architects) – Bernard Avenue – THAT City of Kelowna Zoning Bylaw No. 8000 be amended by changing the zoning classification of Lot A, D.L. 137, ODYD Plan 31667; Lot A, D.L. 137, ODYD Plan 31666; and Lot 2, D.L. 137, ODYD Plan 17333, located on Bernard Avenue, Kelowna, B.C. from the C4 – Urban Centre Commercial zone to the CD17 – Mixed Use Commercial – High Density zone; and by changing the zoning classification of Lot 3, D.L. 137, ODYD Plan 17333; Lot 2, D.L. 137, ODYD Plan 17857; and Lot B, D.L. 137, ODYD Plan 18052, located on Bernard Avenue, Kelowna, B.C. from the RU6 – Two Dwelling Housing zone to the CD17 – Mixed Use Commercial – High Density zone.

Staff:

- The property is under rezoning to a Comprehensive Development (CD) zone to permit a mixed use development consisting of a significant amount of ground floor commercial, 152± residential units in a 16 storey tower, and a spa on the ground floor of a 2-storey building fronting Lawson Avenue.
- When the application was initially presented to Council, staff recommended non-support for the OCP amendment and therefore the text amendment and rezoning. Council opted to support the alternate recommendation and advance the application to Public Hearing.
- The combination of uses proposed is the kind of mixed use supported in many of the policies in the OCP. However, in this case the combination of residential and commercial is a blending of the C4 zone and the equivalent of RM6 zoning and the OCP does not provide for that kind of density for the combination of uses proposed on the site.
- A traffic impact study has now been completed and signed off by both Ministry of Transportation and City transportation staff. As a result minor widenings are required along Bernard and Gordon to accommodate an extra turn lane and future widening on Gordon Drive.

Public Hearing

October 19, 2004

Michael Lobsinger, applicant:

- When People's IGA vacated the premises, the neighbourhood lost shopping and a part of what held the community together. When Days Funeral Home left they lost more. Saw this as a development opportunity that could give back to the community a focal point/meeting place to tie the community back to the site. That will be achieved by creating a 5,000 sq. ft. plaza on the corner of Bernard/Gordon with a seating area, monument, public art piece, etc. to connect the neighbourhood to this development for the next generation.
- The neighbourhood concerns have been addressed.
- Terraces would step up from the 10th storey rising to 16 storeys so as to step back and be less obtrusive. The Kiwanis tower is 14 storeys high and has been there 30 years.
- By acquiring two more properties to the east, shadowing concerns are eliminated because the project would only shadow its own site.
- 57% of the site would be in open area, landscaping and site parking.
- Extra care and expenditure would be paid to landscaping and lighting to make this one of the best projects in the community. The project would bring one of the first green living roof tops to Kelowna. There would be one complete level of underground parking and the surface parking would be well hidden behind its own development.
- The intent is to produce one of the best developments in Kelowna. The development was named 'Centuria' in honour of Kelowna's 100th birthday in 2005.
- The staff comments to the Advisory Planning Commission were favourable and the Advisory Planning Commission approved the application unanimously.

Kim McKecknie, consultant on behalf of the applicant:

- Contacted about 75% of the 565 owners in the area and the response was overwhelmingly in support. Met with the two residents associations and also talked to surrounding businesses and hosted a public information meeting attended by 110 people and again the response was positive.
- Surprised to receive a petition yesterday with 57 signatures opposed; however, many of the signatures were of tenants whose landlords had provided letters of support.
- Very little negative feedback has been received from the neighbourhood.

Brian Kilpatrick, architect:

- Displayed an artist's rendering of the project showing two and three storey townhouses with retail shops and the high rise building behind.
- The second level development would include a restaurant overlooking the plaza which would be landscaped and hopefully heavily used. Working with the Public Art Committee for a public art piece that would be placed in the centre of the plaza.
- The spa would be a 1.5 storey building with sloped roofs.
- 55 at-grade stalls would be provided between the spa and commercial building.
- Terraces step up from the 10th floor on both wings of the tower.
- There would be a swimming pool on the second floor.
- Shadowing is contained within the site. Showed the shadowing effect on March 21st at 10 a.m., noon, 2 p.m. and 4 p.m. to demonstrate that.
- Described the project aided by renderings displayed on the projector.

Public HearingOctober 19, 2004

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

Letters of Opposition

- Lenore Bailey, 1455 Flemish Street
- Clint Alexander, 1479 Aspen Court
- Adam Negrych, #206 – 1056 Bernard Avenue
- Vivian Ferdinands, no address given
- Robert Cichocki, 1221 Kilglen Crescent

Petitions

- Dawn Haines, representing 'concerned residents' at 1229 Bernard Avenue, letter and a petition with 11 signatures
- John Zeger, Chairman for Citizens for Responsible Community Planning, petition of opposition with 57 signatures

All opposed generally on the basis that there would be an increase in noise, traffic and traffic congestion, a negative effect on property values, loss of views, increased shadowing due to the height of the building, the residential density would be too high, and the proposal does not conform with the Official Community Plan.

Letters in Favour

- Tammy Moore & Scott Davis, 770 Bernard Avenue
- Luba Boychuk, 304-1035 Bernard Avenue
- Stewart Turcotte, 781 Bernard Avenue
- Michel & Elaine Lamontagne, 1481 Flemish Street
- Art & Ruth Stuerle, 1421 Flemish Street
- Grant Maddock, no address given
- Helene & Roger Picard, 901 Bernard Avenue

In favour generally on the basis that the project would be a valued asset to the community, a positive contribution to the downtown businesses, would attract more residents to the downtown area, and would generate a large tax benefit to the City with minimal impact on services and surrounding properties.

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

Terry Tompkins, 1086 Martin Avenue:

- Concerned about parking in the area. The proposed at-grade parking would not be enough for the number of employees that would work in the commercial outlets as well as the patrons of the stores. There are already problems with parking on the side streets as a result of restrictions on parking on Gordon Drive. Concerned the employers would tell their employees not to park in the patron parking and that the employees would end up parking in front of the residences on the side streets, as is occurring in the Hospital area.
- If this application is approved, would like to know if the residents will have to petition for signs to be posted on the side streets restricting parking to the residents, or if the City would just do that for the residents.

Staff:

- The surface parking is to accommodate the patrons of the commercial outlets and potentially visitors to the residential units. The applicant was proposing to provide 377 stalls underground but that exceeded requirements and was going to be cut back to 294 stalls to be consistent with City bylaws. The number of stalls can be increased again if Council wants. Staff are confident that more than adequate parking is being provided on the site; it comes down to how the parking is managed on the site.

Public HearingOctober 19, 2004Terry Tompkins, 1086 Martin Avenue, (continued):

- Prospera Place was supposed to have adequate parking too and on event nights parking goes well into the residential area. Wants a parking spot reserved in front of his house.

Resident of 1495 D'Anjou Street:

- Also speaking on behalf of the owners of 1178 and 1190 Bernard Avenue and they all support the application and feel the project would enhance the neighbourhood.

John Watson, 1191 Lawson Avenue:

- Supports the application and appreciates having had the opportunity have input into its creation.

Fred Speckeen, 1156 Sunset (Lagoons):

- Supports the application as a quality project in keeping with the City's desire for higher density in downtown Kelowna.
- If this application is not approved, hope the property would not become another big parking lot.

Scott Davis, new owner of a business on Bernard Avenue:

- Supports the application. The architecture and study that has gone into the proposed building is very impressive and would set a standard the City could be proud of now and in 100 years.
- The development would clean up the area and allow a lot of people in the area to walk instead of drive.

Rob Martell, 470 Patterson Avenue:

- He and his wife took two art deco heritage homes that were on the subject property and are now looking for a property to move the homes onto.
- The project is nice and will clean up the area.

Bill Scutt, owner of commercial building at 1605 Gordon Drive:

- The proposed development would bring life into the neighbourhood.
- Loves the massing and the architecture.

Elizabeth Bothe, 981 Lawson Avenue:

- This is the most sensible use of the subject property that she can think of.
- It is great to think she could live in the downtown and not need a vehicle.

John Zeger, Sutherland Avenue:

- Chair, Citizens for Responsible Community Planning, an organization with between 10-20 members.
- Opposed because of 16 storeys and the proposed high density being imposed on the neighbourhood.
- Opposed because the proposal violates the vision of the OCP; is contrary to the wishes of the neighbourhood – based on a survey he conducted; would aggravate the already high traffic congestion in the area; would obscure residents' view corridors of mountains, and does nothing to alleviate the need for affordable housing in Kelowna.
- If approved, a precedent would be set for other developers to assemble land and then ask for an OCP amendment.
- The subject property would be excellent location for an affordable housing project.

Public HearingOctober 19, 2004Duane Tresnich, 779 Wilson Avenue:

- Founder of the Move Kelowna Forward.com committee which is a committee that supports responsible development.
- The committee thinks the proposal would be good for the area and is in support of the subject application.

Business owner in the 1100 block of Lawrence Avenue:

- Pointed out that a 4 storey building would require a larger footprint resulting in less greenspace.
- Supports the application. Currently is renting and is excited about the possibility of more housing in the area.

Keath Kemper, 1433 Flemish Street:

- His wife signed the petition of opposition.
- Approval of this project could change the neighbourhood. A lot of the people in the area are older and could find maintenance of their lots difficult. Another builder could come in and buy up another 4 or 5 lots and then ask to build condos or a high rise too. Concerned that down the road the whole area could change with this precedent.
- No grocery store is proposed in the retail space so everyday needs such as milk or groceries would still not be within walking distance.
- Concerned that the traffic would use Lawson Avenue.

Gibb Rempel, 1428 Aspen Court:

- Is not against progress but would like to see the high rise be a little lower because concerned that it would obscure the view of the mountains for him and others on his street.
- Main concern is traffic. Vehicles have to go through the residential area to get onto Gordon Drive or Bernard Avenue because traffic is already too heavy on Gordon.

Pat Lee, 1161 Lawson Avenue:

- Her property is directly abutting and she is 100% in support.
- Does not appreciate having someone who does not live in the neighbourhood doing a survey and telling her what is best for her neighbourhood.

John Skrotzki, 595 Yates Road:

- Co-founder of Move Kelowna Forward.com.
- The development would add character to this area of town and clean up the area.

Tony D'Andrea, 3115 de Montreuil Court:

- Also a representative of Move Kelowna Forward.com.
- Supports this development.

Deiter Bothe, 981 Lawson Avenue:

- Supports the project and prefers a high rise with secured parking underground.
- Looking forward to sitting in the plaza on the corner.

Marian Grimwood, 4574 Doeksen Road:

- The mixed use is great but objects to the high rise part of the development – could support up to 8 storeys, stepped up but does not agree with any high rises in Kelowna.
- The developer was not forced into buying the property and he knew the zoning when he bought it.
- The City should be requiring a minimum number of affordable units from every multi-family development.
- City staff recommended against the application because of the scale and density.
- The developer should have to comply with C4 zoning requirements.

Public Hearing

October 19, 2004

Terry Tompkins, 1086 Martin Avenue:

- Supports the development, is just concerned about traffic.

Gord Ledinski, 1212 Lawson Avenue:

- Also speaking on behalf of the owners of 1104 and 1110 Lawson Avenue.
- Supports the development – provides employment.
- Happy to see that Council is moving forward instead of being conservative and wanting to keep Kelowna the way it was years ago.
- Shows foresight which should be encouraged in Kelowna.

Brian Kilpatrick, architect:

- The 57 stalls of street level parking is intended for the retail shoppers. The City requires 75 stalls for the amount of commercial space proposed and another 50 stalls are provided underground for the owners and employees as well as users of the spa. The balance of the underground parking (290 stalls) is for the condo residents and visitors as well as another 20 stalls on street level for visitors of the condo. Based on past experience with projects like this there should be enough parking.

Nick Finn, Traffic Engineer:

- His firm did the traffic impact study. Explained the improvements that are proposed at the intersection of Bernard and Gordon.
- Found that it was difficult getting out of Lawson onto Gordon and anticipates the City will eventually restrict turns off Lawson onto Gordon to right turns in and out only.
- Rerouting traffic would increase vehicle use of Lawson and D'Anjou and even Richmond.
- Anticipates there would be a great deal of walking activity and expects that traffic volumes would be similar to what they were with the former use of the site.
- Vehicular access to the commercial parking lot would be off Lawson Avenue.

4. TERMINATION:

The Hearing was declared terminated at 10:12 p.m.

Certified Correct:

Mayor

Acting Deputy City Clerk

BLH/am