

Public HearingNovember 16, 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, November 16, 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 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 5:04 p.m.
2. Mayor Gray advised that the purpose of the Hearing is to consider certain bylaws which, if adopted, will amend "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 City Clerk advised the Notice of this Public Hearing was advertised by being posted on the Notice Board at City Hall on October 29, 2004, and by being placed in the Kelowna Daily Courier issues of November 8 & 9, 2004, and in the Kelowna Capital News issue of November 7, 2004, and by sending out or otherwise delivering 359 letters to the owners and occupiers of surrounding properties between October 29 and November 2, 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

3.1 570 Sarsons Road and 4388 Lakeshore Road

- 3.1 Bylaw No. 9318 (Z04-0063) – Gazelle Enterprises Inc. and Green Projects Ltd. – Sarsons Road and Lakeshore Road – THAT City of Kelowna Zoning Bylaw No. 8000 be amended by changing the zoning classification of Lots 1 & 2, DL 167, O.D.Y.D., Plan KAP75687, located on Lakeshore Road and Sarsons Road, Kelowna, B.C. from the RU1 – Large Lot Housing zone to the RM3 – Low Density Multiple Housing zone.

Councillor Hobson declared a conflict of interest because of past history between the subject property and his family property and left the Council Chamber at 5:08 p.m.

Councillor Shepherd declared a conflict of interest because direct family members live across from the subject property and left the Council Chamber at 5:08 p.m.

Staff:

- The property is on the northwest corner of Lakeshore and Sarsons Roads.
- A previous application was to develop the property with a mix of multi-family and commercial. The current application is now for all multi-family development.
- The site plan indicates two access points to the development, one from Lakeshore Road and one from Sarsons Road, and provides land on the north side of the site for a hammerhead turnaround for Edinburgh Court as well as for a pedestrian route of access through the site from Edinburgh.

Public HearingNovember 16, 2004

- The current proposal indicates that the predominant portion of the development that would be abutting existing residential property would be townhouses in the form of 2½ storey duplexes. A 2½ storey apartment building would wrap around the corner at Sarsons/Lakeshore Road. A second apartment building along Lakeshore Road would be 2½ storeys stepping up to 3 storeys as it moves into the site. That building would require a height variance as would the internal apartment building which is proposed at 4 storeys.
- At the time the application was reviewed and supported by the Advisory Planning Commission, the 4-storey building was not on the plans. The plans they saw were for a total of 180 units of which 28 were townhouses with 152 units in 3-storey apartment buildings. The current concept has reduced the number of units down to 147. The ultimate number of units would be determined by the Development Variance Permit.
- The RM3 zoning is consistent with the OCP and the North Mission/Crawford Sector Plan. Some of the properties identified for multi-family development in the Sector Plan came in at a lower density and staff see this as an opportunity to recover some of that lost density.
- A Development Permit and Development Variance Permit would be considered concurrent with adoption consideration of the subject bylaw.

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

69 Form Letters of Opposition - opposed generally on the basis that:

- RM3 is too high a density for the area, the proposed 3 to 4 storey apartment building is too high, the frontage exceeds 350 feet and creates a continuous building mass across the property, the proposed apartment development is out of character with the surrounding neighbourhood, and there will be an increase in traffic.

letters of Opposition

- Mr. & Mrs. Gordon Johnson, 664 Greene Road
- Julie McMahon, 531 Brome Crescent
- Dick & Shirley Dumond, 591 Kensington Drive
- Steve and Yolanda Krywulak, 555 Sarsons Road
- Mr. & Mrs. Allan Jantz, 595 Sarsons Road
- Dan & Jane Hobson, 4357 Edinburgh Court
- Allan & Donna Elliott, 4366 Kensington Drive
- Richard Drinnan, 669 Greene Road (3 submissions)
- C. Kuemper, 610 Welke Road
- Vi Coe, #310 – 1779 Pandosy Street
- Debbie Lawlor, 4090 Hughes Road
- Joe Southerden, 496 Sarsons Road
- Ron Hallick, 498 Sarsons Road
- George & Ruby Derkach, 4347 Lysons Crescent
- John & Kirsti Grain, 4452 Lakeshore Road
- Barbara Hallick, no address given
- Christine Collins, 649 Greene Road
- Sungkyung Jin, 524 Sarsons Road
- Jeffrey & Leslie Merrell, 682 Greene Road
- James Quirk, 499 Sarsons Road
- Debbie Mah & David Pavitt, 585 Sarsons Road
- Dennis & Terry Crowe, Lysons Crescent
- Geoff Chapman, 661 Greene Road
- Fran & Victor Pratico, 4393 Lakeshore Road
- Frank & Janine Fabian, Hobson Crescent
- Susan Quirk, 499 Sarsons Road

Public Hearing

November 16, 2004

- Trevor Wright, 4366 Bray Street
- Mark Sadlowski, 508 Sarsons Road
- Karl Hourigan, 4438 Pinegrove Road
- Gail Wright, 4366 Bray Street
- Marian Grimwood, 4574 Doeksen Road
- G.J. Johnson & Family, 664 Greene Road
- Darcy & Karen Alexander, 439 Hobson Crescent
- Raymond & Jacqueline Whyte, 472 Barkley Road
- Maureen Ryan & Gary Taylor, 4329 Dunvegan Court
- Greg & Judi Wallace, 4330 Kirkby Court
- Richard & Leona Pedosuk, 4366 Edinburgh Court
- Dale & Vivian Bonin, 525 Sarsons Road
- Len McFarlane, past president of the Kettle Valley Residents Association
- Colin Comfort & Carmel Anderson, 545 Sarsons Road
- Mark & Tracy Taylor, 422 Hobson Crescent
- Dave Kovatch, #240 – 1640 Leckie Road
- Valerie Halford, president, Friends and Residents of the Abbott Street Heritage Conservation Area Society (FRAHCAS)

All opposed generally on the basis that:

- the Sector Plan amendment to the OCP specifically identifies the Sarsons property for “low-density”, single family, duplex and townhouses
- loss of view corridors, trees, open space
- the apartment building is too long and creates too great a building mass across the property
- the 4 storey height is invasive
- increase in traffic congestion, noise and pollution
- concern about pedestrian safety along Lakeshore Road where there are no sidewalks
- density is too high.
- lack of consultation with all the residents
- negative effect on property values
- the development is out of character with the surrounding neighbourhood
- Edinburgh Court is not safe or practical to be a feeder route to such a large project as the Sarsons Corner development.

Letter of Support

- Anne-Marie De Vos and Adair Banerd, 570 Brome Crescent, indicating support provided that building heights are no more than 2.5 storeys, and the developer provides sidewalks and retains as many of the mature trees on the property as possible.

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 7.5 acres in size.
- Summarized the changes made since the application was considered by the Advisory Planning Commission noting the proposed configuration of building heights allows the development to be more sensitive to the surrounding area.
- The current proposal is for a total of 147 units, 24 in townhouses along with 123 apartment units. The majority of the parking for the apartment buildings would be underground and the number of parking stalls that are proposed exceed bylaw requirements.
- Displayed drawings showing the proposed building elevations.
- A shadow study revealed that the amenity building would be in too much shade and so the building has been moved closer to Lakeshore Road.

Public HearingNovember 16, 2004

- The pedestrian access points off Edinburgh and Lakeshore Road would most likely be gated.
- Traffic that would be generated by the proposed multi-family units has already been anticipated in the OCP.
- The project would be high quality and provide housing choices to residents wanting to down-size and remain in the area.
- The OKMRA board agreed the 4-storey building height would not change anything.
- Would keep as many of the trees on the perimeter of the property as possible.

Don Graham, president, Okanagan Mission Residents Association (OKMRA):

- The Association directors had dialogue with the applicant but what they tried to encourage has not been implemented.
- There is a difference of opinion among the directors regarding this application.
- The letters Council has received opposing this development are reflective of the community spirit.
- The OKMRA Board continues to support the City of Kelowna Official Community Plan (OCP) and the area Sector Plan, and has great concern with traffic.
- The proposed configuration of the buildings is not compatible with the description in the Sector Plan because it allowed for the retaining of more trees.

Ron Hallick, 498 Sarsons Road:

- Zoning Bylaw 4500 was consistent with the text in the area Sector Plan. But when the City changed to the new Zoning Bylaw 8000, the Sector Plan was changed through the back door to allow for apartment blocks. Attempts to have the large vacant properties redesignated from RM3 were unsuccessful. The neighbourhood would support RU4 zoning for the subject property. RM3 'Low Density' is deceiving to the public.
- Referred to illustrative concepts in the sector plan and submitted that City staff are not following the sector plans which were 'negotiated' with the neighbourhoods.

Richard Drinnan, 669 Greene Road:

- Speaking on behalf of himself and an ad-hoc residential committee that is opposed to the RM3 zoning and that does not want sector plan policies to be ignored by the City when considering development applications.
- The sector plan indicates townhouse, duplex or single family units for the Sarsons site at a density equivalent to single family densities in the area. The sector plan does not make any mention of apartment uses on the Sarsons site. Apartment housing is significantly higher density than what was intended in the sector plan.
- The surrounding area is FAR 20% but this zone has an FAR of 70%.
- Would prefer the RU4 low density cluster zone which is consistent with the OCP and is most appropriate to meet density objectives on the Sarsons site.
- The proposed building heights do not conform to the Zoning Bylaw.
- Does not want to play catch up of densification in this neighbourhood.

Staff:

- Explained that the area sector plan is an information document; the OCP is a statutory document. The future land use in the OCP refers to range of zones. RM3 is within the low density multi-family designation which is measured as FAR and the proposal before Council meets the FAR requirement.

Trevor Wright, 4366 Brae Street:

- The residents want the City to maintain RU1 zoning for the subject property.

Dennis Crowe, Lysons Crescent:

- 125 people from the neighbourhood have sent in submissions indicating opposition; only one letter of support was submitted and it was conditional. Council is elected to support the people and the people have made it clear that the proposed density is too high. The people who reside in the area should not be penalized because the developers of other properties in the Okanagan Mission area of the city did not meet the density projected in the OCP.
- The higher the density the more traffic is generated, exacerbating traffic congestion that is already horrific, and the higher density would lower the value of other properties in the neighbourhood.

Sungkyung Jin, 524 Sarsons Road:

- Was told when she purchased her property that the adjacent property would be townhouse and single family development and it was on that basis she purchased the property. Her property was a major investment for her and is very important being her first house in Canada.
- Concerned that traffic would increase and change the peaceful nature of the neighbourhood.
- Apartment buildings would be too large and would be upsetting to the neighbourhood.
- Would support RU4 zoning.

Steve Krywulak, 555 Sarsons Road:

- Shares a lot of the concerns of the previous speaker.
- Moved to the Okanagan Mission area of the city for the ambience of the neighbourhood. Putting a monstrosity on the corner would change the appearance and perception of the neighbourhood.
- Would probably have to take a loss if this application was approved and he tried to sell his house.
- The vast majority of the community is opposed.
- Democracy represents the will of the people.

Jim Quirk, 499 Sarsons Road:

- The proposed project would be a monstrosity and would block existing view lines.
- Wants the neighbourhood to remain RU1 and if not then at least would ask that Council not allow 3 and 4 storey buildings in the middle of the subject property.

Paul Myers, 438 Farris Road:

- Is a director of the OKMRA. The developer met with 4 of the 15 directors of the association. As Don Graham said, there is a difference of opinion among the directors regarding this application. It comes down to that this is too far down the density scale and far beyond what anyone living in the area envisaged.
- Is opposed.
- Council needs to stand up for the character and integrity of the neighbourhood.

Don Lewis, 624 Tomby Court:

- Concerned about loss of privacy and view for his property if this application is approved.
- The heavy traffic already makes it difficult for him to get his travel trailer parked on-site.
- Concerned that his property values would go down with this development directly across the street from his property.

Public HearingNovember 16, 2004Susan Quirk, 499 Sarsons Road:

- Does not think the sector plan should be altered in a wholesale fashion.
- Change is okay if it comes on gradually.
- Does not support multi-family apartments on the subject property. Change such as this should be done as part of the OCP review not through the back door.
- Traffic congestion would be compounded by the people living in this development.
- Inappropriate to put the proposed density on the subject property.
- Is opposed.

Brenda Lupul, 4377 Kensington Drive:

- Her property is adjacent to the subject property on two sides.
- Is opposed because of the building heights. Would accept 2½ storey structures. Apartment buildings like this should be put in planned neighbourhoods.
- Would accept a townhome similar to hers on the subject property but is opposed to the height of the apartment structure in the centre and with the added density.

Shane Styles, 2223 Woodlawn Street:

- He is in real estate and he told his folks, who want to move back to Kelowna and want to move into a high end development, about this project and they are interested in living there and are in support of the project proceeding.

Quentin Dyck, 4370 Kensington Drive:

- Concerned about loss of privacy from the apartment building units.
- People from outside the area should not be deciding what he wants in his back yard.
- Bought in the area because of the RU1 zoning and for the lifestyle of that zone. Would be willing to go to 2½ storeys but not 3 or 4 storeys because of the loss of privacy.

Gail Wright, 4366 Bray Street:

- Is a long time resident of the Okanagan Mission area. The residents were persuaded to support townhouses and single family units on the subject property. It is all about expectation based on the information available. The public needs to be kept in the loop and what they were told would be on the property is what should be developed.

Ross Langmaid, 506 Sarsons Road:

- Is opposed to the proposed density and the apartment buildings.
- The public perception is that Council wants the density and the residents of the area will be the sacrificial lambs.
- Traffic is already congested in the Mission area and will be worse if the density is increased.
- Is happy with the reduced building height along the boundary abutting the existing residential but is opposed to the height variance for the apartment buildings. Would support 2½ storeys.

Marian Grimwood, 4574 Doeksen Road:

- Opposed to 3 or 4 storey apartment buildings on the site and the continuous 350 ft. building frontage that is proposed.
- The proposal is contrary to the OCP and Sector Plan for the area.
- Concerned that once the zoning is in place, there is no guarantee what is presented tonight is what would be developed.
- Supports densification of the property but as townhouses and duplexes.

Public HearingNovember 16, 2004Dave Kovatch, 620 Greene Road:

- Concerned about traffic and pedestrian safety on Sarsons and Lakeshore Road.

Richard Drinnan, (continued):

- Main issues of concern are density in the proposed RM3 zone as opposed to the RU4 zone; the 3 and 4 storey building heights; and the continuous frontage of the buildings is too long for the zone.
- Concerned about how City staff are handling the application and the lack of accountability to the residents. Submitted a letter to the City Clerk saying the processes are flawed and deficient in numerous respects and should the application proceed, his ad hoc association would be immediately applying to the courts to have the application set aside.

Gail Temple, representing the applicant:

- She took an information package door to door and spoke to everyone that she could in the neighbourhood.
- Met with the board of the OKMRA and only 4 directors showed up.
- The OCP objectives are met with this proposal.
- Every effort is being made to be respectful of the back yards of adjacent properties.
- The requested density is supported by the OCP. Traffic issues are much larger than just this development.
- This development will provide three housing choices that are not represented in the Okanagan Mission area today.
- RM3 was a future land use designation supported by the OCP at the time the subject property was purchased by the applicant.

Council:

- Agreed that they would like time to read the many written submissions that were received late and did not make it into their agenda packages.

Moved by Councillor Shepherd/Seconded by Councillor Cannan

P1096/04/11/16 THAT Council debate of Bylaw No. 9318 (Z04-0063 – Gazelle Enterprises et al – Sarsons/Lakeshore Roads) be deferred to the Regular Meeting of Monday, November 22, 2004.

Carried

Councillors Hobson and Shepherd returned to the Council Chamber at 7:48 p.m.

3.2 1862-1872 Chandler Street

- 3.2 Bylaw No. 9317 (Z04-0056) – John and Anne Bulych and Sharon Bulych (Pacific Sun Enterprises Ltd.) – Chandler Street – THAT City of Kelowna Zoning Bylaw No. 8000 be amended by changing the zoning classification of Lot 8, DL 137, ODYD, Plan 10011, located on Chandler Street, Kelowna, B.C. from the RU6 - Two Dwelling Housing to RU6b – Two Dwelling Housing with Boarding House zone.

Staff:

- The rezoning would allow the applicant to relocate an existing half-way house that is located directly across Chandler Street onto the subject property, in order that the vacated property could be consolidated with the Still Waters (private hospital) and Joseph Benjamin Residence properties.
- The 'b' zoning designation was added to the RU6 zone in July 1999 because of concern that there could be a proliferation of boarding and lodging houses.
- A half-way house is considered a boarding house which is a group of people living together in one structure with one common kitchen. The 'b' zoning designation is required in order to have more than 5 unrelated people living in such a facility.
- Some boarding house facilities operate as a half-way house for parolees and some have only a limited number of beds for parolees with the other beds being for people recovering from substance abuse, etc.
- Land use control is only about how many unrelated people can live in one household. No special license is required for a half-way house because that land use is considered no different than boarding homes that cater to seniors or youth.
- Contrary to an insert in Daily Courier and a media storey in that paper, the RU6b zone is not being amended to allow half-way houses; half-way houses can be anywhere that boarding houses are allowed.
- Displayed a site plan showing how the building would be sited on the subject property. Parking would be behind the building off Chandler Street.
- It would be difficult to categorize half-way houses as a different zone without discriminating against the clientele.

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

Letters of Opposition

- Samantha Wilson, 1232 Sutherland Avenue
- Brian Large, owner of 1839 Chandler and 1339 Pridham
- Ronald Mitchel, 1331-1333 Belaire Avenue
- Brian Dillabough, 1349 Pridham Avenue
- Evelyn Dillabough, 1349 Pridham Avenue (2 letters)
- Linda Townsend, 750 Hollydell Road
- Dianne Leduc, Walter Shulhan, Freya Rose, no address given
- Karen Foster, no address given

Opposed generally on the basis that crime, vandalism, and night time noise would increase; property values would decrease; a half-way house is not a boarding house; anxiety/fear for safety given recent news events related to the lack of control of half-way house residents.

Petitions of Opposition:

- Petition bearing 76 signatures opposed because of concerns about the risk to family safety, inadequate security, the market value and desirability of their properties would be diminished, and suggesting that half-way houses should be in commercial or industrial areas.
- Petition bearing 93 signatures suggesting that there should be a specific zone for half-way houses to ensure the safety of surrounding neighbourhoods.

Public HearingNovember 16, 2004Other:

- Letter from the applicant about the application.
- A letter signed by the applicant and the owners of the two abutting properties (Ken & Linda Oakes and Gary & Linda Baker) indicating they no longer object to the proposed rezoning.

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

David Kornell, applicant:

- The rezoning would not add to the number of half-way houses in Kelowna nor would it add to the number of residents in the community.
- The Interior Health Authority has asked him to build a Campus of Care either by redeveloping the Still Waters site or else on a site nearby. A Campus of Care provides 3 or 4 levels of care on the same site.
- The Still Waters property surrounds the existing half-way house facility on three sides.
- In order to meet the timelines set up by the Interior Health Authority, the rezoning is needed now so that construction can begin immediately.
- An agreement has been reached with the immediate adjacent neighbours.

Ken Oakes, 1882 Chandler Street:

- Also speaking for the Bakers, 1359 Pridham Avenue.
- Read the letter that Council received in their agenda packages stating that agreement has been reached between Pacific Sun Ltd. and them and confirmed that they are in support of the relocation of the facility to the subject property.
- The applicant has agreed to construct a 2 m fence and install landscaping to separate their properties.
- His family has resided on Chandler Street for 12 years and the Bakers have lived on Pridham for 9 years and much of the time they have been burdened with undesirable neighbours. The condition of the existing residence makes it appealing for a crack house or other drug house.
- Moving the half-way house facility to the subject property would allow the applicant to fully develop the property across the street. If this application is not approved, then the houses that are in disrepair would probably get back into the rental market and become inhabited with another group of undesirable neighbours.
- Sees redevelopment of the Still Water site as a benefit to the neighbourhood.
- He has never had a concern with the half-way house since the facility was opened in 1996.

Martin Mikoula, 1850 Chandler Street:

- Is not opposed to transitional housing but if the neighbourhood is going to be forced to deal with these facilities, safety concerns need to be addressed.
- Concerned that other RU6b zoned properties could also become half-way houses. Need to amend the bylaw or create a separate zone to allow the City to control the frequency and location of half-way houses in Kelowna.
- Does not want to discriminate against anybody but controls need to be in place to prevent the community from being exposed to a proliferation of these facilities.
- Need to get the protocol in place to protect others from having to deal with safety issues associated with introducing half-way houses into neighbourhoods.
- The residents are high risk offenders and are allowed to come and go at will until midnight without supervision.
- Has spoken with the applicant several times and asked for fencing and financial compensation for loss of property value but the applicant respectfully said no. Concerned that the residents of the half-way house will congregate in the front yard of the subject property – at the current location they have to be in the rear yard – and will be able to look into his yard. The applicant needs to consider the security concerns of all the residents in the neighbourhood not just the two adjacent.

Public HearingNovember 16, 2004

- Has lived there for 10 years and was not aware of the half-way house facility when he purchased his property. Has since sold the property to his sister but he still lives there.
- The half-way house is in the neighbourhood already so would support moving the facility across the street if there was a separate zone for half-way houses.
- Would prefer putting these facilities in an industrial area where there are no children around.
- It was a gross injustice when the three half-way house facilities were established in Kelowna. Need to prevent that from happening again.

Staff:

- Clarified that there are currently no half-way houses in the RU6b zone. The three existing facilities all have non-conforming status because they were a permitted use prior the 'b' zoning designation being created in 1999.
- Facilities with more than 5 unrelated residents require rezoning to RU6b.

Barb Schmid, owner of 1850 Chandler Street:

- A sex offender is more likely to re-offend if he can look into yards and see the children playing, than if he cannot see the children.
- The hedge on her property was dying so it had to be taken out and that is why the residents of the half-way house in the new location would be able to see into her yard. Wants the applicant to provide a fence to screen children playing in her yard.
- Two of the three half-way houses have more than the 10 beds they are permitted.

Robert Koehle, 1277 Pridham Avenue:

- Has lived at this address for 41 years.
- Seems like the area is designated as a transition zone. There is a drug rehab, a women's shelter and two halfway houses in close proximity to this neighbourhood.
- Questioned the ability to move the half-way house onto the subject property and still meet setback requirements.

John Zeger, 1421 Sutherland Avenue:

- Lives less than 500 ft. from the subject property.
- Agrees that the residents of the half-way house should not be able to see into neighbours yards, and that a non-residential area would be preferred for this type of facility.
- The Capri Community Association has not been recognized by the City as a valid group. Asked that the City disregard the statements of any interveners who claim to represent this association.

Brian Large, 2617 Abbott Street:

- Concerned that halfway houses can be located anywhere in a residential zone in the city and yet he sees no concern on Council's faces.
- The people are convicted criminals and are getting out of jail early because sentences are too lenient. Putting them in a half-way house in Kelowna means they will be making contacts and staying in Kelowna, We are importing criminals yet Council does not seem concerned.
- This is the first time that the half-way house use is being tied to a zone. Once it is approved as a use in the RU6b zone, it will be a permitted use in that zone from then on.
- Concerned his property value would be negatively impacted.

Public HearingNovember 16, 2004Jo-ann McLellan, Christleton Avenue:

- Residents of Kelowna are beginning to see the effects of drug use in our area.
- Should consider a separate zone for half-way houses and require a separate business license so as to have a say in proximity to schools, playgrounds, fencing, etc.
- A separate zone would give the City the opportunity for some control in where these facilities get located.
- Adding this use to the RU6b zone allows other properties zoned RU6b to discontinue their existing use and become half-way houses potentially with paedophiles, etc.

Bob Enns, Okanagan Halfway House Society:

- Is manager of the half-way house that would be relocated to the subject property.
- Clarified that it is not easy to get a contract with Corrections Services Canada for a half-way house.
- The facilities have 10 beds but periodically more beds are added on a short term emergency basis.
- Whenever this type of facility is opened, they are required to first canvass the houses in the neighbourhood.
- The operators of these facilities do not discriminate by offence but the RCMP has a screening method in place and the operator can deny a high risk offender.
- Is willing to put up a fence for the property at 1850 Chandler Street if that is what it takes to get their support of this application.
- Enlightened Council and the public gallery on the operation of a half-way house.

Martin Mikoula (continued):

- Council's decision on whether or not to move the half-way house should not be influenced by the applicant's need for property.
- Read statistics on convicts who re-offend.
- More knowledge is needed before dealing with this application. Suggested that a committee be struck to come up with some rules first.
- Neighbourhood's need to have a say before another half-way house opens.

Brian Large (continued):

- Has a better understanding of half-way houses now but his concerns have not diminished.
- Asked for a commitment from Council to try to develop regulations to control half-way houses.

David Kornell, applicant:

- Needs to have a proposal to the Interior Health Authority by December 20th in order to meet their timeline for redeveloping the Still Water site.
- The Still Waters facility needs to be brought up to current standards.
- The conceptual drawings show there is sufficient area for the half-way house and required parking on the subject property.
- The fence he has agreed to construct for the neighbours would be provided on the south and west sides and he would be prepared to do a fence as a screen for the property across the street as well.
- Has never had an issue with the residents of the half-way house in its current location, and in fact some of the residents of the half-way house were working on reconstruction of the Joseph Benjamin Residence.

There were no further comments.

Public Hearing

November 16, 2004

4. TERMINATION:

The Hearing was declared terminated at 10:42 p.m.

Certified Correct:

Mayor

Acting City Clerk

BLH/am