

Public HearingJuly 12, 2005

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, July 12, 2005.

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

Staff members in attendance were: Acting City Manager/Director of Planning & Corporate Services, R.L. Mattiussi; City Clerk, A.M. Flack; Manager of Development Services, A.V. Bruce; Manager of Community Development & Real Estate, D.L. Shipclark; Development Engineering Manager, S. Muenz; Transportation Manager, R.W. Westlake*; Traffic & Transportation Engineer, H. Thompson; and Council Recording Secretary, B.L. Harder.

(* denotes partial attendance)

1. Mayor Gray called the Hearing to order at 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 City Clerk advised the Notice of this Public Hearing was advertised by being posted on the Notice Board at City Hall on June 24, 2005, and by being placed in the Kelowna Daily Courier issues of July 4 & 5, 2005, and in the Kelowna Capital News issue of July 3, 2005, and by sending out or otherwise delivering 156 letters to the owners and occupiers of surrounding properties between June 25-27, 2005.

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 **278 Old Vernon Road**

- 3.1 Bylaw No. 9439 (Z05-0018) – Martin & Bonnie Dupree – 278 Old Vernon Road – THAT City of Kelowna Zoning Bylaw No. 8000 be amended by changing the zoning classification of Lot 2, Sec. 2, Twp. 23, ODYD, Plan 11263 except that part lying west of a line drawn parallel to and perpendicularly distant 102.50 feet from the west boundary of said lot, located on Old Vernon Road, Kelowna, B.C. from the A1 – Agriculture 1 zone to the A1s – Agriculture 1 with Secondary Suite zone.

Staff:

- The suite along with a carport addition is proposed in an accessory building at the rear of the property.

The City Clerk advised that no correspondence and/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.

There were no further comments.

3.2(a) 492 Clifton Road

- 3.2(a) Bylaw No. 9442 (OCP04-0021) – Marona Estates Ltd. (New Town Planning Services/Keith Funk) – 492 Clifton Road – THAT Map 19.1 of the *Kelowna 2020* - Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 7600 be amended by changing the Future Land Use designation of Lot 1, Sec. 31 & 32, Twp. 26, ODYD, Plan KAP76392, located on Clifton Road, Kelowna, B.C., from the Single/Two Unit Residential designation to the Multiple Unit Residential – Medium Density designation, as shown on Map “A” attached to the report of Planning & Corporate Services Department dated February 2, 2005.

See under 3.2(b).

3.2(b) 492 Clifton Road

- 3.2(b) Bylaw No. 9443 (Z04-0078) – Marona Estates Ltd. (New Town Planning Services/Keith Funk) – 492 Clifton Road – THAT City of Kelowna Zoning Bylaw No. 8000 be amended by changing the zoning classification of Lot 1, Sec. 31 & 32, Twp. 26, ODYD, Plan KAP76392, located on Clifton Road, Kelowna, B.C., from the A1 – Agriculture 1 zone to the RM4 – Transitional Low Density Housing zone.

Councillor Day declared a conflict of interest because direct family members own the subject property and left the Council Chamber at 7:12 p.m.

Staff:

- The subject property is on the west side of Clifton Road.
- The concept plan provided by the applicant indicates a range of townhouses, row houses, semi-detached units and apartment style buildings that would be developed on the bottom 40 acres. The zone allows up to 3 storeys in height. Buildings along Clifton Road would be limited to 2 storeys above grade with some under-building parking. The concept plan also indicates public trail connections from the immediate neighbourhood into the upper portions of the land, which would be incorporated within Knox Mountain Park, and trails within the development that would be shared with the public.
- Outlined the OCP objectives allowing for some density transfer for this property, and referenced comments from the Glenmore/Clifton Area Sector Plan encouraging the transfer of any development potential on the upper portion to the area below the escarpment and adjacent to Clifton in order to preserve the upper portion as open space.
- The City has already acquired a portion of the property and a media release was put out a couple of weeks ago making that deal public.
- If this property is rezoned, there is certainty that the remainder of the upper portion of the property would be transferred to the City, clear title.
- The media and the applicant have advertised that the RM4 zoning could support in the order of 1,200 units. The Zoning Bylaw controls the floor area allowable. How the applicant breaks that up is up to him. The total unit yield of the property will not be known until the individual Development Permit applications come forward.
- The applicant has had a consultant undertake a traffic impact study the results of which have been released to the public through a media release and to Council. The initial study used conservative numbers, exaggerating the number of trips per unit to prove beyond doubt that the transportation network would be able to support the transportation demands from this development. Another study was also done using more conventional numbers. The studies recommend improvements, such as traffic lights at Caramillo and Cara Glen with some 4-laning of Clifton around those intersections to control traffic flow and the Skyline connector. However, at this point, there is no conclusive evidence that all the unit impact the applicant has put on the table could be addressed. That determination would be made as the development proceeds.

Public HearingJuly 12, 2005

- The Local Government Act allows for amenity bonusing and density transfers; however, the City is not using those pieces of legislation. The density transfer is being achieved through conventional zoning instead. However, the zoning has to stand on its own and meet the test of Council to be supported.
- The area sector plan in its preamble provides for some single family units in the upper portion. To determine the extent of density transfer it was necessary to look at residual land value. Staff are confident the land transfer is equitable, based on the units proposed on the lower portion. The base density for the lower 40 acres has been determined at 240-250 units.

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

Opposition:

- petition of opposition bearing 4 signatures from residents of the surrounding area
- petition of opposition bearing signatures from residents of the surrounding area
- letter from Lois Smith, 631 Clifton Road
- letter from The Friends of Knox Mountain Park
- letter from Vernon Wallace, 15 Bello Road
- letter from Brian Demers & Georgia Chiovitti, 647 Clifton Road
- letter from Ian Rennie, 19 Bello Road

Opposed generally on the basis that traffic would increase and the neighbourhood would be negatively impacted.

Support:

- Kelsey Kitsch, 820 Manhattan Drive
- Leigh Bjornson, 1128 Sunset Drive
- Mary & Michael Cocivera, 1732 Marona Court
- Candy Bolokoski, 3513 Gates Road
- Catherine Callary, 955 Manhattan Drive
- Jerry Dusik, 609 Spruceview Place South
- Fiona McCormack, #45 – 545 Glenmeadows Road
- Lori Hutchinson, 609 Superview Place South
- Derek Frechette, 955 Manhattan Drive
- Sheila Frechette, 840 Mount Royal Drive
- Gerry Frechette, 840 Mount Royal Drive
- Nick & Trudy Battaglio, 1739 Marona Court
- Greg Dusik, 609 Spruceview Place South
- Laurie Barton, 176 Ritchie Court
- Julie Buchenauer, 1614 Lindsay Drive
- Stanley McCormack, 33 – 450 Yates Road
- Joseph Sullivan, 1751 Spruceview Court
- Doug Watson, 303 -3175 DeMontreuil Court
- Ray Redekopp, 258 Avonlea Way
- Cindy Bennett, 258 Avonlea Way
- Lani & Kelly O'Flynn, 2360 Boucherie Road

In favour generally on the basis that the additional parkland would benefit all Kelowna residents; there would be well planned housing that is needed for Kelowna's growing population; this site is a rare opportunity for additional density with minimal effect on neighbours.

Public HearingJuly 12, 2005

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

Keith Funk, applicant:

- The land has been owned by the Marshall Family since 1949.
- The OCP envisions the expansion of Knox Mountain Regional Park.
- The proposed park exchange for RM4 follows the model in the Glenmore/Clifton/Dilworth Sector Plan.
- The City has already acquired 44 acres for \$3.0 million at appraised value. The City would be acquiring the remaining 75 acres for about 20% of appraised value. The benefit to the developer is about \$1.2 million; the benefit to the City is \$3.8 million.
- The developer is attempting to create a new concept with clustered housing and a variety of housing options as a transitional urban form to the park. Ecologically integrated, not a walled community; a public gateway to the park.
- Individual Development Permit applications would be required for each phase of development.
- Outlined the community consultation process.
- Showed a site cross section showing enhanced walkways and 2-storey maximum building height on Clifton Road, the Commonage Greenway running the full length of the development, and how the contour of the property allows for larger buildings. The commonage linear park would be almost 1 km long, privately owned but dedicated for public use. The other park spaces would also be linked by trail networks and be for public use.
- Protech Consulting has determined that servicing infrastructure could be provided in accord with the City's Servicing Bylaw and utility standards.
- Hamilton Associates did the traffic impact assessment. The upgrades that are proposed to year 2020 indicate satisfactory levels of service.
- The zoning allows up to 1,750 units; the developer would have to achieve at least 1,325 units for the project to be viable.
- If the subject application is not successful, the owners could not leave the upper portion of the land as open space and would come back with an intention to develop.

Ken Campbell, 118 Boppart Court:

- Is a director of the Clifton/Highlands Community Association and a member of the Friends of Knox Mountain Park.
- Concerned about the amount of density that would be transferred. Agrees that the park needs to be expanded even beyond what is proposed with this application, and is in favour of a density transfer but it has to make sense and would support only 400-450 units.
- The City was not supposed to pay any cash. Now the City has paid \$3 million and is paying another \$1 million for the 100 year lease.

Staff:

- Clarified that the value of the 117 acre upper portion of the site was set at around \$7.8 million. The City negotiated with the Marshalls to purchase 42.37 acres of the property for \$3 million and that agreement to purchase has been finalized. The balance of the site is valued at \$4.8 million and the Marshalls have offered to transfer that to the City for \$1 million free and clear (not a 100 year lease). If the zoning does not go ahead, that transfer also would not go ahead.

Michele Rule, 1853 Edgehill Avenue:

- Supports the application. To add such a large property to the park is an opportunity that should not be missed.
- A 2-bedroom apartment on the lower portion of the property would be a lot more affordable than a single family home with a view on the upper portion of the site.

Public HearingJuly 12, 2005Randy Warnaar, 725 Clifton Road:

- Just recently purchased his property.
- Supports the enlargement of the park and is excited about the extra recreational area being added to his neighbourhood.

Jason Rock, 51 Caramillo Road:

- Has lived at this address for 3 years and loves the area. However, has seen the traffic on Caramillo Road get busier and busier every year. There are two speed bumps but they do not appear to be helping.
- Traffic from Glenmore Road uses Caramillo as a short-cut route; anticipate that a good percentage of the traffic generated by all the units that are proposed will also short-cut through Caramillo.
- Is not against development and likes the idea of expanding the park, but would like the area to develop with lot sizes similar to existing lot sizes, even if the homes cost more.

Ken Fell, 35 Caramillo Road:

- Moved to this address a couple of months ago.
- Concerned that the neighbourhood roads will not be able to handle the additional traffic from the Skyline connector and developing the subject property at the proposed density would bring even more traffic into the neighbourhood.
- Concerned about children's safety in the neighbourhood with the busy traffic.

Dr. Bill Bowering, 985 Augusta Court:

- Speaking on behalf of Friends of Knox Mountain Park (FKMP), expansion of the park is a major objective of FKMP and they support fair compensation for the owner and applaud the City's initiative to purchase. However, the magnitude of a 1,350 unit increase in density seems somewhat excessive. FKMP is not convinced that this is the best deal the City can negotiate with the owners.
- FKMP wants to see the residents in the surrounding neighbourhood not have an unfair density imposed on them and for that reason is reluctant to lend its support to the application at this time.

Cindy Rogers, 281 Avonlea Way:

- Lot sizes should be similar to existing lot sizes in the neighbourhood.
- The proposed two traffic lights would create an extreme hazard for traffic on Clifton Road.

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

- Opposed. CRCP supports the views of the Friends of Knox Mountain Park.
- This is the 21st application to amend the OCP this year.
- This is far too great an increase in density beyond what the OCP envisages. The OCP is rapidly becoming a joke in this community.
- Council gave first reading to the bylaws for this proposal before the application even went to the Advisory Planning Commission. Concerned about the speed this application was brought to Council.

Public HearingJuly 12, 2005Les Povarchook, 882 Skyline Street:

- Concerned about the increased traffic that would be created by this proposal and that this application is still being referred to as a density transfer. The rezoning has to stand on its own but in the back of everyone's mind is that if the rezoning is not approved, the City does not get the remainder of the land.
- The requested RM4 zoning goes beyond the one increment increase supported by the OCP.
- Concerned to now hear that 1,325 units would be required for the project to be economically feasible for the developer.
- Suggested that the City purchase the upper portion outright and increase taxes to pay for the acquisition.
- Council should not ignore the good of the residents whose lifestyle would be detrimentally impacted by the proposed development.

Aron Sced, 549 Clifton Road:

- Concerned about traffic. Has two young children and traffic is already a serious issue. Has not seen enough evidence that the developer has taken into account the additional traffic and is concerned that the two traffic lights would create even more problems.
- Does not object to the project but objects to the density of the project. The Marshall family should be more generous and give this land to the City.

Leslie Turner, 333 Rio Drive South:

- Thanked the Marshalls for their generosity in offering the land for expanding the park versus the view lots they could have had.
- It is important for the City to take the opportunity to acquire the land.
- The proposed development allows the community access to land they never had access to before.
- A lot of the traffic problems the people on Caramillo and Cara Glen are facing are caused by traffic from Glenmore Highlands.

Fred Barrett, President of Clifton Highlands Residents Association:

- Concerned about steep road grades on Clifton Road and from the proposed Skyline connection to Rio Drive. Clifton Road is already dangerous in the winter; the two traffic lights would add to that traffic situation. Driveway access for the residents on the east side of Clifton could/should be made safer by providing service roads. Now is the time to address the problems with grade on that road, before this development goes in.
- Many residents are using Caramillo as an exit to Glenmore Road North. Construction traffic from the proposed development would use this shortcut to get to the landfill. There is nothing to improve the problems for traffic going north.

Les Furgala, 579 Clifton Road:

- Has experienced trouble getting up Clifton Road in the winter.
- Distressed at the changes that have been made in the area as the area grows.
- The Marshalls are black mailing Council into approving the rezoning. Would prefer to pay higher taxes so that the City could buy the upper portion of the land and keep development on the lower portion down to 400 to 500 units.
- The road to hook up with Skyline should be along the back of the existing orchard.
- The whole planning of this project is just terrible.

Public HearingJuly 12, 2005

- Mo Rantucci, 615 Glenmeadows Road:
- Concerned that this developer has not finished the development that he started on Glenmore Road.
 - It will not be possible to solve the traffic problem.

- Grainger Evans, 567 Clifton Road:
- Concerned about traffic and the density of the proposal. A lower density around 400 units might be acceptable and a road around the base of the escarpment to serve the proposed subdivision and the people north of there. The proposed 1,300-1,700 units would be overload.
 - If one unit of housing generates 10 single vehicle trips per day, that would indicate 13,000 single trips on Clifton in addition to what is there now. He already has difficulty getting out of his driveway; cannot see how he will ever get out with the additional traffic.

- Carl Hare, 148 Clifton Road North:
- Skyline and Clifton should be a T-intersection with a light but City transportation staff say it cannot be done because of the steep grade of Clifton. The grade of Caramillo and Cara Glen is even steeper.
 - Has problems getting out of his driveway what with the steep hill and vision problems.
 - The developer's plans indicate two main internal roads and all parking underground. At the proposed high density the roads will be narrow. Concerned about where visitors will park.
 - If the proposed development is supposed to be a gateway to the park, there should be parking for visitors to the park. Anticipate that on-street parking will be a problem.
 - Concerned about what will happen to all the trucks and other vehicles parking along Clifton during construction as the subject property develops.

- Ralph Henderson, 8 Caramillo Road:
- Very seldom does a week go by when he is almost in an accident backing out of his driveway. The City is pushing an arterial road through a residential neighbourhood. Traffic will increase immensely.
 - There have been times when he has not been able to get up Clifton Road with a 4x4. With the proposed traffic light there will definitely be problems at that intersection.

- Dianna Podmoroff, 317 Woodcrest Court:
- going north on Glenmore we always cut through Caramillo regardless of the speed bumps.
 - My main concern is security and the crime rates. Magic Estates currently enjoys low crime rates. Adding high density generally means a more transient population and that generally means the crime rates increase. A large high density development would give the criminal element an opportunity to blend into the neighbourhood which they do not have now.

- Val Halsford, president of Friends & Residents of the Abbott Street Heritage Conservation Area Society (FRAHCAS):
- FRAHCAS supports the position taken by the Friends of Knox Mountain Park and the Clifton Highlands Residents Association.
 - Council needs to listen to the people who live in the surrounding area and will be impacted by the proposed development.

Public HearingJuly 12, 2005John Graves, 331 Woodpark Crescent:

- Admitted that he uses Caramillo as a shortcut route to Glenmore.
- Concerned about safety of pedestrians and cyclists and where the children from the proposed development would go to school.
- It feels like the proposed high density is being dumped in their back yards. He is becoming more concerned the more he hears about this development.
- Seems clear there is no separation between the density transfer and the zoning.

Dave McCoubrey, 1783 Sprucegrove Court.

- Suggested that a median be installed to prohibit left turns into the Caramillo neighbourhood, and that providing a service road is the only solution to the problems for people backing out of driveways.
- Is concerned about the proposed density. Would prefer 400 units.

Ted Douglas, 319 Woodcrest Court:

- People check zoning and the OCP before buying and people expect that the integrity of those will be preserved.
- The traffic study was basically volume based and there was no reference to winter driving conditions or to wildlife corridors through the area.
- Would prefer a much lower density.

Resident from Prince George:

- Studied at OUC in Kelowna for seven years.
- Supports the service road idea with a buffer zone for people walking to the park and reducing the density to 700 or 800 units.

Domenico Vinci, 572 San Cabrio Court:

- Concerned about children's safety with the increase in traffic.
- Also concerned about the proposed density.

Brian Demers, 647 Clifton Road South:

- He lives in a single family home and all his neighbours do too. Every year he gives them cherries; does not think he will have enough cherries for all the people in this development.

Brent Bjornson, 680 Doyle Avenue:

- The proposed traffic lights would create more gaps in the traffic allowing for more opportunities to back out of driveways.
- This is an opportunity for the City to preserve the top of the mountain.
- Supports the proposed expansion of the park land and the high density zoning.

Melanie Steppuhn, 1635 Smithson Place:

- Whatever the cost, natural space has to be preserved for future generations. It is community responsibility to pay for the land.
- Supports the proposed density transfer and would support increased density throughout the entire city.

Audrie Tingstad, Durnin Road:

- Hopes to move into the Conservatory (also by this developer) and that the project will start shortly.
- People will always complain that there are too many people coming to the Okanagan and that the roads cannot handle the extra traffic.
- This developer has been honourable in their dealings. The Marshalls have lived here for many years and they will do a decent subdivision.

Public HearingJuly 12, 2005Remi Miller, 868 Skyline Street:

- Has lived at this address since 1968.
- There are now nine driveways backing on the downside of Skyline and the grade now is 10% (2% over what it should be because Skyline will be an arterial road). A frontage road has been talked about but nothing ever seems to happen.

Rich Kirkbride, 1503 MacLeay Court:

- Opposes the proposed high density. Agrees that the extra housing is needed and that the subdivision needs to go ahead but not at the proposed density.
- Would support the City buying the park land. Cannot agree with the huge density transfer.
- Clifton is being closed off because of the grade yet Skyline is the same grade.

Lance Stone, 588 Spruceview Place:

- Does not believe that only 10% of the traffic generated by the proposed development would use the Caramillo shortcut; the increase would be far more significant than that.

Wes Kemett, Mountain/High Road Area:

- Anticipates that the amount of traffic going through the Caramillo neighbourhood will continue to increase over the next few years.
- The city needs the parkland, but the proposed density is too big a trade off.

Gordon Van Montfoort, 615 South Clifton Road South:

- Thirteen years ago the City had a different plan for Skyline, along the hillside above the Marshall orchard, but the plan was changed.
- Suggested a number of alternates for handling traffic in the area and that another route is needed from Clifton at the top of the hill across to Glenmore Road.
- Vehicles speed down Clifton and have difficulty getting stopped at the bottom of the hill.
- He would end up with a 4-lane road in front of his house with the improvements that are proposed. Does not want a 4-lane section of road in front of his house.
- Need to divide the traffic 50/50 between Clifton and Skyline.

Ralph Henderson, continued:

- Property values are lower in areas with high traffic volumes and higher in quiet areas like what the neighbourhood was when he bought his property.
- The proposed changes to the road network will have an adverse effect on property values in the neighbourhood, and high density housing across the street will also negatively impact property values. Feels like their property values are being depreciated to protect the value of the park land.
- Almost everyone tonight has expressed concern about the traffic.

Les Povarchook, continued:

- The OCP supports a one increment increase in density; this would be a two increment increase.

Keith Funk, applicant:

- Parking for visitors and for people accessing the mountain would be within the development at the community centre that is proposed and the on-site roads also provide for resident overflow parking.
- The existing lots on Clifton are large because they were developed on septic.
- Moving Skyline westward was based on future water line requirements. The road is in the right location.
- Does not believe that property values would be negatively impacted.
- Build-out is anticipated to take 10-15 years.

Public HearingJuly 12, 2005Warren Neufeld, Project Manager:

- Responded to questioning by a member of Council trying to determine whether the density transfer was equitable to the \$3.8 million difference, explaining that two independent appraisers arrived at \$7.8 million as a discounted value, and explaining the process used in determining the present value of the income stream.
- The upper 75 acres could be developed under the existing zoning but the development would not be financially viable with the constraints that were put in place by this Council.
- Negotiations have been going on for 18 months now. The City is getting much better value; regrets offering the City the deal.

Ensen Ho, Traffic Consultant:

- Addressed the traffic concerns raised by the public advising that in his experience increased traffic volumes usually slow traffic down. The developer would also be providing sidewalk, cycle lanes and street lights and signal lights all of which would improve safety.
- Traffic counts that were done on a week day in February and in March of this year indicated that the volume of traffic using Caramillo is low (5% or about 20 vehicles per hour).
- The proposed development would generate about .78 to .8 trips per hour during peak periods, and half of that outside of peak times.
- The development would produce positive impacts for the area.

Keith Funk, continued:

- Caramillo Road is considered by the City Transportation division to be a minor collector road.
- Minimum 50% of the lower portion of the land would be undeveloped and the proposed development would not be fenced.
- There was no requirement for specific wildlife corridors.

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

P679/05/07/12 THAT the meeting be continued past 11 p.m. in accordance with Section 5.5 of Council Procedure Bylaw No. 9200.

CarriedStaff:

- Clarified that if the Public Hearing is closed tonight and the application stays alive, staff would work with the applicant to conclude all the studies and would be back for adoption once the servicing agreement is in place. If site servicing is changed to other than what was considered tonight or if staff reach an impasse with the developer, a new Public Hearing would be required.
- The developer's offer to the City with regard to the additional land for \$1 million is contingent on the City giving the subject bylaws second and third readings tonight. They would have the option of withdrawing their offer if the City did not meet the terms of their offer.

Council:

- Agreed to close the Public Hearing on this item, and to debate the bylaws tonight.

There were no further comments.

Councillor Day returned to the Council Chamber at 11:27 p.m.

Public HearingJuly 12, 2005**3.3 1276 Teasdale Road**

- 3.3 Bylaw No. 9441 (Z04-0064) – Alfred & Christine Kempf – 1276 Teasdale Road – THAT City of Kelowna Zoning Bylaw No. 8000 be amended by changing the zoning classification of a portion of Parcel A (Plan B5620) of Lot 2, Sections 23 and 24, Township 26, O.D.Y.D. Plan 2329 Except Plan H13224, located on Teasdale Road, Kelowna, B.C., from the A1 – Agriculture 1 zone to the A1s – Agriculture 1 with Secondary Suite zone, as per Map “A” attached to the report of Planning & Corporate Services Department dated June 9, 2005.

Staff:

- The applicant has received approval for a homesite severance at the southwest corner of the property. There is an existing house and a building with two residential units previously used for farm help. To keep the buildings in tact as part of the homesite severance, the applicant requires rezoning and one of the suites would have to be converted to a storage area.

The City Clerk advised that no correspondence and/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.

Alfred Kempf, applicant:

- Indicated he had nothing to add at this time.

There were no further comments.

3.4 Industrial High Technology Research & Product Design

- 3.4 Bylaw No. 9444 (TA05-0004) – City of Kelowna – THAT City of Kelowna Zoning Bylaw No. 8000, Section 2.3.3 – General Definitions be amended to add a definition for Industrial High Technology Research and Product Design and to amend Section 15.4.2 of the I4-Central Industrial Zone to include Industrial High Technology Research and Product Design as a Principal Use.

Staff:

- The amendment would facilitate the location of high tech businesses within the industrial area located to the north of the downtown.

The City Clerk advised that no correspondence and/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 were no further comments.

4. TERMINATION:

The Hearing was declared terminated at 11:31 p.m.

Certified Correct:

 Mayor

 City Clerk

/blh