

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, August 9, 2005.

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

Council members absent: Councillor A.F. Blanleil.

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; and Recording Secretary, I. Tilstra.

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 "*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 Public Hearing was advertised by being posted on the Notice Board at City Hall on July 22, 2005, and by being placed in the Kelowna Daily Courier issues of August 2, 2005 and August 3, 2005, and in the Kelowna Capital News issue of July 31, 2005, and by sending out or otherwise delivering 442 letters to the owners and occupiers of surrounding properties between July 22, 2005 and July 25, 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(a) McKinley Road, End of Slater Road and West of Slater Road, Finch Road and Part of Glenmore Road North

- 3.1(a) Bylaw No. 9466 (OCP03-0003) – Vintage Landing 622664 BC Ltd., Robert Johnson, Tanya Courtorielle, Bradley Serwa, Kevin Serwa and Peter Angle (Site 360 and 622664 BC Ltd.); McKinley Road, End of Slater Road and West of Slater Road, Finch Road and Part of Glenmore Road North – THAT Map 19.1 of the *Kelowna 2020 - Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 7600* be amended by changing the Future Land Use designation of: Frac. NE ¼, Twp. 23, Sec. 29, O.D.Y.D.; SW ¼, Twp. 23, Sec. 33, O.D.Y.D, Exc. Plan 13462; NW ¼, Twp. 23, Sec. 28, O.D.Y.D; NW ¼, Twp. 23, Sec. 21, O.D.Y.D, Exc. Plans DD24364, and 18402; The W ½ of SE ¼, Twp. 23, Sec. 28, O.D.Y.D. Exc. Plan 20134; SW ¼, Twp. 23, Sec. 28, O.D.Y.D; Part of Lot A, Plan 5353, Sec. 21 & 28, ODYD, except Plans B7114, 17921, 18046, 19773, 22105, 23083 and 29083; Part of the SE ¼ of Sec. 33, Twp. 23, ODYD, except parcel A (DD W18607) and Plans H10783 & KAP66567, located on Glenmore Road, Finch Road, and Slater Road, Kelowna, B.C., from the Future Urban Reserve designation to the Future Urban Reserve, Rural/Agricultural, Commercial, and Private Recreation designations, as shown on Map "A" attached to the report of Planning & Corporate Services Department dated June 30, 2005.

See under 3.1(c).

3.1(b) McKinley Road, End of Slater Road and West of Slater Road, Finch Road and Part of Glenmore Road North

3.1(b) Bylaw No. 9467 (TA05-0007) - Vintage Landing 622664 BC Ltd., Robert Johnson, Tanya Courtorielle, Bradley Serwa, Kevin Serwa and Peter Angle (Site 360 and 622664 BC Ltd.); McKinley Road, End of Slater Road and West of Slater Road, Finch Road and Part of Glenmore Road North – THAT City of Kelowna Zoning Bylaw No. 8000 be amended by adding the CD 18 – Vintage Landing Comprehensive Development zone as outlined in Schedule “B” attached to the report of the Planning & Corporate Services Department dated June 30, 2005.

See under 3.1(c).

3.1(c) McKinley Road, End of Slater Road and West of Slater Road, Finch Road and Part of Glenmore Road North

3.1(c) Bylaw No. 9468 (Z03-0009) - Vintage Landing 622664 BC Ltd., Robert Johnson, Tanya Courtorielle, Bradley Serwa, Kevin Serwa and Peter Angle (Site 360 and 622664 BC Ltd.); McKinley Road, End of Slater Road and West of Slater Road, Finch Road and Part of Glenmore Road North – THAT City of Kelowna Zoning Bylaw No. 8000 be amended by changing the zoning classification of part of Frac. NE ¼, Twp. 23, Sec. 29, O.D.Y.D.; SW ¼, Twp. 23, Sec. 33, O.D.Y.D, Exc. Plan 13462; NW ¼, Twp. 23, Sec. 28, O.D.Y.D; NW ¼, Twp. 23, Sec. 21, O.D.Y.D, Exc. Plans DD24364, and 18402; The W ½ of SE ¼, Twp. 23, Sec. 28, O.D.Y.D. Exc. Plan 20134; SW ¼, Twp 23, Sec 28, O.D.Y.D; Part of Lot A, Plan 5353, Sec. 21 & 28, ODYD, except Plans B7114, 17921, 18046, 19773, 22105, 23083 and 29083; Part of the SE ¼ of S 33, Twp 23, ODYD, except parcel A (DD W18607) and Plans H10783 & KAP66567, located on Glenmore Road, Finch Road, and Slater Road, Kelowna, B.C., from the existing A1 – Agriculture 1 zone to the P3 – Parks and Open Space zone, W2 – Intensive Water Use zone, and the CD18 – Vintage Landing Comprehensive Resort Development zone as shown on Map "B" attached to the report of Planning & Corporate Services Department dated June 30, 2005.

Staff:

- The requested OCP and zoning amendments would allow for the development of a wellness resort which would include a golf course, vineyard and winery, wellness clinic, marina and related commercial uses.
- The zoning amendment only affects the area of the proposed resort (proposed zones are CD18, P3 (for the golf course) and W2 (for the marina)). The balance of the property is designated as future urban land reserve in the OCP and remains zoned A1.
- The CD18 zone was developed for this site and encompasses a comprehensive development zone specific to this piece of property.
- Written confirmation has been received from the Land Commission supporting in principle the requested ALR inclusions and exclusions; Use of the land for the golf course carries some conditions - the golf course must be consolidated into one legal title, with the exact boundaries identified prior to final permission being granted by the Land Commission; There must also be a demonstration of commitment to the construction of the vineyard to achieve final approval.
- The most intensively used portion of the site proposed to be zoned CD18 is the upper area, in which a water feature, a common parking area and the larger buildings are to be located.
- Winery buildings are to be located further down the slope and some associated resort accommodation. The potential for a restaurant and other typical winery uses also exists.
- The main part of the slope down to the lake is indicated as the site of free-standing resort bungalow accommodation, a maximum of four units not intended for permanent residential housing, to be associated with the common reception area.

Public HearingAugust 9, 2005

- A low-rise hotel style building is planned for the waterfront, along with common facilities that will accommodate beach front activities, swimming pools, fitness areas, etc., to be shared by all resort users.
- Waterfront bungalows indicated on the original plans have been removed and the marina relocated to be more central to site.
- The applicant has indicated that a restaurant pier may be constructed on the waterfront.
- A gondola will link the upper levels of the resort with the beach club and the waterfront area.
- The overall development plan has been overlaid with an environmental sensitivity analysis and designations of Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs) appended. ESAs 1 are to be avoided to the greatest extent possible; ESAs 2 are also to be avoided where possible; any environmental impact or intrusion can be made possible through mitigation on the site or other areas of the general property.
- The applicant intends to preserve contiguous linkages and landscape within the ESAs 2.
- Those units shown to be in proximity to the beach are on the border between the ESA 1 and ESA 2.
- Wildlife corridors are shown throughout the site, crossing through ESAs.
- Overlying the wildlife corridors is a proposed trail network, to be established as development proceeds on the site. Trails will be accessible to resort guests and members of the public. Statutory right of ways in favour of the City of Kelowna held on the property allow for public access within normal parks hours, with trails to be developed and maintained by the property owner.
- The overall resort development is not to exceed 1,000 units of resort accommodation. The property is divided into four areas: Area 1 is the main area resort village (250 units), Area 2 is the winery (150 units), Area 3 the hillside bungalows (300 units), and Area 4 contains waterfront uses (300 units).
- Within the CD18 zone definition, limits have been imposed on the total amount of commercial space that can be developed in association with the resort accommodation, with a provision to allow 19,000 sq. metres of employee accommodation, limited to those who are actually employed by the resort.
- Unit allocations will be controlled by covenant at the time of the first subdivision when parcels are created.
- Units can be transferred from Areas 3 or 4 during development to Areas 1 or 2, but may not be transferred to Areas 3 or 4 – the maximum number of units in those areas are not to be exceeded.
- Commercial allocation within the wellness village (Area 1) outside of resort accommodation, lobbies, etc., is limited to 56,000 sq. metres. Two thousand sq. metres of commercial are associated with the winery (Area 2). Area 3 will accommodate only 1,000 sq. metres of commercial capacity, and Area 4 6,000 sq. metres of commercial capacity. Commercial areas can be transferred from Areas 3 and 4 to 1 and 2 but not the reverse.
- The zone outlines the process for granting of development permits, all of which are considered to be environmentally sensitive. Every development application requires a permit addressing form, character, and environmental sensitivity to the site. No-build areas, mitigation and areas of compensation elsewhere on the site are also outlined in the zone.
- Staff feel comfortable that the zone provides adequate regulation to allow appropriate controls on types of development allowable in the area, providing sufficient regulation to protect the vision put forward throughout the process.
- The developer has committed that any services/infrastructure not considered within the City's current 20 year servicing and capital plan will be provided at the developer's expense.
- The scope and location of the development has meant that there is still work to be done to arrive at a final servicing agreement. Works & Utilities and Finance staff have entered into a MOU with the applicant identifying those works required and not forecast within the DCC or capital plan, providing information regarding order of magnitude infrastructure impacts.

- Sewer brought to the site will provide capacity for McKinley Landing and the future urban reserve lands. Upgrading of the sewer treatment plant is scheduled within the City's 20-year plan; the upgrade will have the capacity to accommodate the proposed development. DCCs are currently being collected at the 20-year plan rate structure, as scheduled completion falls within the 20-year period.
- The GEID and the developer have drawn up a letter of understanding regarding the provision of water to the development. GEID has already made application to the Province for a license to construct a new Okanagan Lake intake, and the development would be able to be serviced by this.
- Storm sewer will be contained on the site; no impacts from storm sewer have been identified to this point.
- A number of roads have been identified but are still subject to change as a final servicing agreement is not yet in place. All roads listed are the responsibility of the developer, at certain trigger points in the development process.
- A method of contribution, including provision of security, will be identified in the servicing agreement to ensure that both the developer and the City are protected and to provide sufficient funds to construct roads at the appropriate times.
- The connection proposed to align McKinley Road to Highway 97 (the UBCO connection) is within the 20-year plan and will be funded through the collection of DCCs already scheduled. There has been discussion of constructing the road in advance of the 20-year plan but the actual mechanism for capturing the cost of expediting the road (and perhaps delaying other required improvements from the roads list) has been left for Council debate.
- The developer will pay DCCs regardless of road priorities identified for that sector in addition to contributing towards roads not within the 20-year plan.
- The APC supported the application for rezoning, OCP and text amendments.
- Staff now feel that the zone provides adequate protection for the sensitivity of the area as well as the applicant's vision.
- Planning & Corporate Services staff are recommending that Council support the applications presented.

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

Opposition

- Dave & Donna Moires, 3370 Slater Road
 - Roger Kintzinger, 2175 Paly Road
 - Pina Michieletti, 2052 Dewdney Road
 - Robert Newby, 3702 Finch Road
 - Ron & Arlene Tuttle, 3832 Finch Road
 - Joseph Gordon, Gordon & Company Solicitors – 16 page package
- Opposed generally on the basis that: there will be a negative impact on the environment because of the intensive water use, there will be a negative impact on the quality of lake water because of marina pollution, the density is too high on the waterfront, there may not be enough fire and police protection, there isn't sufficient explanation of infrastructure cost, there hasn't been enough time to research the ramification on the environment, and the McKinley Landing residents will lose their quality water source from the Lake

Support

- B. Aldred, 3210 Glenmore Road
- Joseph & Cathy Higgins, 668 Westpoint Court
- Shayne Styles, 1050 Kelly Road
- David J. Novak, 324 Phoebe Court
- H.B. & V.H Howden, 574 Sprucemount Court
- Wayne Olafson, #533-1088 Sunset Drive
- Thomas Yonkers, 3074 Glenmore Road North
- Marc & Georgie Pezzin, 971 Valley Road
- Tom & Helen Potts, 3550 Glenmore Road

Public HearingAugust 9, 2005

- Hans & Irene Giesen, 1101-1160 Sunset Drive
- Brock Aynsley, 3893 Casorso Road
- Loraine Kemp, 686 Lequime Road
- Lisa Laing, 2643 O'Reilly Road
- Graham Wood, 2410 Grantham Road
- Robert & Brenda Gruber, 2200 Gordon Drive
- Ralph Stapleton, 100-5309 Main Street
- Len Bidwell, 2904 Bouvette Street
- Michael Mooney, 8 – 700 South Crest Drive
- Mohini Singh, 2115 Bennett Road
- David Daku & Linda Kobiarka, 2470 Glenmore Road North
- Lionel Waller & Rhonda Roystro, 2902 Glenmore Road North
- Clark Smith, 3135 Shayer Court
- Joseph Bielak, 1985 McKinley Road
- Eileen Young, 400 Glenmore Road North
- Sharene Young, 1985 McKinley Road
- Todd & Veronica Grevling, 2435 Butt Road, Westbank
- Chris & Megan Tarr, 2235 McKinley Road
- Ivan Gaudet, 1875 McKinley Road
- Albert Baldeo, 950 Lanfranco Road
- Doug & Jean Flintoft, 2010 McKinley Road
- Bonnie & Steve Cloutier, 171 Woodridge Place S.W.
- Al & Vivian Kuhn, 4000 Glenmore Road North
- Kathleen MacKenzie, 12 Shayler Court
- Rick Pasutto, 4300/4370 Junes Springs Road
- Bernie Penner, 1523 Lawrence Ave
- Wayne & Karen Reszityk, 2105 McKinley Road
- Bill Ruzicka, 2910 Glenmore Road North
- Brian Schjodt, 336 Klassen Road
- Denise Grant & Jaime Almeida, 4055 Glenmore Road North
- Lynda Schmidt, 2610 Glenmore Road North
- Mary Hamann, 2245 McKinley Road
- Gary Benson, 315 Stetson Road
- Robert Bennett, 4915 Frost Road
- Elroy Dueck, 140-715 Leathead Road
- Dr. Mandy Wong 303-3001 Tutt Street
- Murray & Heather Reiter, 2265 McKinley Road
- Shanti Handley, 4795 Dillon Place
- Joel Gordon & Jim & Lexie Gordon, 3112 Glenmore Road North
- John & Donna Gatschuff, 2046 Bennett Road
- Ken Spotswood, 770 Southcrest Drive
- Shelly Bourdreau, 1985 B McKinley Road - 1 letter with 16 signatures in support of letter
- G Group, 3275 Lakeshore Road – 28 page submission from the applicant including letters between Richard Drinnan and the Environmental Assessment Office, and a letter of opposition from 1000 Friends of Kelowna, aswell as a summary of the applicaton process and public input.
- Glenmore-Ellison Improvement District – 5 page submission including a letter from Agua Consulting Inc. with a list of issues related to water supply and water quality.
- Bill & Jan, 2633 Dubbin Road – 8 page submission including a letter they received from -“1000 Friends of Kelowna” and a letter from Glenmore-Ellison Improvement District responding to the letter.

In favour generally on the basis that: there will be improvements to McKinley Landing such as, road improvements, sewer sevice and improved water services, there is a reasonable balance of commercial profitability and preservation and enhancement of the natural surroundings, the development will provide significant economic benefits to the community, this project will provide a world-class property while maintaining a commitment to the natural environment, there will be an attractive blend of residential, recreational, agricultural and preserved green space, local residents will have public

access to the 1 km lakeshore, trail system and public Golf Course, there will be infrastructure benefits for the immediate area, the project will create jobs and attract more tourism, this will be an opportunity to bring in better fire protection for the area, this development will create a better image for the North end, the resort will attract special events and conferences, there will be a positive impact on health and wellness, this project will enhance the quality of life in the area, there will be property tax revenue for the City of Kelowna, there will be additional opportunities within healthcare and wellness, and there will be a positive impact on surrounding property values.

Gail Temple, representing the Applicant:

- The development upholds the goals of the OCP and the strategic plan, with its focus on the environment and sustainable development, and promotion of health and wellness initiatives.
- A lot of professional research and investigation work has been done since March 2003 to successfully address City staff concerns.
- Six information pieces have been sent to area residents to provide information. Twelve meetings with residents have been held to solicit feedback informally, in addition to five public hearings.
- Unanimous support was received from the APC.
- While the developer's vision has remained constant, feedback has dictated significant changes to the overall appearance of the proposed development.
- Three additional parcels have been acquired to address resident concerns regarding access and traffic volumes.
- Massing has been moved away from the waterfront to a more centralized location, lessening impact on the hillside and visual impact from the water. Residents have received changes favourably.
- The first phase of construction will create 125 units of resort accommodation, the first phase of the wellness centre, intake facility and possibly a surgical centre, as well as creating the public access to the lakeshore. Amenities will be phased in according to market demand.
- The zoning document will ensure that the resort is built out as represented.
- The four areas with their specific allowable uses and maximum development heights are clearly identified, with the highest concentration of use at the top of the slope. The development footprint near the waterfront will be light.
- Time of stay is limited to that allowable in a commercial zone. The hotel will service resort accommodation units.
- Internal roads may be park paths separated by a grass boulevard. This would allow access to emergency vehicles while enhancing the pedestrian feel of the resort.
- The entire area is categorized according to environmental sensitivity.
- Environmental consultants and City staff agree that only ESAs 1&2 are of concern from a development perspective. Mitigation will prevent a net loss to habitat; maintaining connectivity is a primary consideration.
- Significant portions of ESA 2 remain as open space to ensure connections for wildlife. Corridors through ESAs 1&2 work together to provide connecting habitats.
- A blue-listed species of owl has been identified on the property; appropriate measures will be taken to protect the species.
- Environmental sensitivity is a guiding principle of the development. Development permit requirements are written into the zone.
- Development is concentrated in areas of less than 30% slope; a development permit will be required should any areas in excess of a 30% slope be utilized. The resort will be a model for hillside development.
- The applicant has no residential development aspirations for the area at this time. There is no need to further develop surrounding land to make viable or sustain this resort. It is envisioned as a stand-alone development, capable of meeting its infrastructure requirements.
- As a destination resort, the development must accommodate water activities, golf and a winery. The proposed location allows for these uses within the green, open space of the future urban reserve, providing the desired feel of a 'world apart'.

- Approximately 15% of the site will be developed, with the balance remaining green. The natural environment is the overwhelming presence on this site.
- Amenities will be accessible to the community, with public access to trails and waterfront assured via water, road, gondola and the public trail system.
- Once necessary approvals are received from the federal and provincial governments, applications for foreshore development that respect environmental sensitivity will be put before Council.
- The development will be visible only to one neighbour to the north.
- The ALR application related to the golf course was approved by the APC, on the condition that the vineyard be completed before construction of the golf course can commence.
- The developer intends to design and maintain the golf course in an environmentally sensitive manner.
- Safety of the water in the reservoir is closely monitored by the GEID. Studies have been undertaken to ensure that there is no impact on the safety of drinking water from the McKinley reservoir. A letter of intent has been signed in regard to a planned water intake.
- The development will facilitate this important expansion, resulting in better water quality for existing GEID users and the possibility of incorporating services for new users.
- Road accesses trigger improvements to Glenmore Road.
- Sanitary sewer services to accommodate this development, the future urban reserve and existing McKinley landing neighbourhood will allow for the removal of septic fields closer to the lake.
- The applicant will address servicing issues to ensure that there is no financial impact for taxpayers. The MOU establishes a framework that ensures the development will proceed on the basis of no additional costs to the City and is an indication to Council and the public that staff have thoroughly examined the financial implications.
- Chief Zimmerman has written a letter indicating that the fire department will be able to service the development.
- All commercial uses are specific to the wellness centre or resort environment and are not meant to compete with downtown commercial or village centre commercial.
- One thousand linear feet of marina are planned, with up to 200 boat slips, subject to the municipal, provincial and federal application processes. Any environmental impact will be dealt with during the development permit process.
- It may be possible to create a local road access between McKinley Landing and the development along the planned north/south sewer line.
- Wildlife corridors follow the ravine down to water and are adequate to funnel wildlife through the area. The planned gondola has been removed from ESA 1 to protect the corridor.

Dr. Eric Miltner, research agronomist for the Applicant:

- Involved in some design issues related to water quality and impact on reservoir.
- Low irrigation and unirrigated areas will be incorporated, with use of drought-tolerant species in those area.
- Water volume has been addressed with the GEID.
- Nutrient and pesticide mobility will be under proper management; those issues are not of great concern. There are outstanding tools and materials available to limit mobility.
- Doesn't anticipate a lot of leaching/run-off issues.
- Irrigation management is key in this dry climate. State-of-the-art irrigation systems with computer controls tied into environmental monitoring will be used.
- An environmental development permit will be required for the construction of the golf course.
- Protection of ground water systems will be looked at through the design of the golf course and will be built into the development permit.

Lorne Friesen, wellness consultant for the Applicant:

- Four primary clusters will be created in the initial phase of the wellness centre – a comprehensive health spa, an assessment and consultation centre including a variety of different practitioners and an interdisciplinary approach, accommodation for wellness programs and a surgical centre.
- A consulting group that builds private surgical centres is involved. A more detailed feasibility analysis will be conducted and the project goes forward.
- A research facility in collaboration with UBC will address prevention and wellness issues.
- Also included will be an education centre, massage therapy, physiotherapy, a native learning centre, and a number of other things that will fit within the overall scope.

John Grods, environmental consultant for the Applicant:

- The wildlife corridor is planned to be roughly 20 metres to 75 metres in width, varying along the length of the corridor, providing more than adequate wildlife connectivity.
- Other corridors in ESA 1&2 will provide buffering for ESA 1, preventing fragmentation and creating overall connectivity.
- Discussions are underway with the federal departments of fisheries and the environment regarding riparian setbacks. The DFO requires that there be no net loss of riparian area and a lot of habitat is maintained outside of the development, preserving waterfront access for wildlife. Further development detail remains to be worked out with respect to fisheries aspects.
- Significant green space around the smaller bungalows provides open area.
- Environmental development permits will be required for the entire property. The owner has made it a priority to protect all ESA 1, including those in the future urban reserve.

Staff:

- A 15-metre riparian management area from high water mark will be required.
- In the majority of the foreshore, only a walking path will be constructed, not intended to be intrusive to wildlife.
- The marina location will also incorporate the urban connection to the upland portion.
- The CD18 zone ties protection of the ESAs to zoning and will include specific protection and mitigation wording. The rest of the site is outside the CD18 zone.
- Any development in an ESA will go through a development permit process and must be located to minimize impact. Where this is not possible, mitigation will be required.
- There will be no activity in the future urban reserve until such time as the designation has changed. The same ESA analysis will be undertaken as within the CD18 zone to protect the area and integrity of linkages.
- The MOU was not circulated as part of the report because it is not a binding agreement, only a technical analysis of the requirements of the development. Council may suggest a change in priorities.

Gail Temple, representing the Applicant:

- A right of way for any trail system outside of the development area has not been included through the future urban reserve, but some preliminary planning has been done to identify potential trail locations.
- It may be possible to do further trail planning work with the Planning department prior to 4th reading of the bylaw.
- Policing, fire protection and maintenance costs will be covered by the revenue generated by the resort.
- Cannan MOU, formal servicing agreement firmed up before 4th and final reading, timeline? Gail at least 6 months, exercise for this provide level of comfort, not only show commitment, staff felt achievable no cost, having done that, coming up with process certain amount allocated per unit, have at 75% recovered 100% money needed to build road, piece of work assist greatly in shortening up time frame for servicing agreement

Public HearingAugust 9, 2005

- Units will be sold on a fractional basis as vacation resort accommodation with a maximum stay of 240 days. There is no intent anywhere in the zone for designing single-family homes.
- Non-traditional type roads to bungalow units are not easily accessible by car.
- The MOU is intended only to identify any potential major stumbling blocks; the developer is aware that it is only a preliminary document.
- There have been some updates to the table of road improvements in the past few days.

Pat Hickerson, Glenmore-Ellison Irrigation District (GEID):

- Residents have expressed concern regarding impact on water quantity due to the development.
- On July 18, a letter was sent to McKinley Landing water system customers stating that this or any development does not drive what the GEID is doing. The GEID continues to follow its capital plan.
- The GEID cannot guarantee that the McKinley Landing water will always come directly from Okanagan Lake, but this is not contingent on development. Health department may require a water quality treatment plant in future.
- The GEID plans to install a new deep lake intake regardless of this development. There may be a monetary benefit to GEID users with regard to cost sharing with the developer on portions of that lake intake.
- Additional dollars may be available due to the development, but this does not affect the timing of an application to the Ministry.
- The GEID has an application before the Ministry in regards to a water usage license on Okanagan Lake. Two potential locations exist, either at the Vintage Landing site or at the location of the existing intake. The location can be adjusted at the final design stage.
- The capital plan call for installation of the intake by 2007. This development may have slowed the process slightly, as the location decision will not be made until the development decision is finalized.
- The GEID has stated all along that the golf course must not have any negative impact on the reservoir. Preliminary requirements have been put forward, including a request for a complete analysis and monitoring.
- More study is required to ensure that there is no movement from the golf course into the reservoir, an issue of high concern.
- Right now there is only a letter of understanding; more concrete requirements regarding ongoing monitoring will be laid out prior to final agreement. Depth and scope of monitoring will be dependent on the results of studies currently underway. Some minimum standards have been set at this point.
- The GEID capital plan was developed by a GEID engineer in conjunction with City staff. Water load within all sectors of future GEID boundaries were looked at. The planned intake would cover not just the area under discussion but also other areas within a 20-year scope.
- The study of water availability in the Okanagan basin should be completed by 2006. The controller has stated that the threshold has not yet been reached and applications are still being reviewed in order of receipt. The GEID's application is the only large application before the Ministry at the present time.
- Licenses are granted on a volume basis. Current projections surpass the 25-year build out projections, even at the size of the current intake.
- Presently residential units are not on metering, but any new construction is required to include water metres. Retrofitting on existing residential and agricultural properties will be completed by 2008; all industrial, commercial and institutional buildings are metered.
- At this time, meters are used only for data collection.
- The public can contact the GEID and Land Water BC with their concerns.

Public HearingAugust 9, 2005Bob Hrasko, GEID water engineer:

- Boundaries for the GEID were set out in accordance with land use agreed upon by the Kelowna Joint Water Committee.
- Lane use was based on acreages where development plans were not yet known. Where plans are available, unit numbers contained in the OCP were used.
- While development will not occur exactly as shown, there is a good long-range forecast.
- Even at the proposed growth rate, limits of the water system will not be reached for more than 40 years.
- The 600 mm deep lake intake pipe will end well below the point of water temperature change. Currents in the area drive warmer water down to a 30-metre depth.
- Water quality in the area looks very good.
- In the interim, the proposal starts with taking good quality water up to McKinley landing to improve current water quality. The second step involves the addition of UV disinfection, followed by the addition of a water treatment plant.
- A large percentage of current water licensing held in the province is sitting idle at the present time.

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

Vivian Kuhn, 4000 Glenmore Road North:

- Delighted about the prospect of this development and considers it a magnificent opportunity for Kelowna.

Mohini Singh, 2115 Bennett Road:

- Supports the project, feels it will be good for the area and the city, creating excellent jobs and bringing money into the community.
- Comfortable now with the fact that staff supports the project and that environmental concerns have been dealt with.

A resident of McKinley Road:

- Approves of the project, thinks it is a great thing for the city.
- Agricultural or residential development on the site would also require a lot of water.

Dave Moores, 3370 Slater Road:

- Supports the projects.
- Was concerned about fire protection but believes that has been addressed.
- Not concerned about access now being on Slater Road.

Reverend Albert Baldeo, 950 LanFranco Road, Unit 38:

- In support of application, attracted by the concept of wellness.

John Zeger, Citizens for Responsible Community Planning:

- Opposed to all related applications, including the amendment to the OCP, change of land use designation, and the addition of the CD18 zoning bylaw, which would permit comprehensive development.
- Inappropriate and untimely misuse of the future urban land reserve, defined as land with development potential outside of the 20-year time horizon.
- There is an urgent need to save land for future housing needs.
- Only 13% of land with development potential remains undeveloped in Kelowna. The proposed development would use over 7% of the remaining developable land in Kelowna.
- Land could be better used for family-oriented units.
- Too many units are provided for part-time residents; community is built by year-round occupants. One thousand temporary residential units will not contribute to a strong sense of community and will preclude those with a more lasting commitment from living here.
- The wellness village will serve only high-income clients.

Public HearingAugust 9, 2005

- There are already 15 golf courses within Kelowna city limits; building housing for families, especially affordable housing, merits a higher priority.

Peter Rudy, 3950 Glenmore Road:

- In support of the project, but has two concerns.
- The road access is 100 feet from his doorstep. Straightening the curve and adding an extra turn lane in another location would address that concern.
- Residents in the area are all on wells. The addition of water mains down the roads would provide the opportunity for installation hydrants to provide increased fire protection.

Michael Mooney, 8 – 700 Southcrest:

- Supports the initiative and entreats Council to support it as well.
- Wellness is an increasing global trend and growth industry; a whole, well and healthy family unit is the bulwark of society and reduces the overall deployment of health costs.

Dave Hammett, 2285 McKinley:

- In favour of project, but feels that infrastructure improvements are also needed on McKinley Landing Road to deal with traffic volumes and high accident rates.

Staff:

- The 20-year road plan shows a realignment of McKinley Road towards the end of the plan timeline. Council could direct staff to make it an earlier priority.

Denise Grant, 4055 Glenmore Road North:

- Property is directly affected by the development; the gates will be visible from her window.
- In support of application, on the grounds that it is an opportunity for economic and recreational growth.
- Concerned about fire protection and hopes a way will be found to bring water to North Glenmore residents.

Marc Pezzin, 971 Valley Road:

- Supports the project, looks forward to the development of golf courses and resort bungalows.

Jeff Maxwell, 362 Stellar Drive:

- Supports project.
- Provision of technical details provides assurance that there will be very little impact on air quality and environment.

Joe Gordon, 2329 Dewdney Road:

- Does not support the project.
- Concerned about water quality and quantity, increase in traffic.
- Golf courses are full of chemicals and the course is being placed uphill from and adjacent to the drinking water source for 10,000-12,000 people in the Glenmore Valley.
- When the uncovered reservoir in a natural land bowl was created, no one anticipated that a golf course would be placed right beside this drinking water source.
- Kelowna should be conscious of the lessons of Walkerton.
- Monitoring of water quality should be provided by a third party, not the GEID. He would support drinking water protection plan implemented by health inspectors under the drinking water protection act and requests this as a condition of approval.
- Cost of this protection should not be an issue for the GEID, as the developer would be paying for it.
- Disappointed to see the MOU produced tonight, as he has been trying to get the information for about a year without success.

Public HearingAugust 9, 2005

- Public input into this critical aspect of the development is not possible if the information is not provided in a timely manner. This flies in the face of the spirit and intent of a public hearing. Third reading should be postponed until the public has had an opportunity to review the information.
- The community is interested in ensuring that there will be no increased taxes related to this development.
- There are concerns about the appropriateness of negotiating zoning for offsite amenities.

Staff:

- The servicing agreement is not yet finalized. Some costs must be paid up front and securities will be required to achieve final rezoning approval.
- If the applicant does not meet his obligations throughout the development process, approvals will cease and there will be no further development.
- Staff are not trading zoning for amenities, but are requiring appropriate service levels for the application.
- Staff would be willing to review the MOU with Mr. Gordon.
- Servicing requirements are not usually the subject of a public hearing, but a matter of technical review between an applicant and staff.
- Traffic impact modelling has been done by Works & Utilities staff in conjunction with the applicant's consultant, identifying requirements for development servicing.
- The servicing issues can continue to be worked out between staff and applicant even after the close of the public hearing as they are technical issues.
- Council budgetary discussions provide a mechanism for adjusting priorities based on the amended DCC road plan.
- Final adoption will require a signed servicing agreement indicating that technical requirements have been met.
- Only sewer capacity for the future urban reserve is addressed in the MOU, as there is a need to install a certain size of pipe to provide capacity for the future urban reserve and McKinley Landing residents.

Al Kuhn, 4000 Glenmore Road North:

- Strongly in favour of the application.
- This project is an opportunity for 30 landowners adjacent to Glenmore Road North to feel a part of Kelowna.
- Asked that the City find a way for Glenmore Road North residents to tie into the proposed water system at the head of Slater Road, as a number of people are running out of water.
- A system is needed to provide fire protection to the fire hydrant level. The development is an opportunity to tie into a system that would provide that.

Dave Skoglund, 2930 Shaler Court:

- Supports the development, likes the idea of the golf course, hotel and restaurant.
- Concerned about the public boat launch and would like clarification. Power boat traffic is not in keeping with the stated objective of wellness centre.

Jim Shkrabuik, resident of Oliver, owns property on Glenmore Road/Slater Road:

- Water quality issue with regards to the golf course will probably be properly managed. Fire retardant use in the area is a greater threat to water quality.
- This is a good project, safe, friendly, creates jobs, good for everybody.

Penny Harris, 3962 Finch Road:

- Has concerns about the size of the marina being considered, with related public access and parking issues, and the potential of pollution from the gas bar.
- Main concern is noise pollution from big boats that zoom up and down.
- Noise bylaws should be enforced, otherwise noise will upset the serenity of the area and will impact wellness centre.

Public HearingAugust 9, 2005Shane Jamieson, 1892 Dewdney Road:

- Not concerned with water quality, certain minimum standards have to be complied with by law.
- Problem with lack of clear information supplied by developer. The developer has not been forthcoming with information; has discussed this with them on occasion.
- Would like to see the developer's plans for the entire property owned by the applicant.
- Concerned that the developer will apply for farm tax rates for the entire property, severely reducing amount of property taxes paid, revenue upon which the City is depending.
- Would like to see the property using recycled water and filtration technologies. The current proposal calls for a great deal of water use; we have to be advocates of our natural resources.
- 240 days is 8 months of the year.
- Jobs created will be paid minimum wages.
- Employees and guests will spend their money on site, not in the rest of Kelowna.
- Thinks more information is needed to make a proper appraisal of the entire development.

Robert Newby, 3702 Finch Road:

- The proposed waterfront development would impact access to the water for wildlife.
- Shocked to find out Council has not been apprised prior to the public hearing regarding the MOU negotiated between City staff and the applicant.
- Given the potential magnitude of impact on taxpayers, specific information regarding a binding agreement should be provided prior to public hearing to provide assurance that taxpayers won't suffer.
- Current fire fighting capacity will be impacted by the demands of the development.
- Gasoline additives bond with water and may not be removed by filtration.
- Further analysis of water pollution impact should be conducted, perhaps at the provincial level.
- Okanagan Lake is his existing water source.

Shelley Boudreaux, 1985 McKinley Road:

- Wondering if deer will have access to the waterfront along public trails.
- In support of the application, feels she has been well informed.
- Will provide benefits for the tourism, travel and hospitality industries, as well as tax revenue for the city.

Julie Gordon, 2329 Dewdney Road:

- Marketing behind this development is brilliant; everyone caught up by motherhood issue of wellness.
- If Kelowna is to be a leader in the country or the world with regards to wellness, we should look at assisting the disadvantaged, children, and those at the low economic scale of the community.
- It is not necessary to promote health among those at the higher income scale. If we are really to be proponents of wellness and health, we should focus on areas identified by health practitioners and statistics.
- This development is 20 years too soon. The focus should be on downtown, creating schools, playgrounds and facilities for families and children and providing affordable housing.

Richard Drinnan, 669 Greene Road:

- As an environmental consultant, can't say that this is an environmentally sound project.
- It is premature to bring the application to a public hearing without a fish and fish habitat impact assessment. The DFO has not reviewed impact mitigation plans and compensation.
- There has not been an assessment of the social or economic impacts of excluding lands from the ALR.

Public HearingAugust 9, 2005

- There has not been a public health risk assessment in regards to the water supply that is at risk from transportation and construction and serves 12,000 people.
- There has not been a risk assessment of chemicals present in sewage. Okanagan Lake water quality is at risk.
- There is no assessment of the costs involved in building, servicing and maintaining related infrastructure (sewers, water systems, roads and highways). The public is entitled to know the details of annual ongoing costs before the project proceeds.
- There are no details in the master plan regarding development in the vineyard and the future urban reserve.

Dr. Heather McEachern, Mission resident:

- Has been involved in the project since its conception and continues to be involved in the development of the wellness concept.
- The clinic will provide a variety of secondary and primary health services currently not available in our community.

Eric Heffernan, 2505 Dubbin Road:

- The developer has dealt with some of his concerns.
- An independent public health risk assessment could further address community concerns.
- Construction activity could adversely affect the reservoir; would like an assessment of the risk.
- More detail should be provided on related costs.
- Concerned that the City will not be able to limit guests to a stay of 240 days and wondered who would enforce that limitation and at what cost.
- In other local resorts, people remain 10-12 months.

Staff:

- The 240-day limitation is based on a long-standing bylaw and separates commercial from residential projects. That length of stay does not trigger requirements for schools, hospitals, and other facilities.
- Enforcement is in response to complaints.

Doug Flintoft, 2010 McKinley Road:

- Pleased to see efforts from the developer and Planning department in regards to access and environmental issues.
- Is strongly in favour of the plan.

Brad Dunlop, 1040 Thompson Road:

- Would like to see a commitment from the City that a portion of the revenue from the project would be put toward health care for the needy.
- If Council had made affordable housing a priority, they would have made more than \$300,000 available to address that need.

Heather Reiter, 2265 McKinley Road:

- In favour of proposal, would oppose single-family dwellings on the site.
- More green space is needed in the area. A commitment to provide green space should be sought from all developers.
- Looks forward to upgrades of the GEID system.
- It would be a shame to miss the opportunity to provide water and related fire protection to area residents.

Public HearingAugust 9, 2005John Gatschuff, 2046 Bennett Road:

- The developer has gone out of his way to accommodate the requests of residents.
- A number of concerns have been addressed, such as the impact on the area, the lake and visual impacts.
- The area will be developed in the next 10-20 years; this is an opportunity to choose what goes in.
- The project protects natural lands and public access and provides local amenities to residents, along with significant new and varied levels of local employment.
- Supports responsible development for the area.

Craig Lewis, golf course superintendent for the Applicant:

- All local golf courses utilize Integrated Pest Management and good cultural practices.
- If fertilizer is applied in the right ways, at the right time, with the proper amount of irrigation and spot treatments only when necessary, this is the softest way a golf course can be maintained; Fertilizers are all slow releasing and not mobile. The turf consumes them so they do not run into the waterway.
- On a new course, there are lots of opportunities for low water use and slow growing grasses (varieties better suited to our area). The developer is spending money to utilize the best researchers and knowledge out there.
- Organic course management can be done to a certain degree, but delays course opening significantly.
- In the Okanagan Valley, pests are at minimum and there are few weed problems. Fairways and roughs are only rarely treated, with spot treatment on greens (2% of course) and tees (3% of course).
- The highest risk to any waterway is during construction; the right guidelines have to be laid down; Riparian vegetation should be preserved and proper mitigating procedures utilized.

Wayne Reszitynyk, 2105 McKinley Road:

- Property faces reservoir, opposite the golf course; he is in favour of the development and improved access to the university.
- Water access and fire protection is very important.

Fred Marin, 623 Southwind Drive:

- Supports the application; the developer has gone out of his way to accommodate the City and neighbourhood residents.
- As a taxpayer, feels it is prudent of the City to take advantage of the money the developer is putting on the table.

Charlie Harris, 3962 Finch Road:

- Wondered if the development was contingent on the marina portion.

Nick Finn, 4102 Finch Road:

- Opposed to the development despite the changes.
- This leap-frogging of development creates downtown type densities outside of the downtown.
- The development is premature in the absence of a sector plan. Much of the discussion regarding the future urban reserve is the result of the lack of a sector plan.
- Council and administration should know what development of the future urban reserve means in terms of traffic and long-term road requirements
- Concerned about the vagueness of information. Would have liked to see more detailed cost and impact information prior to this hearing.
- Main issues are around the marina and intensive water use.
- Powerboats are often obscenely loud and many gather in the same area. Would like to see bylaws to control noise.
- Concerned about boats coming in at speed within 100 metres of shore. Boundary markers would address that safety issue.

Public Hearing

August 9, 2005

Public HearingAugust 9, 2005Sharene Young, 1985 McKinley Road:

- Supports the project, believes the right people have been brought in to conduct studies.
- The development is supportive of the environment. The wildlife corridors are very important.

Bob Devlin, 2632 Arthur Road:

- Glad to see proposal for public beach access. Supports the proposal.

Radim Par, 2168 Bennett Road:

- In support of proposed project.

Gail Temple, representing the applicant:

- The College of Physicians and Surgeons has stated that they don't approve or disapprove surgical centres based on distance to a hospital. The College has made a number of recommendations that would be implemented if the centre was constructed.
- A whole range of wages will be paid to employees of Vintage Landing. It will not be just minimum wage service jobs. There will be range of jobs including professional and paraprofessional as well.
- Services will be provided across income ranges, including day users. Education about wellness and health will be accessible to those beyond those staying at resort.
- An examination of the feasibility of an addiction treatment centre is underway.
- The intent of the MOU was just to get something in writing and give a level of assurance that issues have been looked at in detail. Work on the MOU was only concluded in the week prior to this hearing.
- There are no details for the future urban reserve in the plan because planning exercises have not yet been conducted. While there are no current plans for residential units, there may some day be housing around the golf course in that future urban reserve area.
- The concept for the marina is in the preliminary stages. Environmental impact recommendations will dictate the final concept.
- The marina is not a deal breaker for the resort, but some access to the lake is desired. The development permit for the marina will come forward once approvals are received from the provincial and federal governments.
- Marina pollution will be looked at closely by provincial and federal agencies. Current water intakes, including that of the immediately adjacent neighbour (Mr. Newby) will be factored into plans.
- A public boat launch will increase access to the lake and is in the community's best interest.
- The golf course is extremely committed to being environmentally sensitive and conscious of water conservation, as is the entire property.
- Extreme care will be taken with construction around the McKinley reservoir; no buildings will be placed in that area.
- Average stay in other resort environments is 18 days and applicant expects the same here.
- It may be possible to further adjust access roads to be sensitive to affected properties.
- All 868 acres have been looked at in a comprehensive way by environmental consultants and ESA on the entire property have been identified. Environmental development permits will ensure that the same level of environmental integrity is maintained throughout the site, including the future urban reserve area if and when it comes forward for development.
- Fire and forest health remediation will be a huge benefit to the area. A DP has been issued by the City for wildland fire and forest health mitigation work on the entire site (not just the proposed development), and work is commencing immediately on that.
- The developer has committed to bring the water line from the golf course clubhouse to the existing end of Slater Road if area residents organize access to that water. Information has been sent to residents.

- The developer wishes to be environmentally sensitive and responsible on the site. Water conservation and other environmentally sensitive methods will be implemented. A small model of a sustainable home is also being considered (but will not be occupied).
- The marina will be pursued; some of level of marina development is a goal, with more detail to be provided at the development permit stage.
- The developer agrees that there would be advantages to providing a connection to the airport, but this development does not trigger that road requirement.
- Because of changes to the bungalow units, a new application process with the DFO has been initiated. It is hoped that approval will be received within 6 months.
- GEID approval is required before final reading.

Staff:

- Comments from Works & Utilities are usually included in rezoning reports, dealing with items such as layout, infrastructure improvement requirements, street frontages, lot consolidation, sometimes estimated costs for bonding purposes. These are just comments by an internal department, not a formal servicing agreement. Technical requirements such as servicing are based on approved bylaws and implemented as a step in the process, and a final servicing agreement is not typically a Council requirement at a public hearing.
- The requirement that the applicant sign a servicing agreement and have funds in place is timed for between 3rd reading and final adoption.
- The requirements of the development are known, but full costing and impact is not known at this time.
- Most of the servicing items included in the MOU have been submitted as part of the area structure plan, documents which have previously been in front of Council.
- Two servicing agreement options can be prepared for Council's information with regard to the proposed future road link to UBCO: one where the road is built according to the existing capital improvements schedule and the second with construction of the road advanced. Both must be cost neutral.
- The servicing agreement is a technical exercise determining what roads and services will be needed at what point in the development process. Council can continue to dialogue road priorities (such as moving the priority of the UBCO link forward) with staff outside of the public hearing.
- The fire department has indicated that the development does not cause concern with regards to physical fire protection
- As a commercial development, the project will pay commercial taxes far and above residential taxes; the owner will not be able to just "apply" for farm tax status.
- A detailed analysis of soft service costs has not been done (such as increased fire or policing costs), but those services are paid for out of general tax revenue, which would increase if this development goes ahead.

3.2 3753 East Kelowna Road

- 3.2 Bylaw No. 9462 (Z05-0032) – Phillip and Gerti Bachmann – East Kelowna Road – THAT City of Kelowna Zoning Bylaw No. 8000 be amended by changing the zoning classification of Lot A, Section 14 Township 26 O.D.Y.D. Plan KAP72697, located on East Kelowna Road, Kelowna, B.C. from A1 – Agriculture 1 to A1s – Agriculture 1 with Secondary Suite.

Staff:

- The property was the subject of a home site severance application some years ago. Once approval was granted, an accessory building was added to the site, consisting of a barn-type structure used as an art studio by the applicant's daughter.
- The applicant is seeking rezoning to allow for conversion of a portion of the building into a secondary suite and has also applied for variances, one of which addresses an oversize suite floor area.
- The floor plan layout makes it difficult to create a studio as separate area from the secondary suite.

Public HearingAugust 9, 2005

- ALC confirmed that the applicant could create a suite at the requested size.
- Staff have no concerns with the requested zoning and are recommending that Council consider the rezoning in positive manner.

The City Clerk advised that no correspondence and/or petitions had been received relating to this application.

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

Applicant:

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

There were no further comments.

3.3 3920 Bluebird Road

- 3.3 Bylaw No. 9457 (Z05-0025) – Tarcisio and Angelina Niccoli (Hans Neumann) – Bluebird Road – THAT City of Kelowna Zoning Bylaw No. 8000 be amended by changing the zoning classification of Lot 2, Section 1, Township 25, O.D.Y.D. Plan 3107, located on Bluebird Road, Kelowna, B.C. from RU1 – Large Lot Housing to RU1s – Large Lot Housing with Secondary Suite.

Councillor Day declared himself to be in a conflict of interest due to proximity to the notification area and excused himself from Council Chambers at 9:33 p.m.

Staff:

- Previously, a sight line variance was approved for a proposed single detached housing unit.
- At this time, rezoning for secondary suite is requested.
- As the habitable area of the suite would be attached to the main building, it is considered to be part of main dwelling.
- A walkway will connect the main dwelling to the secondary suite on the upper floor of the building that houses the garage.
- The garage is accessed around the side of the building.
- Staff have no concerns with the rezoning application.
- Because the secondary suite is attached, there are no height restrictions.
- Staff is recommending that Council support application.

The City Clerk advised that one letter of support had been received from Peter Schumann, 219 Bernard Avenue.

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.

Councillor Day returned to Council Chambers at 9:38 p.m.

3.4 1277 Houghton Road

- 3.4 Bylaw No. 9464 (Z05-0017) – Kee Sing Low and Mei Low (Protech Consultants) – Houghton Road – THAT City of Kelowna Zoning Bylaw No. 8000 be amended by changing the zoning classification of part of Lot 6, Section 27, Township 26, O.D.Y.D. Plan 4558 Except Plans B6628 and 12644, located on Houghton Road, Kelowna, B.C. from the RU1s – Large Lot Housing with Secondary Suite zone to the RU6 – Two Dwelling Housing zone, as shown on Map "A" attached to the report of Planning & Corporate Services Department dated June 30, 2005.

Staff:

- This property was the subject of a previous development application that was eventually abandoned.
- There are a mixture of land uses on the area, including a number of multi-family developments and RU6 lots to the south and east of the subject property.
- The applicant is proposing to subdivide the existing lot and create a duplex lot on the portion to be zoning RU6.
- The RU6 zone would allow for a semi-detached or duplex building.
- The APC reviewed and supported the application.
- Staff have no concerns with the proposed rezoning, which is consistent with the general premise of intensifying development in existing areas while retaining the character of the general area and are therefore recommending support.

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

Opposition

- Del & Jean Lot, 1257 Houghton Road
- Ed & Jeanie Smith, 1267 Houghton Road
- Pauline Lowery, 290 Temple Court
- Steve Beskidny, 279 Temple Court

Opposed generally on the basis that: there will be a negative impact on the character of the neighbourhood, there will be lack of parking.

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

Grant Maddock, applicant:

- Canvassed the area on March 26, 2005, presenting the development plan currently before Council. At that time, only one person was opposed to the planned duplex.
- There will be ample parking on the site – a double garage plus driveway parking.
- Was not aware of the letters of opposition.
- As there are duplexes in the neighbourhood already, it seems a good use of the property.
- The application was before the APC on April 5, 2005, in its current configuration.

There were no further comments.

Public Hearing

August 9, 2005

4. TERMINATION:

Council:

- Councillor Cannan moved that the public hearing on items 3.1(a), 3.1(b) and 3.1(c) be kept open for two more weeks to allow for the provision of additional information. The motion died for lack of a seconder.
- Agreed to close the Public Hearing on all items.

The Hearing was declared terminated at 10:05 p.m.

Certified Correct:

Mayor

City Clerk

IT/am