

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, January 24, 2006.

Council members in attendance: Mayor Sharon Shepherd, Councillors A.F. Blanleil, B.A. Clark, C.B. Day, B.D. Given, C.M. Gran\*, R.D. Hobson, N.J. Letnick and M.J. Rule.

Staff members in attendance were: Acting City Manager/Director of Works & Utilities, J. Vos\*; Deputy City Clerk, S.C. Fleming; Manager of Development Services, A.V. Bruce; Manager of Policy, Research & Strategic Planning, S.K. Bagh\*; Parks Manager, J. Creron\*; and Council Recording Secretary, B.L. Harder.

(\* denotes partial attendance)

1. Mayor Shepherd called the Hearing to order at 7:01 p.m.
2. Mayor Shepherd 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 Deputy City Clerk advised the Notice of this Public Hearing was advertised by being posted on the Notice Board at City Hall on January 6, 2006, and by being placed in the Kelowna Daily Courier issues of January 16 & 17, 2006 and in the Kelowna Capital News issue of January 15, 2006, and by sending out or otherwise delivering 719 letters to the owners and occupiers of surrounding properties between January 6 – 10, 2006.

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 **OCP Amendment to allow for C7 Zonings in Rutland Urban Centre**

- 3.1 Bylaw No. 9533 (OCP05-0018) – City of Kelowna – THAT *Kelowna 2020 – Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 7600* be amended in order to establish the framework to allow for consideration of C7 zonings in the Rutland Urban Centre by:
  - Adding C7 – Downtown Commercial (Rutland) to the definition of Town Centre;
  - Amending the Commercial section in Chapter 19 to allow for up to 12 to 14 storeys rather than up to 6 storeys at selected locations in the Rutland Urban Centre and to revise the last sentence from "Exclusively residential projects will be permitted under the commercial land use designation only where such use is supported by the Downtown Plan" to read "...only where such use is supported by the C7 zone in the Downtown and Rutland Plans."

#### Staff:

- There has been interest for some time now in seeing development increase in the Rutland Town core where currently there are a number of one-storey buildings with limited tenancies that are not necessarily pedestrian friendly.
- Since 1995 when the OCP was put in place designating the urban centres, only 1% of commercial activity has gone to the Rutland Urban Centre, and Rutland only has 6% of the city's commercial space.

- With the recent interest in high rise development, Council asked staff to look into whether allowing taller buildings would make a difference in Rutland. Having done that, there appears to be overwhelming support for allowing 12-14 storey buildings in the cultural core of Rutland. Townhouses, 4-storey apartment buildings and mixed use commercial type projects would act as a transitional separation between the cultural core area of Rutland and abutting residential developments for all but one residential neighbourhood. The residents of that area are not keen on having a 12-storey building immediately adjacent to them with no transitional separation.
- To allow for taller buildings in Rutland, amendments are necessary to change some definitions and descriptions in the OCP and zoning bylaw and some maps would need to be updated. Those amendments would allow up to 14-storey buildings within a certain area; the buildings would be either residential or commercial or a mix of residential and commercial. Ground floor commercial uses would be required in a sub-area of the core of the Rutland urban centre in order to spawn a vibrant street life in that area.
- Computer model is available to show the impact of taller buildings on any particular area if required. [Council did not ask to see the computer model].
- The proposed amendments would set the stage for an applicant to come forward with a request for rezoning to the higher density.

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

- letter of support from the Uptown Rutland Business Association also making note of their support for having included the property at the southeast corner of Highway 33 and Hollywood Road within the boundary of the C7 zoned area.

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

John Vielvoye, representing the Rutland Residents Association:

- The Association was involved in the initial discussions in 2005 about whether taller buildings would be appropriate in Rutland and was of the opinion that taller buildings in the uptown Rutland area would increase building density as well as the number of residents living and doing business in that area. Since then the Association has had several discussions and presentations regarding this and in each case membership supported almost unanimously the concept of C7 zoning for the town centre of Rutland.
- Some residents have expressed concern about tall buildings adjacent to residential development. The property on the corner of Hollywood and Highway 33 is currently vacant and already could be developed with up to 6 storeys. There would be little or no difference in the impact of the taller buildings on views from the impact of a 6-storey building.

Lisa Simone, Uptown Rutland Business Association:

- A survey of the Rutland Business community resulted in 100% in support of the proposed amendments.
- Read a letter from Lexington Enterprises about including their property at the corner of Hollywood and Highway 33 within the boundary of the C7 zoned area, and noted that the property was in the end included in the area proposed for C7 zoning.

Steve Shoranick, Lexington Enterprises:

- The density currently permitted for the property at Hollywood and Highway 33 would allow a large mass to be developed on the site. A taller building would look better. Higher does not necessarily mean more square footage but would give more open space. The property is the gateway to the town centre. Would still need to apply for rezoning and a Development Permit for the property.

There were no further comments.

**3.2 Zoning Bylaw Amendment – C4 and C7 Zones**

3.2 Bylaw No. 9534 (TA05-0011) – City of Kelowna – THAT City of Kelowna Zoning Bylaw No. 8000 be amended as follows:

- to retain the Downtown Urban Centre as the primary financial services area in the C4 Urban Centre Commercial zone;
- to include the cultural core of Rutland in the C7 Central Business Commercial zone.

See discussion under 3.1.

**3.3(a) OCP Amendment - 1102 Cameron Avenue and 1091 Guisachan Road**

3.3(a) Bylaw No. 9537 (OCP05-0011) – Aberdeen Holdings Ltd. (Water Street Architecture) – Cameron and Guisachan Road – THAT Map 19.1 of *Kelowna 2020* – Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 7600 be amended by changing the Future Land Use designation on parts of Lot 19, District Lot 136, ODYD Plan 38928 and Lot 18, District Lot 136, ODYD Plan 38928, located on Cameron Avenue and Guisachan Road, Kelowna, B.C., from the Multiple Unit Residential – Low Density designation to the Multiple Unit Residential - Medium Density designation, as shown on Map “A” attached to the report of Planning & Corporate Services Department dated December 5, 2005.

Councillor Gran conflict of conflict of interest because she lives adjacent to the property under application and left the Council Chamber at 7:27 p.m.

Staff:

- The applicant wishes to amend the Future Land Use designation in the OCP in order to allow for a proposed apartment style multiple unit housing development and an expansion of the adjacent park.
- The property is currently vacant. The applicant has agreed to sell the tree lined lane on the northwest side of the property as well as a buffer along the southwest side of the property to the City of Kelowna as an addition to the Guisachan Heritage Park.
- The proposed site plan indicates that the site would be developed with four multi-family housing buildings and an amenity building. Access would be from the south end of the property off Cameron Avenue. A gated fire egress would be provided off Guisachan Road.
- The plans that have been submitted with the Development Permit application for the subject property follow all the requirements of the RM5 zone. Staff are still working with the applicant on the measured height of the buildings.
- The Community Heritage Commission passed a recommendation of support for the application.
- The Advisory Planning Commission did not support the application because of concerns the majority of which have since been addressed by the applicant.
- The OCP objectives for parkland are now met.
- A traffic light would be installed at the Cameron/Gordon Drive intersection as part of this application.
- The project would include an affordable housing component; 10% of all the units or about 21 units would be subject to a Housing Agreement to meet the current affordability benchmark which is about \$150,000 for a condo-style apartment. This is the largest commitment for affordable housing the City has achieved to date. The applicant has also committed to have some of the units be wheelchair accessible. The wheelchair accessible units would not be protected by the Housing Agreement.

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

**Letters of Opposition**

William & Trish Heimbecker, 2272 Rhondda Court – 6 separate submissions

Janet MacArthur, 117 – 1120 Guisachan Road

Dave & Marion Humphreys, 145 – 1201 Cameron Avenue

Denton Powles, 2383 Ayrshire Court

Mr. & Mrs. C.C. Brown, 61 – 1201 Cameron Avenue

Mary Truss, 68 – 1101 Cameron Avenue

Clarence & Helen Dyck, 84-1101 Cameron Avenue

B. Diane Kemp, 1 – 220 Gordon Drive

William Poirier, 56-1101 Cameron Avenue

Laurie-Ann Bay, 129-1120 Guisachan Road

Susan Greenwell, 21-1120 Guisachan Road

David & Karen Edwards, 54-1101 Cameron Avenue

Lea & Carol Wegleitner, 60-101 Cameron Avenue

Norman & Art Fletcher, 79-1101 Cameron Avenue

Elaine Reiner, 48-2200 Gordon Drive

Lloyd Reiner, 48 – 2200 Gordon Drive

Dan & Trudy Kilburn, 12-1101 Cameron Avenue

George & Ilah Hockin, 2-1101 Cameron Avenue

William Cutfield, 1055 Cameron Avenue

Denton & Dianne Powles, 2383 Ayrshire Court

Myrna Mills, 137 – 1200 Cameron Avenue

Ross Hamilton, 43-1201 Cameron Avenue

Norma & Art Fletcher, 79 – 1101 Cameron Avenue

Joey Lambrick, 664 Dehart Road

Christina Pearson, 214 – 2350 Stillingfleet Road

Daryl Gibbs, 1031 Cameron Avenue

Margery Heuser, 1027 Cameron Avenue

Fred Henkelman, 35 – 1101 Cameron Avenue

Ron & Gloria Baker, 2266 Rhondda Court

Clare Mallow, Balmoral

Don Kennett, 59-1101 Cameron Avenue

Frank & Irene Burgoyne, 49 – 1101 Cameron Avenue

L. Striemer, #1 – 1101 Cameron Avenue

Mike Wagstaff, 130-1120 Guisachan Road

Therese Smith, 73- 1101 Cameron Avenue

Ida Grant, 52 – 1101 Cameron Avenue

Ron & Amy Jacobson, 1201 Cameron Avenue

Melvin & Johanna Wright, 1240 Guisachan Road

Norma Nevin, 152 – 1201 Cameron Avenue

Grace & Gordon Morris, 10 – 1201 Cameron Avenue

Ed N. Burke, 51 – 1101 Cameron Avenue

Ernie Heiland, 228 – 1200 Cameron Avenue

Fraser Berry, Sandhaven Strata Council, 13 – 1101 Cameron Avenue

Gail Cocker, 77 – 1101 Cameron Avenue

Linda Coombe, 90-1201 Cameron Avenue

**Petition of Opposition bearing 445 signatures from surrounding residents**

All opposed generally on the basis of increased traffic congestion, noise and pollution; lack of parking; the density is too high; the proposed park area is too small; negative impact on surrounding property values; overdevelopment of the Guisachan area would negatively affect the quality of life for residents; area infrastructure is inadequate to handle the proposed amount of increased density; the proposal is not consistent with the South Pandosy/KLO Sector Plan; and the Official Community Plan should not be changed.

Public Hearing

January 24, 2006

**Letters of Support**

Maureen Gallant, 920 Glenwood Avenue  
Bob Kendel, 90 – 2365 Stillingfleet Road

In favour generally on the basis that there is a need for a complex within walking distance to amenities.

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

**Peter Brenneman, applicant:**

- Aberdeen is a land investment company that holds land for long periods of time until development opportunities come to fruition. Aberdeen purchased the lands in this area over 40 years ago with the goal of development. Heritage buildings were dedicated and garden areas were gifted by Aberdeen.
- The property is naturally separated by three streets and a park, is within three blocks of Kelowna General Hospital and is on the transit route, and the necessary infrastructure is in place to handle the density proposed.
- The proposed design for development of the site has changed considerably over the last 18 months.
- The 21 units of affordable housing would be protected perpetually by agreement.
- Potential purchasers would have the option of leasing with an option-to-purchase.
- The roots of the cedars would be protected during and after construction.
- Sale of the park land to the City is conditional on receiving a Development Permit for the subject property; the agreement to sell is not conditional on approval of the rezoning.

**Doug Lane, project architect:**

- Showed visuals and gave a brief outline of the form and character of the proposed four buildings.

**Peter Brenneman, continued:**

- Asking for another 48 units and another 1.5 storeys above what could be built today and in return the City will achieve 21 units of affordable housing, 10 wheelchair accessible units, 50% expansion of the park (achieved through the additional building height), a traffic light, 30% increase in green space, additional DCCs of \$500,000, and a sustainable development.

**Marietta Lightbody, Abbott Street:**

- Concerned that the proposed building height will block sun for the flowers in the butterfly and hummingbird garden to the west of the subject property.

**Staff:**

- Clarified that the closest buildings would be about 150 ft. from the existing property line. Any shadowing would occur in the early morning hours when the sun first comes over the hill.

**Ken Churchman, 2454 Rhondda Crescent:**

- Built on his property 23 years ago and was told then that the subject property was proposed for a strip mall and that Cameron Avenue would not link into Gordon Drive but when Sandhaven developed Cameron was extended to Gordon.
- Concerned about traffic. His property is at the tee of the Cameron/Rhondda intersection and would be impacted by the additional traffic.

Bill Heimbecker, 2272 Rhondda Crescent:

- Concerned about the City paying for the additional park space. The City should only be buying half the area proposed for acquisition or alternatively, Aberdeen should be required to donate the park land but then doubt there would be an affordable housing component. Concerned that the City is subsidizing the affordable housing with the funds the City is paying for the park land.
- If the requested zoning is not approved, doubt that there would be a Development Permit application. The City does not get anything unless the developers get what they want.

Margery Heuser, 1027 Cameron Avenue:

- Concerned about traffic. There are already so many residential complexes; the traffic from over 800 units flows into the central area of Guisachan. Traffic congestion in the centre of Guisachan increased with the Balmoral development and there is other vacant land and an empty commercial spot still not occupied in the shopping centre so density in the core area is intense. This is not a pedestrian friendly zone being created at the centre of Guisachan. There are few sidewalks in the area and only one small park. The existing residents walk on the roads and these new residents would also be walking on the roads. Most of the traffic will head down Gordon but some will travel up the residential streets to get to the downtown to avoid traffic lights and the school zone. The street they would use is Charolais where there are no sidewalks and kids ride their bikes.
- Concerned about parking in the area. Displayed photos showing on-street parking on the residential streets at times when there are functions at Guisachan Heritage Park. Concerned that overflow from the proposed development would add to the on-street parking problem.
- Most of the units are proposed to be 2 bedrooms, and some are over 1,800 sq. ft. in size and most likely there would be more than one car per unit so parking will not be adequate.
- Asked that the RM3 density be upheld.

Monica Nahm, 2251 Nelson Road:

- Supports the application.
- Has lived in the Guisachan area for the past 17 years and during that time has seen a lot of changes. Had similar concerns about traffic, etc. when the Greens and Balmoral projects were developed to the south and found that their worries were unfounded. The seniors have been wonderful neighbours and since these projects came, she has noticed a dramatic increase in the foot traffic to Guisachan Village and the surrounding area.

Denton Powles, 2383 Aryshire Court:

- Opposed to the rezoning and allowing four 4.5 storey buildings. The final height will be closer to 5 storeys with under-building parking. Exceeds RM5 zoning regulations.
- The only greenspace is the heritage park and the developer wants the City to purchase the cedars and strip of grass which is heavily used for walking and most people already consider to be park. The applicant's website indicated they were dedicating 8 acres; this was removed after being questioned at the APC.
- Concerned the City may be trading zoning to extend park space.
- Failure to provide adequate green space for this neighbourhood.
- Development could hasten the demise of the cedars.
- There are six walled communities within a two block radius and most are for the 55+ age group. Seniors like to walk in the heritage park by the flowers but cannot do that during functions in the gardens. Cameron Avenue and the lane are currently used for over-flow parking and that is already a problem on the residential streets.

Public HearingJanuary 24, 2006

- Noise will increase.
- Council should reject this application and do a multi-purpose park and expand the hours of the park so access is less restricted.
- Would like the area to be maintained as low density residential.
- The archaeological significance of the property should be investigated since it is probably one of the oldest ranch areas in Kelowna.

Staff:

- The City's parkland acquisition strategy was based on future development and staff are addressing the growth according to the standards in the OCP.
- Nothing has ever been discovered of archaeological significance that would warrant such a study of the subject property.

Steve Rayburn, 845 Francis Avenue:

- Supports the application. Likes the affordable housing component. Traffic will increase but the street light at Cameron Avenue will help. Parking requirements are being met. Properties that are already serviced and are in the downtown core need to be developed.

Les Woller, 1071 Guisachan Road:

- Supports development but is disappointed in the ability of the City of Kelowna to match development with infrastructure development.
- Has been experiencing regular power surges. A development of this size may warrant spending the money to upgrade the power distribution system in the city.

Staff:

- Fortis B.C. was invited to comment on this application and raised no power issues.

Wally Dennison, 48 – 1120 Guisachan Road:

- This development proposal would be akin to having Sylvester the Cat placed beside Tweedy Bird; the development would gobble up and diminish the heritage park.
- Instead of blighting the heritage park, Aberdeen should team up with the City for a development of the site as a park project that would harmonize with the heritage park. This would impart a lasting legacy for enjoyment by future generations.

Doreen Velin, resident of 2365 Stillingfleet Road:

- Supports the application. Likes the proposed design and thinks it would be compatible with the surrounding area. Is pleased the developer is local with roots in this area.
- It is narrow minded and self-serving for the public to expect that this private property that has been trespassed on for 42 years remain undeveloped.
- Most of the traffic problems on Gordon Drive are a result of new development coming from outside this area.

Jim Morris, representing the Canadian Homebuilders Association:

- Supports the application.
- The Canadian Homebuilders Association hosts annual Tommie Awards. In 2004 there was no award for affordable housing and the former Mayor of Kelowna expressed displeasure and asked the Association to encourage its members to build affordable housing. The Association did that and this member is now proposing 21 units of badly needed affordable housing units.

Brad Heuser, 1027 Cameron Avenue:

- Ideally the land should be preserved as natural park land. Since the developer is intent on building not selling for park, the City should consider a land swap of a portion of the old KSS site in exchange for park on the subject property. Otherwise, the proposed development is inappropriate and unfair to each resident who has bought in the area.
- The \$150,000 affordable units would impact the value of other property.

- The area Sector Plan indicates the subject property for multi-family residential-low density which at the time provided for a maximum height of 2 storeys. The land was subsequently reclassified to allow RM3 zoning which would allow up to 3.5 storeys which is still a far cry from what is being proposed with this application. The Sector Plan also says maximum 55 units per gross ha which would equate to 142 units, not the 200+ as is proposed.
- If the property has to be developed, would like it developed in accordance with what the residents of abutting developments were told when they bought. Something like Aberdeen Estates or the Fountains would be fine.
- Parks are jewels within the city and once gone, they are gone. What is proposed dwarfs what is already there.

Janet Macarthur, 1120 Guisachan Road:

- Opposes the application. Is a parent of a 9 year old child and there is a lack of park space in the area. Feels hemmed in and traffic choked. There are few sidewalks or paths for taking a long walk in the area. The area is built-out at this point and any more development would be a mistake.

Therese Smith, 1101 Cameron Avenue:

- Lives at the corner of Gordon/Cameron and can attest to the noise, pollution and traffic accidents along this section of Gordon Drive.
- The proposed main access off Cameron would be directly across from Sandhaven's exit to Gordon. Not sure why the main entrance/egress has to be off Cameron and only emergency access/egress proposed off Guisachan where there is a traffic light.
- A traffic light at Cameron/Gordon would bring more traffic noise.
- The developer should be required to provide sidewalks on Guisachan, Gordon and Cameron.
- What will the land lease cost be on top of strata fees? The prices quoted by the developer are at today's prices.
- The affordable units are not being provided out of social considerations but rather for the higher density.

Randy Engman, 2141 Stillingfleet Road:

- His home is right beside Stillingfleet Park. Thought the people using the park would be disturbing, but found that it is quite the opposite. The park is heavily used by the community. It is a relief in this day and age to have a cool greenspace to go to.
- Traffic is an issue on Gordon because of expansion in the south part of the city.
- This is the last of a 400 acre parcel of which only a fraction is being developed as green space.
- Urged Council to know the value of park land and consider the alternatives such as land exchanges or maybe only developing three instead of four buildings on the subject property in order to allow the property or a part of it to be green space.
- Parking concerns are real.
- Need to look hard at the alternatives and develop this final 6 acres in a more responsible way.

Doug Herbert, 1101 Cameron Avenue:

- The revised plans indicate the cedars along the west boundary will be almost completely obscured from Gordon Drive.
- The proposal exceeds RM3 by two zoning increments.
- There should be sidewalks and curb & gutter on both sides of Cameron.
- It is unfortunate that the City cannot acquire this property for park. Such a purchase would not be without precedent and could be accomplished with innovative financing.



Mick McGarry, 1101 Cameron Avenue:

- Has accepted that the property is zoned for development but what is proposed is unacceptable.
- His main objection is to the appearance of what is proposed and how it will fit in with the neighbourhood and Guisachan Village.
- Concerned about the building height going from 4 to 4.5 storeys.
- There are advantages and disadvantages to a 2-storey development. Would have liked to see what a 2-storey development would look like on the subject property.

Ernie Gabbs, 2543 Rhondda Crescent:

- Is disabled and serves on a committee that deals with accessibility for people with disabilities. Concerned about traffic and the lack of sidewalks in the neighbourhood.

Laurie-Anne Bay, 1120 Guisachan Road:

- Opposes changing the zoning to the higher density.
- Would prefer to see the project developed with the proposed affordable housing and accessibility components under RM3 regulations.

Valerie Hallford, 429 Park Avenue:

- This is an opportunity to expand Guisachan Park; would like to see this land added to Guisachan Heritage Park.
- Supports the land swap suggestion and part of the KSS site would be ideal because affordable housing is to be a component for development of the KSS site.

Stan Velin, 2365 Stillingfleet (Balmoral):

- Supports the application.
- Retired and moved to Kelowna about 2 years. Chose this neighbourhood because of the location. Can walk almost anywhere and it offers great accommodation for retired people.
- In the two years he has lived there the only time he has found that traffic was heavy was at rush hours. The rest of the time the traffic is no problem. Does not see that this development would add to the impact on traffic all that much.

Dan Chun, 2372 Rhondda Crescent:

- There is a Yield sign at the corner of Cameron/Rhondda and a lot of traffic goes through there. Even if the subject property is developed at RM3 density, at least a Stop sign is needed.
- Was told when he bought his property 9 years ago that the subject property would be RM3. Wants the elected officials to stick to the plan.

Ron Briggs, 1043 Calder Court:

- Canvassed 30 neighbours and not one was aware of or supported this proposal. Everyone said they did not want RM5 and that they would support RM3.
- The water table and Fascieux Creek were issues when he bought his property which is only two streets over. Need to look at hydrology to make sure RM5 can be supported on the subject property.

Bill Heimbecker, 2272 Rhondda Crescent, continued:

- City staff were asked by Council at first reading of the subject bylaw to review the objectives of the sector plan with respect to this project, yet there has been very little questioning of staff regarding the sector plan guidelines.
- Read some comments made by speakers when attending the meeting when the Advisory Planning Commission considered this application.
- The mass of the building would be twice as large it would be under RM3 – too big and would not fit.

Public HearingJanuary 24, 2006

- RM5 would be a huge increase in density from the RU1 density of his own property which is within 72 ft. of the subject property. No consideration has given to buffering. The developer should be donating the row of cedars as a buffer yet the City is paying for it. If the City did not pay, doubt there would be an affordable housing component with this proposal.

Peter Brenneman, continued:

- Perimeter sidewalks would be provided with this development.
- Building up allows costs to be spread over more units. Affordable units are difficult to achieve and cost would likely prohibit achieving affordable units at a lower density.

Staff:

- The owners of the subject property have in the past allowed the field to be used for overflow parking from Guisachan Park as a good will issue.
- Under RM3 zoning, about 150-160 units could be achieved if the property was developed aggressively and maybe 175 units with bonusing if the developer opted to take that option. This proposal is for 206 units and that is not maximizing the potential under RM5 zoning.
- Explained that in the OCP, moving from low density to medium density is considered one increment. The incremental change is not based on zoning category.

**3.3(b) 1102 Cameron Avenue and 1091 Guisachan Road**

3.3(b) Bylaw No. 9538 (Z05-0037) – Aberdeen Holdings Ltd. (Water Street Architecture) – Cameron Avenue and Guisachan Road - THAT City of Kelowna Zoning Bylaw No. 8000 be amended by changing the zoning classification of Lot 19, District Lot 136, ODYD Plan 38928 and Lot 18, District Lot 136, ODYD Plan 38928, located on Cameron Avenue and Guisachan Road, Kelowna, B.C. from the RM3 – Low Density Multiple Housing zone to the RM5 – Medium Density Multiple Housing zone and P3 – Parks and Open Space zone as shown on Map "B" attached to the report of Planning & Corporate Services Department dated December 5, 2005.

See discussion under 3.3(a).

**4. TERMINATION:**

The Hearing was declared terminated at 10:15 p.m.

Certified Correct:\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor\_\_\_\_\_  
Deputy City Clerk

BLH/am