

Public HearingSeptember 6, 2005

A Public Hearing of the Municipal Council of the City of Kelowna was held in the Council Chamber, 1435 Water Street, Kelowna, B.C., on Tuesday, September 6, 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 and S.A. Shepherd.

Council members absent: Councillor A.F. Blanleil.

Staff members in attendance were: City Manager, R.A. Born; City Clerk, A.M. Flack; Manager of Development Services, A.V. Bruce; Subdivision Approving Officer, R.G. Shaughnessy\*; and Council Recording Secretary, B.L. Harder.

(\* denotes partial attendance)

1. Mayor Gray called the Hearing to order at 7:03 p.m.
2. Mayor Gray advised that the purpose of the Hearing is to consider certain bylaws which, if adopted, will amend "*Kelowna 2020 - Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 7600*" and "*Zoning Bylaw No. 8000*", and all submissions received, either in writing or verbally, will be taken into consideration when the proposed bylaws are presented for reading at the Regular Council Meeting which follows this Public Hearing.

The City Clerk advised the Notice of this Public Hearing was advertised by being posted on the Notice Board at City Hall on August 19, 2005 and by being placed in the Kelowna Daily Courier issues of August 29 & 30, 2005, and in the Kelowna Capital News issue of August 28, 2005, and by sending out or otherwise delivering 672 letters to the owners and occupiers of surrounding properties between August 19-22, 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) **632 Craig Road**

- 3.1(a) Bylaw No. 9480 (OCP05-0009) – Tony Khun Khun (R.A. Quality Homes Ltd.) – Craig Road – THAT Map 19.1 of the *Kelowna 2020 - Official Community Plan* Bylaw No. 7600 be amended by changing the Future Land Use designation of Lot B, Sec. 26, Twp. 26, ODYD, Plan 28885, located on Craig/Lacombe Roads, Kelowna, BC, from the Rural/Agriculture designation to the Single/Two Unit Residential designation.

See under 3.1(b).

**3.1(b) 632 Craig Road**

- 3.1(b) Bylaw No. 9481 (Z05-0023) – Tony Khun Khun (R.A. Quality Homes Ltd.) – Craig Road - THAT City of Kelowna Zoning Bylaw No. 8000 be amended by changing the zoning classification of Lot B, Sec. 26, Twp. 26, ODYD, Plan 28885, located on Craig/Lacombe Roads, Kelowna, BC from the A1 – Agriculture 1 zone to the RU1 – Large Lot Housing and the RU1s – Large Lot Housing with Secondary Suite zones.

Councillor Cannan declared a conflict of interest because the applicant is financial agent for his federal election campaign and left the Council Chamber at 7:06 p.m.

**Staff:**

- The requested OCP and rezoning amendments are required to facilitate a proposed 6 lot single family subdivision. The northerly five lots would be zoned RU1 and the south lot with the existing house would be zoned RU1s.
- The intent of the Rural/Agricultural OCP future land use designation was to provide a buffer between the established single family neighbourhood to the west and the agricultural land to the east.
- The depth of the property is 50 m providing ample space for a buffer.
- The Advisory Planning Commission and the Agricultural Advisory Committee both recommend support provided that a 15 m buffer and chain link fence are provided at the rear of the lots.
- City of Kelowna Planning Policies do not support urban residential uses on the subject property and therefore staff recommend non-support.
- If approved, a notice would be registered on title regarding the adjacent agricultural land as a condition of subdivision approval.

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

- letter from Wendell & Leona Turk, 180 Mail Road, concerned about potential urban/rural conflict.

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, representing the applicant:**

- The applicant has met with the Turk's. Their concerns would be addressed with the 15 m landscape buffer and the notice on title that the property is next to agricultural land.

**Sarah Cherrey – 1110 Lacombe Road:**

- Objects to the size of houses, not the housing itself.
- Putting large lot housing in an area consisting of mainly single and two storey homes is not right and would be out of character with the homes that are already there. Large lot housing would block existing views and give the new homes a view into the living rooms, kitchens and front doors of the existing homes.

## Staff:

- Clarified that the zone allows a building height of 9.5 m or 2.5 storey equivalent.
- The original application, 2-3 years ago, was for suites on all lots, now only the existing dwelling would be permitted a secondary suite.
- The applicant's intent is to replicate the homes that are already there.
- The property has never been included in the Agricultural Land Reserve.
- The lot with the existing house would provide a 1.5 m buffer of cedar hedging along with a chainlink fence. The other five lots would all have a 15 m buffer and a chainlink fence.

There were no further comments.

Councillor Cannan returned to the Council Chamber at 7:23 p.m.

**3.2 2355-2395 Gordon Drive**

- 3.2 Bylaw No. 9476 (Z05-0049) – Aberdeen Holdings Ltd. (716309 BC Ltd.) – Gordon Drive – THAT City of Kelowna Zoning Bylaw No. 8000 be amended by changing the zoning classification of Lot B, D.L. 136, ODYD Plan KAP46155, located on Gordon Drive, Kelowna, B.C. from the C3rls – Community Commercial (Retail Liquor Sales) zone to the C3rls/lp – Community Commercial (Retail Liquor Sales/Liquor Primary) zone.

## Staff:

- The subject property was part of a pre-planned comprehensive development that included commercial with three phases of residential development along the east and south portion of the site; the phase three 3-storey apartment building is not yet built. The intent was to provide a level of commercial activities to support the neighbourhood within a few blocks of the site.
- The shopping centre was zoned with the 'rls' designation about two years ago to accommodate a retail liquor store on the north side of the building. The proposed pub would be at the southeast end of the buildings, directly across from residential buildings.
- Initially the application was for a neighbourhood pub with 120 indoor seating capacity and 40 patio seats. The applicant has since dropped the patio space but the interior seating remains at 120 seats. Hours of operation applied for are 10 a.m. to midnight.
- The Mayor's Entertainment District Task Force recommendations reveal no technical reasons why staff should not recommend support for this application.
- The applicant has been encouraged to meet with the neighbourhood to try to deal with potential noise conflicts and traffic complaints that could arise.
- No rezoning would be required for a pub with less than 100 seat capacity; the rezoning is required to accommodate the additional 20 seats. Either way the applicant would still require a liquor license application.

Gary Benson, applicant:

- Advised that he is a principle of the numbered company that would be operating the pub. They are also involved in the management of the Post Haus Pub in Rutland and that pub is the benchmark of a scale where a neighbourhood pub should be.
- The proposed pub would be 120 seats; 40 parking stalls would be required.
- The location would provide the ability for residents in the neighbourhood to walk to a pub and would be similar to the Post Haus. The Post Haus is not a nightclub or beer parlour; there are no live bands or DJs; music is through a speaker system at a low level, more like background music. There are no outdoor speakers.

Public HearingSeptember 6, 2005

- The outdoor patio was dropped from the application because of the significant concern of the neighbours. The proposed access has also been changed to the opposite site of the building, from the east side to the west side facing the parking lot and into the mall area. Is working with the landlord to provide signage to direct parking during evening hours away from the residential buildings.
- Displayed photos to show that the distance from the residences to the parking area is similar to what is at the Post Haus.
- Consulted with the neighbours around the Post Haus and received no indication of concern and no complaints.
- There is no market evidence to indicate there would be a decrease in value of neighbouring properties.
- Would provide the same kind of security camera system as at the Post Haus to monitor the parking lot and the interior of the pub. The cameras would be monitored by the owners from inside the building.
- Experience from the Post Haus Pub is that 100 seats are not as viable as 120 seats; the additional 20 seats are critical to improved viability.
- Would have no intention of applying for off-sales; with the liquor store next door it would not be viable.

**Staff:**

- Clarified that once the liquor license was issued, any change in hours or in occupant load or for an outdoor patio would have to come back before Council for public input.

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

**Support**

- letter from Ethel & Maurice Aked, 34 - 1120 Guisachan Road
- letter from Kris Stewart, #14 – 1120 Guisachan Road
- letter from Neil Collette, #54-2365 Stillingfleet Road
- letter from Donna MacDougall, 107-2350 Stillingfleet Road
- letter from Tracy Hansen & Duane Peters, 113A-2365 Gordon Drive
- letter from Grant & Donna Larson, 131-1201 Cameron Avenue
- letter from Edward Sauter, 213-2350 Stillingfleet Road
- letter from Orchard Park Travel Ltd., 101-2365 Gordon Drive
- letter from Domenic Panucci, 104-2365 Gordon Drive
- letter from Don & Joyce Favell, 103 - 2365 Gordon Drive
- letter from John Crofts, 2365 Gordon Drive
- letter from Paul & Ann Andrews, #102-2365 Gordon Drive

In support generally on the basis that the area needs an eating/liquor establishment within easy walking distance.

**Opposition**

- letter from Nancy Henry, (Secretary of KAS1424 Strata Council, 2370 Stillingfleet Road, submitting a letter that the Strata Council distributed to their residents
- letter from Dick & Cathy Leppky, 124 – 2370 Stillingfleet Road
- letter from Lloyd Reiner, 48 – 2200 Gordon Drive
- letter from Pam & Ken Murphy, 115 – 2350 Stillingfleet Road
- letter from Ross Hamilton, 43 – 1201 Cameron Avenue
- letter from Norma Fletcher, 79 – 1101 Cameron Avenue
- letter from Anna Henry, 126 – 2370 Stillingfleet Road
- letter from George Athans, 120-2370 Stillingfleet Road
- letter from Mary Glenn, 123 – 2370 Stillingfleet Road
- letter from Richard & Phyllis Law, 67 – 1120 Guisachan Road
- letter from Harry & Darlene Mosley, 5-2365 Stillingfleet Road
- letter from Helen & William Poirier, 56 – 1101 Cameron Avenue
- letter from Ron & Amy Jacobson, 97-1201 Cameron Avenue
- letter from Perle Nickells, 101-2350 Stillingfleet Road
- letter from Luke Stack, 237 – 1200 Cameron Avenue
- letter from Ronald & Sharon Green, 34 -1201 Cameron Avenue
- letter from Elaine Reiner, 48 – 2200 Gordon Drive
- letter from Steven Finkleman, 221 – 2370 Stillingfleet Road
- letter from Mr. & Mrs. Calvin Fortnum, 2260 Nelson Road
- letter from Henry & Maria Stanski, 324 – 2365 Stillingfleet Road
- letter from John & Carol Gran, 118-2370 Stillingfleet Road
- letter from Alice Zdrlek, 2205 Stillingfleet Road
- letter from Denise Jansen, 129- Guisachan Village
- two letters from Ray & Kathie Webber, 227 – 1200 Cameron Avenue
- letter from Irene Athans, 120-2370 Stillingfleet Road
- letter from Wayne & Judy Bignell, 217-2350 Stillingfleet Road
- letter from Rhonda & Robert Brockman, 985 Guisachan Road
- letter from Dietmar Tonn, 232-1200 Cameron Avenue
- letter from David & Jean Weir, 212-2365 Stillingfleet Road
- letter from Robert & Carolyn Wright, 222-2370 Stillingfleet Road
- letter from Lina Coombe, 90-1201 Cameron Avenue
- letter from George Athans, 120-2370 Stillingfleet Road
- letter from Dianna & Bruce Selman, 158-1201 Cameron Avenue
- letter from Kenneth & Linda Daviss and Dorothy Krull, 6-1201 Cameron Avenue
- letter from W.F. Holmes, 51-1201 Cameron Avenue
- letter from Ambrus & Julia Fodor, 112-2365 Gordon Drive
- letter from Christina Pearson, 214-2350 Stillingfleet Road
- letter from Wallace Henderson, 134-1200 Cameron Avenue
- letter from Florence Janeschitz, 111-2350 Stillingfleet Road
- letter from Paul Dreher, 59-1201 Cameron Avenue
- letter from Alice & Norman Barr, 102-2350 Stillingfleet Road
- letter from Thomas Sawtell, 88-1201 Cameron Avenue
- letter from Charlene Caruso, 2260 Stillingfleet Road
- letter from Heather & Sal Caruso, 2320 Rhonda Crescent
- letter from Johanna & Melvin Wright, 1250 Guisachan Road
- letter from Gordon & Grace Morris, #10-1201 Cameron Avenue
- letter from Denise Barker, 235-1200 Cameron Avenue
- letter from Wes & Tammy Epp, 2281 Burnett Street

Public HearingSeptember 6, 2005

- petition bearing 13 signatures from Guisachan Family Medicine
- petition bearing 25 signatures from residents of the surrounding area
- petition bearing 152 signatures from Balmoral Resort Community

Opposed generally on the basis that the liquor establishment would be too close to the townhouses and an unsupervised swimming pool; traffic and noise would increase; insufficient parking; negative impact on property values and quality of life for the surrounding residents; concern about safety and the potential increase in crime and irresponsible behaviour associated with alcohol consumption.

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

Doug Ladell, Manager of Guisachan Family Medicine:

- Guisachan Family Medical clinic has five doctors and eight staff and all are opposed to this application. The medical complex is about 18 ft. from where the pub entrance would be.
- Parking is horrendous in this complex already. There are 250 strata units to the east and they use the roadway going through the mall property as their access to Gordon Drive as opposed to using Guisachan Road. The corner on this internal road is totally blind, vehicles have to come to stop to see if anyone is coming.
- As a medical clinic, there are drugs in the premises, in a secured locked situation but there is potential for attempted break-ins. The drug store was broken into in the last month or so. Also concerned about potential for increased vandalism.
- 60-75% of the clinic patients are elderly and their driving skills are not as good as younger people. Concerned that the influence of alcohol could increase the speed in the parking lot, and commercial truck traffic would increase.
- Objects to being monitored by the pub cameras.

Wally Dennison, resident of Aberdeen Estates, 1120 Guisachan Road:

- The proposal is most unsavoury. Potential fall-out would include noise, increased traffic when traffic is now almost overwhelming, potential for violence and the area could even become vulnerable as a drug trafficking centre.
- People coming from the pub would not be able to manoeuvre the turnaround at Guisachan and Burtch.
- There is already a liquor store in Guisachan Village.
- People leaving the area and heading north use Wilkinson Street to access Springfield Road. There is a pedestrian crosswalk on Springfield but it is unsafe because there are no flashing warning signals.
- The propose pub would exacerbate existing problems.

Bob Clayton, 473 – 1260 Raymer (in Sunrise Village):

- Has to get his sick wife in and out of a wheelchair to get her to the doctor's office. On-site traffic is as close to grid-locked as it can get. The proposed pub would be 18-20 ft away from the door to the doctor's office. With the proposed pub the doctor's office would probably have to move.

Arthur Scully, 2200 Gordon Drive:

- Concerned that once approved, the hours of operation would change to 2 a.m. like the other pubs.
- The drop in property values would be tremendous and crime would increase in the area around the pub.
- There are no young people in the area; the neighbourhood residents are all older and do not go to pubs.
- Concerned that there would be theft of vehicles, more accidents, and continual complaints for the police to respond to. The Capri Pub is within 3 blocks of Guisachan Village; there is no need for another pub in the area.

Public HearingSeptember 6, 2005John Thompson, 201-Guisachan Village:

- There is a public phone booth on the corner of Guisachan/Gordon behind the gas station. The public phone makes the area drug central. Virtually every night of the week cars pull up and make a phone call, another car pulls up and a drug transaction takes place. Most of these people have cars with noisy mufflers.
- The public phone booth is about 150 ft. from the proposed pub.
- There is a board full of For-Sale signs in his strata complex and there is little movement. The fact that there is a liquor application pending may be the reason for that.
- Bought in the area for quiet enjoyment but the area is already extremely busy with traffic and limited access. It is only a matter of time before there are accidents and people walking to this pub are prime candidates for that.
- The quality of life for the residents in the neighbourhood would be adversely affected; the residents are adamantly opposed.

Marg Scully, 2200 Gordon Drive:

- Used to be a realtor and property values dropped drastically in three locations she is aware of when pubs went in nearby.

Lisa Stokes, #105, 2350 Stillingfleet Road:

- Supports pubs and is not convinced that pubs bring more crime; however, the area is already heavily congested and there already parking issues. Directional signs would not solve the lack of parking. If every patron of the pub came in a separate vehicle, that would add a lot to the traffic on the site.
- Concerned about safety for people using the swimming pool behind her complex. The pool is open until 11 p.m. People won't observe the directional signs, they will want to drive around to the back and park next to the pool.
- The pub would introduce more noise to the area; people do not always leave as soon as they exit the premises (have a smoke or whatever).
- Would prefer a tenant such as a café offering light lunches.

Carol Gran, 118-2370 Stillingfleet Road:

- Her unit is on the blind corner on the access road that comes from Stillingfleet and that has now become a freeway. Residents of Balmoral now go through there to get to Gordon Drive. The road is busy all day. The only peace and quiet she gets is after 6 p.m. in the evening. The shrubs cause the blind corner but would not want to see the shrubs removed. From her patio she could reach through the shrubs and touch the cars.
- Would never have expected a pub application in this neighbourhood. After a couple of drinks, people talk louder, sometimes do something they would not otherwise do, and they drive differently. To entertain the thought of a pub there is pure folly.
- Concerned about the process. Was a Councillor in Vancouver for many years. Realizes that it is intimidating for the public to stand before Council and difficult for the residents to get organized. The process is slanted to the developer. Most people do not have the time or knowledge.
- Found out by accident that this application was coming so has had a couple of months notice. A dozen or so of the residents have spent their entire summer trying to get signatures on petitions, get people to write letters, to get heard before this application came.
- The applicant could have a restaurant or a smaller pub without rezoning.
- Even if Council decided the pub was not appropriate, the neighbourhood would have to be on guard for the next application. Ask that Council refuse this application and direct staff to put covenant on the entire mall to prevent an application/use like this from ever being approved.

Shari McCorkle, 116-2350 Stillingfleet Road:

- Her bedroom would be 30 ft. from the pub. Noise carries from outside to indoors very much. She goes to bed at 10 p.m. and a pub would decrease the quality of her life. If this is approved, she will be calling the police every time she is bothered by noise after 11 p.m. She bought her unit thinking it would be a quiet complex.
- Also concerned about traffic.
- The pool is directly adjacent to the proposed pub – what will stop people from jumping the fence and using the pool or vandalizing the hot tub?

Nancy Henry, 126 Guisachan Village:

- Approval of this application would set a precedent for other establishments that are going to be developed in future. People's balconies would be adjacent to the proposed pub.
- Concerned about traffic and noise and security for the swimming pool.
- It is currently still being investigated, but it appears from the land title documents that some of the parking the applicant is using for the commercial property should belong to the strata property.
- The roadways are narrow and turning for trucks is difficult – they break some of the curbs coming through from Stillingfleet.
- Individual landowners have limited influence over big business and do not have as much money to hire lawyers.
- Parking has to be policed either by Aberdeen or the owners of the strata units because it is private property.

Marg Norman, resident of Balmoral:

- Stillingfleet and Cameron have become a speedway with tires squealing and motor noise. The roundabout at Guisachan/Burtch provides motorists great joy because during late hours they just go round and round.
- There is no safe way for motorists to exit from Balmoral with all the lanes of traffic that have to be crossed to go towards Gordon or KLO Road, and pedestrians have no help at all to get across. Need to find a way to handle the increased traffic safely. The residents feel like they take their lives in their own hands each time they have to exit.
- There is increased vandalism now; windshields being smashed, a motorcycle was recently stolen from her complex in mid-day. These problems would be exacerbated by the late night traffic from the pub.

Charlene Caruso, 2260 Stillingfleet Road:

- Is opposed to the proposed pub. The neighbourhood is a retirement and family area; the area does not support a pub or the clientele that would go there.
- Since the liquor store has been established, much has deteriorated in the neighbourhood. A cage had to be built to keep people out of the garbage receptacles and at 5:15 p.m. this week, as she exited her vehicle two men with an aluminium baseball bat were leaning up against the building drinking. They jeered at her and verbally asked her what her problem was. She recently went to the mail box at Guisachan Village and when she was not back right away her husband was concerned for her safety and came looking for her.
- There is a better use for the tenant space. A pub would not enhance the area or the neighbourhood.
- The area is not being patrolled properly (i.e. the phone use) and people are drinking outside with open bottles and in the park on Stillingfleet and McBride.

Public HearingSeptember 6, 2005Bill Heimbecker, 2272 Rhondda Court:

- Aberdeen Holdings have developed approximately 125 acres in the immediate neighbourhood and have sold a lot of different types of development with promises that Cameron would be a dead-end street which is not the case.
- Questioned why Aberdeen is trying to change the zoning on the shopping centre when they were just before Council two years ago for the liquor store. Aberdeen needs to have more foresight in their planning to be a responsible developer in this city.
- He lives behind the row of cedars and sees what Liquids (the liquor store) has done to the neighbourhood. Does not support having a pub.

Chris Thatcher, #24 Balmoral Estates:

- Opposed to pub. The location is in too close proximity to two gated communities.

Randy Engman, 2141 Stillingfleet Road:

- His house overlooks Stillingfleet Park and he has gone into the park to clean up bottles and garbage in there.
- His five 5 year old will have to go past this area to get to Casorso Elementary; does not want to be going by a Pub.
- Pub problems cannot be solved by the police alone. City Council is well-informed and has the information to make the decision regarding the liquor permit. The residents have to rely on Council.

Wayne Bignell, 217-2350 Stillingfleet Road:

- Is opposed. Since the liquor store went in, does not get to sleep until midnight because of squealing tires, yelling, screaming, etc. even though the liquor closes at 10 p.m.
- Parking will be inadequate; pub patrons will be parking in the area where the doctor's clinic is.
- Delivery trucks during the day make on-site manoeuvrability difficult.

Ryan Stokes, 105 - 2350 Stillingfleet Road:

- Owns a family business on the Westside. In his opinion, this is not the appropriate time or place for a pub. The area residents are in the older age category and they are opposing the pub. If the applicant is marketing toward those in walking distance and close driving proximity then, if this application is approved, the residents need to just not go there to eat or drink.
- The adjacent swimming pool area would literally be 20 ft. away from the pub and patrons of the pub are going to want to park at the rear.

Cindy Dalton, Caramello Road:

- Representing her mother who lives in Guisachan Village.
- Opposed the application.
- The Post Haus pub is on corner of Rutland Road and Highway 33. Cannot compare the demographics of that area to the residents in this quiet area of seniors. The crime in the Petro Can site across from that pub is appalling.
- There are a number of properties listed for sale in Guisachan. Where property values are going up elsewhere in the city, these residents are having to reduce their asking price because of this pub proposal.
- A pub at this location would be utterly wrong.

Christina Pearson, 214-2350 Stillingfleet Road:

- The Post Haus pub location is not challenged with the same issues as in this neighbourhood.
- Is very opposed. Does not want the pub and feels that the applicant should look for a better location.
- Concerned that if this is approved, the applicant could sell the facility and the neighbourhood would have no control over that or what the next use could be.

Public Hearing

September 6, 2005

Rich Tench, 208-2350 Stillingfleet Road:

- The facility has no walkways and no sidewalks in most areas so people have to walk in the common property. There is no fence or locked gate. People coming out of the pub could take a wrong turn and end up on someone's patio drinking beer.
- 'Liquids' has 1 hour parking but a truck has been parking there 24-seven.
- Any time he has been by the liquor store, there has been only one employee. concerned for the safety of the employee and that one of these days 'Liquids' will get robbed.

Doug Ladell, continued:

- Cannot compare this location to the Post Haus location.
- Concerned that someone could get killed in the parking lot.

Wally Dennison, continued:

- Council should bear in mind the quality of life for the residents and be mindful that there is a large voting block in this neighbourhood and they will respond at election time.

Gary Benson, applicant:

- Post Haus pub has been opened since December 17, 2004 and so has been open for one winter and one summer season.
- A lot of the issues raised tonight are existing concerns re traffic, security – all unrelated to the pub application. It is not fair to blame those current issues on the pub.
- With the clientele they target and the type of market they try to establish, the concerns raised by some of the speakers would never come up. Their target customer group is over 30 clientele. At the Post Haus pub, most of the clientele are people over 50 and there is little activity after 10 p.m.
- Held a public meeting with some of the residents in the area and invited them to contact him if they had concerns. Has not received any phone calls, letters or other contact from any of those who attended that meeting.
- Has taken the steps necessary to address parking, access, security issues.
- The proposed security camera would show only the interior of the pub and the sides of the building – entrances/exits. Plans to monitor the entire parking lot have changed; the security camera would not focus on the door of the medical clinic and there would be no monitoring of the parking lot.
- The market could dictate closing earlier than what is authorized by Council and the liquor control board.

There were no further comments.

4. TERMINATION:

The Hearing was declared terminated at 9:18 p.m.

Certified Correct:

---

Mayor

BLH/am

---

City Clerk