



CITY OF WEST KELOWNA
MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

Wednesday, July 15, 2020
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
2760 CAMERON ROAD, WEST KELOWNA, BC

MEMBERS PRESENT: Wayne Kubasek, Chair
Anthony Bastiaanssen, Vice Chair
Julian Davis
Joe Gluska
Nicole Richard
Katalin Zsufa

MEMBER ABSENT: Bea Kline

Staff Present: Carla Eaton, Planner III
Stirling Scory, Planner II - Long Range
Natasha Patricelli, Recording Secretary

1. CALL THE ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

2. INTRODUCTION OF LATE ITEMS

3. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

It was moved and seconded

THAT the agenda be adopted as presented.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

4.1 Minutes of the June 17, 2020 Advisory Planning Commission meeting held at the City of West Kelowna City Hall via WebEx

It was moved and seconded

THAT the minutes of the June 17, 2020 Advisory Planning Commission meeting held at the City of West Kelowna City Hall via WebEx be adopted

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. PRESENTATIONS

6. DELEGATIONS

7. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

8. REFERRALS

8.1 File P20-01, Update on Community Visioning (Phase 1 OCP Review)

Highlights of the presentation include:

- Working on a new vision for the Official Community Plan update;
- Community Vision: A collection of the communities values and desired outcome for the future;
- The Community Vision is a living document that will change over time and something that the community is able to participate in. Everyone has a voice in planning their city;
- A vision is formed by: starting with a foundation (our current context), created through listening (what matters to our community), and refined through the community's review:
 - Step 1: The visioning process starts with a community conversation;
 - Step 2: Exploring ways to meet the community vision;
 - Step 3: Develop policies and actions, and review together as a community;
 - Step 4: Form the Official Community Plan and review together as a community;
- Timeline for Step 1: Community Visioning Process is to be completed in winter 2020/2021 with next steps of OCP review follow;
- To be successful in our Community Vision we need: a clear future vision, an understanding of priorities, realistic and measurable directions, and an involved community;
- Phase 1 Engagement Activities (engaging while physical distancing):
 - Online engagement platform at ourwk.ca;
 - Social media platform - Facebook, Twitter and Instagram;

- Main input questionnaire (June 16 - Sept 21);
- Weekly topics include: environment, parks, recreation and culture, transportation, operations and maintenance, health and well-being, economy, growth and development, housing;
- 2-page backgrounders about key topics and highlights trends, changes, issues and opportunities in West Kelowna, as well as a review of our current OCP key objectives/policies;
- Weekly videos from Mayor and Council;
- Weekly photo challenge online through ourwk.ca or instagram;
- Weekly topic questionnaires, which cover the topics listed earlier;
- Online interactive web platform community workshops;
- Future drop box stations - quick comment opportunities at City Hall, Library and Recreation Centre, in accordance with the requirements or recommendations made under the Public Health Act due to COVID-19;
- Kids activity book - engaging our younger residents;
- How can you help?
 - spread the word through your network;
 - share a few words at your meeting or event;
 - encourage participation in engagement activities online through the questionnaires and in the online community workshops;
 - work with us to remove a barrier to participate for our 'hard to reach';
- Community Leader Kits - can be picked up at City Hall, or be arranged to be delivered electronically or through mail by contacting the project team at ourwk@westkelownacity.ca.

Discussion on presentation include:

- Can you go back and complete a previous week's input questionnaire? Yes, they will remain available until September 21.
- How has the first weekly topic done? Approaching 800 completed responses for our main questionnaire.
- Good engagement at the start;
- Is it possible to have larger posters in the community with Community Vision information and website listed? Stirling will look into this.

- Are project cards, business cards? Yes, they are business cards with the ourwk.ca website information listed.

8.2 File Z 20-03, Zoning Amendment Application, 2971 Gorman Rd

Highlights of the presentation include:

- 2.9 ha (7.31 acres);
- Located in the Glenrosa neighbourhood;
- Walking distance of schools and commercial;
- Not within the ALR;
- Located approximately 250 meters West of the roundabout at Webber and Gorman Road;
- The surrounding land uses include:
 - North - Single Family Residential (including some duplex use);
 - East: Neighbourhood Commercial and Single Family Residential (including some duplex use);
 - South: Glenrosa Middle School and Agricultural (in and out of ALR);
 - West: Single Family Residential and Country Residential;
- Proposal - OCP Amendment
 - Currently designated: Single Family Residential;
 - Propose to amend a portion of the Single Family Residential to Low Density Multiple Family;
- Proposal - Zoning Amendment
 - Currently zoned: Rural Residential Small Parcel Zone (RU2);
 - Propose to amend to Single Detached Residential (R1) and Low Density Multiple Residential (R3);
- The proposed amendment will facilitate approximately 17 single family residential lots and 44 townhouse units;

Official Community Plan (OCP) Bylaw No. 0100

- Single Family Residential designation:
 - Supports traditional single family housing opportunities;
 - Encourages efficient compact housing forms for families;

- R1 lots consistent with designation and create a buffer between existing lots and proposed townhouse development;
- Proposed amendment to Low Density Residential designation:
 - Provides a broader range of housing in area served by transit and in walking distance to schools and commercial uses;
 - Buffered by R1 lots;
 - Ground oriented townhouses consistent with policies to encourage infill where designed to respect neighbourhood character and scale;

Policy and Bylaw Review

- Located within two Development Permit Areas;
- Hillside:
 - Development of the site will require the issuance of a Hillside DP;
 - A DP will be required to address:
 - Site grading and site suitability prior to subdivision of single family lots; and,
 - the Form and Character elements of the proposed low density multiple family development, and will reconfirm the site grading for the multiple family lot;
- Sensitive Terrestrial Ecosystem:
 - Environmental Assessment recommends incorporating mitigation measures into the design and construction, as well as limit the development footprint;
 - A DP will address specific conditions (bat/tree boxes/etc.);
- Recommended mitigation measures include:
 - Limiting disturbance areas,
 - Restoring a vegetated swale designed to capture groundwater,
 - Installing bird and bat boxes as compensation for lost habitat, and
 - Ensuring that tree clearing avoids bird nesting periods or includes a site survey for active nests and bird activity.

Zoning Bylaw No. 0154

- Application proposes a split zone to facilitate both traditional single family houses, as well as townhouses;

- Conceptual lot layout is consistent with proposed minimum zoning regulations where proposed zones only permit buildings up to 9m in height to a maximum of 3 storeys.

Technical Review

- Site Servicing:
 - Site can be adequately services;
 - Anticipate off-site sanitary service upgrades (needs review);
 - Need to confirm potential off-site water conditions, as well as stormwater conditions and routing on and off-site;
- Access:
 - Access from Gorman Road and from the extension of Lyon Court to Ficke Road;
 - Anticipate frontage improvements to a Rural Local Road Standard;
 - McTaggart Road improvements not anticipated except to address pedestrian connections;
- Geotechnical:
 - Confirmed that site is safe for use intended;
 - Recommendation for control and redirection of the drainage course and additional future building recommendations;
 - Future DP to address possible geotechnical covenant;
- Pedestrian Connection between Gorman Road and McIver Road:
 - Pedestrian connection desired between Gorman Road and McIver Road with access to Glenrosa Middle School;
 - Portion of pathway (yellow dashed line) required at subdivision as per Works and Services Bylaw No. 249;
 - Additional discussion with applicant required regarding construction of remaining portion;
- Park Network:
 - Park dedication or cash in lieu of park dedication for subdivisions creating three or more additional residential lots would be addressed as a condition of future subdivision;
 - Additional discussion is required with the Parks Department;

Referral Comments

- Application referred out on July 2nd (July 17th comment deadline);
- No concerns noted with the proposed amendment, but the following comments were received:
 - Recommend review of transit infrastructure and crossings on Webber Road;
 - Noting history of unsightly premises (weeds) that were remediated upon complaint;
- DRC scheduled for July 15th (additional comments anticipated).

Key Considerations

- Official Community Plan policy encourages sensitive integration of different housing forms in support of neighbourhood diversity and healthy communities;
- Infill development makes more efficient use of community services and reduces development pressures at the urban fringes;
- Proposed townhouses have transition buffer with ring of single family next to existing single family residential uses;
- Proposed uses are similar in form in respect of ground oriented maximum 3 storey buildings;
- Future DP will address hillside and environmental mitigation, as well as form and character of the townhouse development;
- Opportunities to provide additional trail connections and improve pedestrian connectivity to Glenrosa Middle School that require additional discussion.

Questions on presentation:

- Clarification regarding pedestrian connection between Gorman Road and McIver Road - Section 219 covenant never registered and proposed amendments were never adopted? The previous zoning application (Z17-14) on adjacent property did receive third reading however the applicant decided not to proceed with the application and closed the file at the applicant's request. No conditions are in effect at this time.
- Are they allowed 3 storey homes with rental suites in proposed zones? Existing RU2 Zone and proposed R1 & R3 Zones are all permitted up to 3 storeys. Secondary Suites are permitted within the proposed zones and must confirm on site parking if suites are proposed.

- McTaggart right-of-way, is it currently used as an informal walking path? Yes, students and pedestrians are walking there. Existing driveway, which is part of the dedicated roadway, and the rest is not a formalized pathway.
- Extension of Lyon road or court? The subdivision process would determine road naming.
- Lot of traffic, possibly from the Glenrosa detour. Traffic impact on existing neighbourhood and access to major roads will be reviewed? Because the application is less than 100 units, did not trigger a traffic impact assessment. These are elements that are brought out during the technical review. Conditions are being affected by the Glenrosa Road detour. Traffic circulation is reviewed for the R3 Zone at development permit stage. Additional technical discussion regarding transportation is expected at the Development Review Committee meeting.
- Pathway – under what considerations will it become a roadway? Previously noted concerns with grade transition and road profile as there is a substantial change in elevation and implications with drainage. Previous recommendation was to not require road access however road access will be reviewed again with this application.
- Environmental sensitivities of the area - anything particular valuable in the community from this property? Environmental report reviewed through zoning and details and conditions considered through the development permit process. Greater concern with routing water and drainage in the area. Opportunities to do restoration areas. Recommendations regulating limiting disturbance areas. Development permit stage is where we get into the specifics. Nothing on site that is precluding development, but recommendations to limit disturbance and mitigate habitat impacts.

Highlights of the discussion include:

- 61 units with houses and townhomes is 122 cars with 2 per family. Recommendation: adequate parking for townhouse and visitors to take pressure off surrounding areas;
- No road access straight to this area, need to go around elementary school;
- Single family houses with legal suite is 3 cars per house at least;
- Other member feels that there is quite a bit of access from McIver Road and Webber Road;
- Appears to be a great diverse use for this unused piece of property. Flat developable piece of land, in a great residential neighbourhood, close to schools. Rare opportunity for more affordable housing. Great family

neighbourhood with schools close by. Exactly what we would like to see in the community;

- Access considerations will be dealt through the subdivision process. From conceptual plans, some lots may have access through Gorman Road;
- Noticed comments from the community on social media about how important a play area for children would be. Proposed dog park and playground that applicant has suggested would be very valuable to the neighbourhood but questions regarding private or public use;
- Parking regulations would apply to the proposed development, not anticipating variance requested. Would happen through the development permit process. Parking is required in accordance to the existing zoning bylaw.

It was moved and seconded

THAT the APC recommend support for file Z 20-03, Zoning Amendment Application, 2971 Gorman Road as presented

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. CORRESPONDENCE AND INFORMATION ITEMS

9.1 File Z 19-13, Decision Letter, 1130 Thomas Rd

10. OTHER BUSINESS

10.1 Standing Item: Community Discussion Topic

How to Conduct the Discussion / Report Outcome

Highlights of the discussion include:

- Limit ourselves to 30 minute discussions;
- Document concerns and issues that the APC hopes Council will consider through their other master planning and budgetary processes;
- As a Commission, bring Council comments and suggestions as a group;
- Not to duplicate Council process;
- Discuss larger scope items not budgetary process;
- To highlight areas of community interest that the APC would recommend for greater focus or emphasis; and to
- Develop useful comments.
- Determine process for reporting back to Council:

- Suggestion that the minutes go forward and finalize comments at the next meeting for each topic;
- Defined process to provide advisory comments to Council is to provide the monthly meeting minutes as per the APC Bylaw No. 0098;
- Some topics are feeding into OCP visioning process topics - opportunity for APC to provide comments on that process?;
- Currently OCP is accepting feedback on an individual basis not from groups but further updates will be provided to the APC throughout the course of the Official Community Plan review, and the committee will be asked to formally weigh in (i.e. via a resolution) during later stages of the OCP bylaw development.
- These discussions are valuable for our own education to share with who we interact with in the community.

10.2 Standing Item: Community Discussion Topic

Street Lighting, Curbs and Sidewalks

Highlights of the discussion include:

- Noted items related to this topic were provided by email from Engineering Manager with information (context and history) regarding previous Council reports associated with transportation planning and capital budget process for the APC's information.
- Sidewalks, what is the breakdown of costs for improvements?
- Safety on arterial roads - faster traffic, dark roads, wildlife. No sidewalks or curbs and dangerous at night;
- Should we do something with our arterial roads before we rebuild others?;
- Boucherie road is most travelled road within West Kelowna. Areas vary from beautifully landscaped areas that function brilliantly to areas that are dangerous with groups of people walking down them and full of potholes. Identify some places where money should be spent - areas deserving of early considerations;
- The section between the Hatch and Quails Gate winery was scheduled as the next section of the wine trail. When is that section being redeveloped?;
- More street lights on existing roads before enhancing other roads;
- Very common to be hitting deer there and to have slightly inebriated people walking in between the wineries there and that section is a great concern for safety;

- Shannon lake no sidewalks to bus stop. Horribly unsafe with kids and people walking along the street. Strong safety concern;
- APC acknowledged that every individual neighbourhood could identify similar concerns within their neighbourhoods because they are familiar with their circumstance. But how do you identify and prioritize these roads across the whole community? Priority shouldn't be based on tragedy;
- Input to Council we have concerns on safety of arterial roads that have not yet been developed. Some priority be given to arterial road development or we find some interim solutions, like hanging lights off of hydro poles to alleviate safety concerns;
- However, we don't want the city to spend money to put in lighting along a roadway that is going to be torn up and redone later;
- Improve safety of pedestrians and travel in general along arterial roads;
- Traffic is becoming more as developments happen;
- Interesting dynamic between Westbank First Nation and City of West Kelowna land. Like to encourage integration of planning between those communities. Walking or cycling along a nice area and suddenly you're left walking in the road;
- Need to have more coordination between Westbank First Nation and City of West Kelowna to reduce the perception of changing standards;
- Is there an opportunity to do what Westbank First Nation has done: One side of the road has light standards and sidewalks. Could we do the same for our roads which don't need to be fully rebuilt to save on costs;
- If some businesses would achieve a major benefit from improving these facilities (sidewalks and streetlights), would they undertake a levy to see it done faster?
 - Opportunities if certain businesses would like to or not;
 - In the past, on Shamrock Drive it came to residents to put in streetlighting. It was deemed as decorative and non essential and paid for by the community;
 - In Casa Loma the City came to the residents with a cost to each resident for sidewalks and streetlights which was turned down;
 - However, you can establish projects through Local Area Service (LAS) levy for individual areas if the area supports it;

Discussion tabled until next meeting to finalize a proposed motion.

11. ADJOURNMENT OF THE MEETING

The meeting adjourned at 11:02 a.m.

CHAIR

RECORDING SECRETARY