



CITY OF WEST KELOWNA
MINUTES OF THE AGRICULTURAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Thursday, October 1, 2020
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
2760 CAMERON ROAD, WEST KELOWNA, BC

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jan Bath, Chair
Colin Cruickshank
Sheri Paynter

MEMBER ABSENT: Serina Penner, Vice Chair
Graham Pierce

Staff Present: Chris Oliver, Planner III
Stirling Scory, Planner II - Long Range
Natasha Patricelli, Recording Secretary
Brandon Mayne, Service Desk Technician

1. CALL THE AGRICULTURAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 5:01 p.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 Agricultural Advisory Committee meeting held August 6, 2020 in the City of West Kelowna Council Chambers

THAT the minutes of the Agricultural Advisory Committee meeting held August 6, 2020 in the City of West Kelowna Council Chambers be adopted.

- 5. **PRESENTATIONS**
- 6. **DELEGATIONS**
- 7. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**
- 8. **REFERRALS**

8.1 Community Visioning Update

Highlights of the presentation include:

- Phase 1 launched June 16 and ended September 21;
- Various questionnaires, stakeholder meetings and workshops;
- The main visioning questionnaire received over 1,400 people which was the most amount of engagement to date for a questionnaire;
- We received approximately 469 participant responses on our 8 smaller weekly topic questionnaires;
- In total we received just under 1900 responses on our questionnaires;
- People heard about the project and ways to get involved through word of mouth and social media;
- Consultants are compiling everything we've heard into a summary for Mayor and Council then there will be a report for AAC;
- The timeline for Phase 2 will be October to December and focus on building the community vision;
- A completed vision should be ready for Council in February;
- Looking for more help from our AAC members and community leaders to spread the word and increase engagement;
- Appreciate AAC members for participating in our online workshops and questionnaires.

Questions on presentation:

- Have you aggregated the responses yet? Main questionnaire has over 4,500 comments. Consultants are working on analyzing data, and it should be ready for October.

8.2 Z 20-04, Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 100.61 and Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 154.94 (Goats Peak)

Highlights of the presentation include:

- Located along Highway 97 S (no municipal address);

- 65 ha (161 acres);
- Only considering a portion of the property;
- Within the Goats Peak CDP Area;
- Not within the ALR;
- Surrounding Land Uses:
 - North - Agricultural and Rural Residential;
 - East - Rural Residential (vacant, future CDP lands);
 - West - Rural Resource (vacant, future CDP lands), and I4 - Timber Processing;
 - South - Goats Peak Regional Park (currently Rural Resource);

Background - Goats Peak CDP

- Adopted February 14th, 2017;
- Block C was anticipated as the first phase;
- Designated Single Family Residential, Low Density Multiple Family and Parks and Natural Areas;
- Propose amendment to shift these areas;
- Development areas are still focused on historically disturbed areas of the site;
- Proposal to rezone properties from Rural Resource Zone (RU5); and Rural Residential Large Parcel Zone (RU4), to Single Family Residential Zone (R1); Low Density Multiple Residential Zone (R3); and Parks and Open Space (P1);

Official Community Plan

- Single Family Residential designation:
 - Supports traditional single family housing opportunities;
 - Encourages efficient compact housing forms for families;
- Low Density Residential designation:
 - Provides a broader range of housing in area served by transit and in walking distance to community amenities, shops and services;
 - Ground-oriented townhouses consistent with polices for low density multiple family in residential neighbourhoods;

Technical Review - Access

- Access from Gellatly Road through adjacent parcel (previous ALC approval);
- Traffic Impact Assessment has been updated and is being reviewed;
- An off-site improvement related to sidewalk connectivity will likely be discussed with the applicant;

Technical Review - Agricultural Buffer

- 15m planted agricultural buffer and 15m setback for structures;
- Ministry of Agriculture and RDCO have requested an Agriculture Buffer plan;
- May be impacted due to the revised road layout;

Key Considerations

- Residential policies encourage the sensitive integration of different housing forms in all residential growth areas in support of neighbourhood diversity and healthy communities;
- The proposed application is generally consistent with the land uses that were as part of the Goats Peak CDP process;
- The development of Block C is focused in a historically disturbed area of the site;
- The future development permit process will address hillside and environmental mitigation, as well as form and character for any proposed townhouse units;
- The proposal includes buffering from adjacent agricultural lands.

Questions on the presentation include:

- Do they still require a fence and tall trees along the road way? Currently a 15m buffer setback, if reduced to 9m then planted vegetation as well as a screen would be required. For this application, they have included a 15m setback and 15m planted agricultural buffer which is above what we would normally see.
- Especially with a cherry orchard and vineyard, weekly spraying is going to happen and there is the concern of theft. It would be an expense for the cherry orchard to put up a fence.
- It is a considerable difference for the person farming to be beside a rural residential lot vs a multi family.

- Typical expectation of the developer for the buffer. It is intended to have trail connections, potential to have emergency access, some deer fencing already in existence.
- Deer fencing may be something for the developer to consider along the walking paths to avoid theft in the neighbouring cherry orchard.
- Amount of people walking through the area and the spray being used in the cherry orchard should be considered.
- Putting up a buffer could sometimes hurt a farm (air catch pocket). RDCO and Ministry of Agriculture expressed that a buffer plan would be warranted.
- Maybe they should talk to the farmer to ensure it's the right thing for the agriculture beside the development as well.
- Requirement for buffer relating with roadways and lot layout comes with development permit not Zoning and OCP application? Typical scenario, rezoning process of a single family lot, condition of third reading a agriculture protection covenant to include things such as a buffering plan and planting requirements.
- Application is already exceeding the buffer requirements.
- It will be interesting to see if the road ends up being on the other side of the buffer and if the driveway frontage is on the roadways. Those details will be sorted out by the development permit.

It was moved and seconded

THAT the AAC support the application as presented with consideration given to consultation of appropriate buffers between the residential community and the agricultural operations.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. CORRESPONDENCE AND INFORMATION ITEMS

10. OTHER BUSINESS

11. ADJOURNMENT OF THE MEETING

The meeting adjourned at 5:31 p.m.

CHAIR

RECORDING SECRETARY