



CITY OF WEST KELOWNA
MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

Wednesday, October 21, 2020
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
2760 CAMERON ROAD, WEST KELOWNA, BC

MEMBERS PRESENT: Wayne Kubasek, Chair
Julian Davis
Joe Gluska
Bea Kline
Nicole Richard
Katalin Zsufa

MEMBER ABSENT: Anthony Bastiaanssen, Vice Chair

Staff Present: Carla Eaton, Planner III
Natasha Patricelli, Recording Secretary
Taylor Mellen, Service Desk Technician

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 Advisory Planning Commission meeting held September 23, 2020 in the City of West Kelowna Council Chambers

It was moved and seconded

THAT the minutes of the Advisory Planning Commission meeting held September 23, 2020 in the City of West Kelowna Council Chambers be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. PRESENTATIONS

6. DELEGATIONS

7. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

8. REFERRALS

8.1 Z 20-06, OCP and Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 100.60 and 154.92 (APC), Unaddressed Canyon Crest Drive

Highlights of the presentation include:

- Unaddressed Canyon Crest Drive;
- South end of Tallus Ridge neighbourhood;
- Adjacent to Shannon Lake Road;
- Not within the ALR;
- Surrounding Uses:
 - North: Compact Single Detached Residential (RC3) and Parks and Open Space (P1);
 - East: Low Density Multiple Residential (R3) and Single Detached Residential (R1);
 - South: Single Detached Residential (R1) and Agricultural (A1) - in ALR;
 - West: Compact Single Detached Residential (RC3).

Proposal - OCP Amendment

- Designated: Parks and Natural Area, Single Family Residential and Low Density Multiple Family;
- Propose to exchange the land use designation from Low Density Multiple Family to Parks and Natural Area, and from Parks and Natural Area to Low Density Multiple Family;
- To accommodate the proposed future subdivision layout, the OCP amendment will also include a very small piece of the Single Family Residential land use designation to match the new frontage on Canyon Crest Drive following Road dedication in Ph. 10 B.

Proposal - Zoning Amendment

- Zoning: Parks and Open Space (P1) and Low Density Multiple Residential (R3);
- Propose to amend a portion of the subject property to increase the R3 zone by approximately 863 m²;
- Propose to reduce the P1 zone area by the same amount to adjust the development boundary;
- Allows a single site access and reduced hillside disturbance.

Policy Considerations - *Official Community Plan*

- Residential policy encourages the sensitive integration of different housing forms in all residential growth areas in support of neighbourhood diversity and healthy communities;
- Parks and Natural Areas encourages the adequate provision of recreation opportunities and provision of trails through parks and open space;
- Corridors between sensitive ecosystems are encouraged to create interconnectedness especially for wildlife;
- Proposed amendment does not affect trails and park dedication secured through previous rezoning.

Policy and Bylaw Review

Zoning Bylaw No. 0154

- Application proposes to rezone only a portion of the subject property by swapping zoning areas:
 - Increase R3 zone by approximately 863 m²;
 - Decrease P1 zone by approximately 849 m²;
 - Amend RC3 zone to adjust for road dedication along Canyon Crest Drive 14m²;
- Conceptual lot layout is consistent with zoning regulations for proposed minimum parcel area and frontage;
- Adjusted R3 and P1 zoning boundary will allow for a single site access and reduced hillside disturbance.

Development Permit Areas - three Development Permit Areas and Form and Character

Hillside:

- Requires issuance of Hillside DP;
- Previous Hillside DP 18-05 was issued for Tallus Ridge Ph.10 and 11 subdivision, which included the proposed multiple family lot;
- A Development Permit is also required to address the Form and Character elements of the proposed low density multiple family development, and will reconfirm the site grading.

Sensitive Terrestrial Ecosystem:

- Environmental Assessment updated with recommendations regarding adjustment to the ESA protected through covenant completed with previous rezoning.

Wildfire Interface:

- Existing wildfire covenant requires wildfire mitigation efforts prior to construction, including thinning, pruning, and removal of woody debris.

Technical Review

Site Servicing: No additional off-site requirements anticipated

- Water - Site can be adequately serviced with existing infrastructure;
- Sanitary Sewer - downstream capacity is adequate as off-site upgrades were installed in previous phases;
- Stormwater - a private storm water detention facility will be provided for the townhouse development at the time of future development.

Transportation and Access

- Access through private driveway off new road Canyon Crest Drive;
- No off-site road improvements anticipated as previous development has improved frontage on Canyon Crest Drive and Shannon Lake Road.

Geotechnical

- Confirmed site is safe for use intended;
- Noted perched water seepage zones along bedrock surface;
- Additional future building recommendations for:
 - Site preparation;
 - Maximum slope;
 - Foundation design;

- Groundwater and drainage;
- Safe setbacks from crest of slope;
- Safe set forward from rock faces;
- Pavement and trench backfilling;
- Geotechnical covenant anticipated as condition of future Development Permit and subdivision process.

Environmental

- Rezoning area identified ESA-2 with low anticipated impact to ecosystem values;
- New P1 area has less historical disturbance;
- Improves buffer area to future park dedication along Shannon Lake Road;
- New R3 area has greater disturbance and weeds despite having some red-listed species;
- Additional mitigation recommended for:
 - Constructing timing;
 - Managing site equipment;
 - Controlling erosion, weed spread and site disturbance;
- Environment no disturb covenant boundary adjustments to be addresses as condition of future Development Permit and subdivision process;
- Covenant areas (in P1 zone) and will be private not dedicated.

Park Network

- Anticipate park dedication along Shannon Lake Road as condition of future subdivision of multi-family lot consistent with Tallus Ridge neighbourhood plan (covenants registered on title);
- Construction of 1.5m wide linear trails and wildfire mitigation works required prior to park dedication (as per DP 18-05).

Referral Comments

- Application referred out on September 25th;
- No concerns noted;
- Comments received from:
 - BC Hydro requires an SRW;

- BC Transit recommends sidewalks, higher densities in support of future transit service in the neighbourhood;
- FLNRORD Ecosystems Branch recommends covenant is placed over new P1 area and notes that the plant inventory of rare and at-risk species was not included in the EA;
- Fire department, Telus and Interior Health all noted their interests were unaffected.

Key Considerations

- Proposed new low density multi-family boundary has an appropriate transition to existing adjacent compact single family residential zone;
- Proposed new boundary of the P1 zone will create a larger treed buffer adjacent to Shannon Lake Road enhancing the area as a potential wildlife corridor;
- Residential policies encourage the sensitive integration of different housing forms in all residential growth areas 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 zoning boundary amendments do not alter the servicing implications for the site from those previously assessed during the original rezoning (File: Z 12-04);
- Future Development Permit process to address hillside and environmental mitigation and revised covenant protection areas, as well as form and character issues with the proposed townhouse development.

Questions on the presentation:

- 30% reduction in the park and 30% increase in townhouse development. Does the density of townhomes change and what is the maximum number of townhomes for the property? This is not changing the dedicated park but the P1 zone. Which will still be privately held as a park and open space zone. It does reduce the area by approximately 849 sq m. Large covenant area will shift. Idea is to attempt to not disturb the slope. Final covenant area will be close to existing protected covenant area. As for the density area, there is no change in the amount of townhomes. It is just a swap of areas.
- Why are there privately owned P1 lots and for what purpose? Different approaches may afford higher level of protection for different areas. For example: Development Permit area does not allow disturbance until the proposal has been reviewed. Covenants can create no build no disturb

areas, which may exempt you from a Development Permit area in some cases. Privately owned P1 zone is another level of regulation that restricts the use of the area. Parcels may also be split zoned where development may not be seen desirable on a portion of a parcel. For this property, a covenant area matched with a P1 zone is proposed to protect certain areas to enhance ESA1. Another layer of protection would be park dedication typically where strong environmental values align with park policies and meet Councils parks Acquisition Policy. The long linear proposed park dedication is consistent with park dedication throughout the Tallus Ridge neighbourhood.

- Who is required to maintain the P1 area? Privately owned piece of land. Environmental areas should be protected based on the Official Community Plan Development Permit area guidelines but it will be the developments responsibility for maintenance.
- Park would be in the area behind the structure with the X through it? The newly rezoned P1 area would be behind the storm tanks and adjacent to the existing covenant area and the Park dedication will be along Shannon Lake Road.

Highlights of the discussion:

- Recommendation for point of reference on future information for our committee. Could we be provided with the number of units from the developer and the maximum density allowed by the City so a comparison can be made? Response from Planner: when dealing with zoning amendment, the R3 zoning regulations set the maximum density permitted on the site. Zoning bylaw allows for park dedication to not affect the density allocation. Zoning exercise for calculating density is complex because the number of units is finalized. Developers to have flexibility to change the size and number of their units with the Development Permit process and the maximum FAR (Floor Area Ratio) allows. But there are constraining factors such as parking through the zoning bylaw that must be met as well as hillside considerations on this site. When there is an estimated range of units, planning will provide that information with the proposal. The lot configuration that was shown is conceptual. APC decisions should consider the regulations in the proposed zone.
- It would be helpful to have a rough number of units for a better understanding of the parameters that we're voting on. Looking for a reference point.
- Is it possible to have the math done as a reference point? Response from Planner: R3 zone attached on the report notes development regulations which identifies Maximum density of .75 FAR (Floor Area Ratio), the maximum floor area you can have for the parcel. A calculation concluded they could have 96 units based on the FAR. Absolutely no way to have that maximum density on this site due to covenant, hillside and parking

constraints. With FAR, if unit size is shifted that could increase/decrease the amount of units. Development Permit process is a Council process where they address the specifics of the site such as the number of units. The FAR is not the only constraining factor in the number of units. The APC should consider the proposed zoning regulation rather than the number of units on the proposed form of the buildings.

- The above information would have been helpful in key considerations.
- Would be helpful to know but such a wide ratio (1,000 sq ft townhome vs 1,800 sq ft townhome) could change the number of units.
- Residents want to know what density looks like but difficult to know that at this process.
- Also the vertical is important in the planning stage for example up to a maximum of 3 storeys.

It was moved and seconded

THAT the APC recommend support for application Z 20-06 as presented.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. CORRESPONDENCE AND INFORMATION ITEMS

9.1 File DP 20-09/TUP 20-03, Decision Letter, 3404 Sundance Drive

10. OTHER BUSINESS

10.1 Standing Item: Community Discussion Topic

Streetscaping

Highlights of the discussion include:

- Streetscaping was a discussion point some time ago in particular the Hwy 97 corridor;
- What could we as a City do with respect to creating a more aesthetic corridor?;
- Lot of requirements to get a development permit to get the landscaping;
- What is the theme that we want to coordinate as a city for the corridor?
- Before living in West Kelowna, always travelled through West Kelowna on the way to somewhere else. There is a lot more to West Kelowna than what meets the eye when you drive through Hwy 97;

- Are there ways or incentives for property owners, developers of future properties, existing business or citizens to be included in enhancing the look of this corridor?;
- WFN has increased the enjoyment of driving through;
- Great wineries that you can't see from Hwy 97;
- Banner? Do we have a slogan? We could build things around our slogan if we had one;
- Thematic approach such as Kimberley, Winthrop Washington. There is a consistency in their buildings that makes people stop and walk around, shop etc.;
- What is going to attract people besides wineries and skiing?;
- Should the City having a contest for what the theme should be to spark interest to have people contribute?;
- How have other small communities incorporated these things into their OCP?;
- What is going to attract people to stop and spend their dollars?;
- Has any discussion come up through board of trade or economic development committee in respect to themes? To have the consumer stop and spend money? Is this unique to our concerns or has it come up in other? Can't speak for Economic Development Committee. Branding has come up corporately for the City. To the extent that it's been investigated I'm not sure. Exercise of the Official Community Plan, these questions are asked of the community around the look and the feel. These go into the development permit guidelines for standards. Some of this may come out from the current Community Visioning Process.
- Lot of work on the wine trail which is amazing but a corridor to get through somewhere is something different. Having to shut down the highway to change banners and water plants is not a good idea;
- Very impressed with the guidelines set out for developments;
- We are a young city that needs time to develop and get things looking the way we want;
- Googled "Scenic routes for the Okanagan". City of West Kelowna's scenic routes was Shannon Lake road, scenery, lake, golf course;
- Another example would be in Kelowna, signs for tourists. Scenic route signs (ex. Boucherie wine trail) or golf courses along Hwy 97;

- We're not promoting our area enough;
- If the lighthouse winery building goes through great;
- Can we change our sign location for the City of West Kelowna sign? Where does West Kelowna start?;
- Should we attach our sign to the Glenrosa overpass? "Welcome to West Kelowna";
- We don't need to worry about the people that live here but the visitors;
- We need more signage to promote our area;
- Branding, themes, signage to promote/encourage people to get off the Hwy 97 to do something;
- Should there be a policy to create commonality for new businesses that there is an understanding of aesthetics for property frontages/back on Hwy 97 corridor enhancements;
- Tourism ministry in the province, federal, why do we not have in the City? Who is organizing all of those things in the municipality? There is a lot of small businesses in West Kelowna and they may be willing to pay something to advertise their business;
- Will the new City Hall building have space for the tourism office?;
- The planner responded with: we do have a Business Development Officer, John Perrott, and an Economic Development Committee who works with Tourism and Board of Trade on those particular areas for the City. For this conversation maybe they could come and do a small educational presentation for more information.
- We don't know how our thoughts would compliment what is already going on;
- The City of West Kelowna should pull together its roots and committees into a roundtable to spark ideas to potentially take the ideas forward;
- The APC was reminded to keep their mandate in mind for this particular issue. How does it relate to planning exercises? Keep a planning focus;
- Defer the discussion until we can bring back more information on the process?;
- Enhancement process to help with planning along the corridor and future zoning proposals into consideration is where the group is coming from;
- Refinements to Official Community Plan process will be reviewed at a later date;

- May be the place to provide input in the Visioning process;
- Wise for committees to be aware of the processes of the City. Programs in place and education in place for our committee and ambassadors in the community;
- Lake Oswego had a great public art program. Rezoning or Development Proposal to spend on community art may influence in some way. Suggestion to include those themes;
- Bus terminals have really improved the corridor;
- Little things over time will add up;
- Linda Lovisa West Kelowna artist was mentioned;
- Discussion be tabled until the opportunity to speak with Economic Development Committee or the visioning process.

11. ADJOURNMENT OF THE MEETING

The meeting adjourned at 10:41 a.m.

CHAIR

RECORDING SECRETARY