



**CITY OF WEST KELOWNA**  
**MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

Wednesday, February 17, 2021  
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: Jayden Riley, Planner II  
Hailey Rilkoﬀ, Planner II  
Stirling Scory, Long Range Planner  
Brent Magnan, Planning Manager  
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 9:29 a.m.

In accordance with the most recent Provincial Health Officer Order regarding gatherings and events, the public was not permitted to attend the Advisory Planning Commission meeting in-person. As an open meeting, it was webcast live and is archived on the City's website.

**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 January 20, 2021 in the City of West Kelowna Council Chambers**

It was moved and seconded

**THAT** the minutes of the Advisory Planning Commission meeting held January 20, 2021 in the City of West Kelowna Council Chambers be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**5. PRESENTATIONS**

**6. DELEGATIONS**

**7. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**8. REFERRALS**

**8.1 P20-01, West Kelowna Community Vision (Final DRAFT Vision)**

Highlights of the presentation include:

- The Community Vision is a 2020-2022 Strategic Priority of Council;
- Shifted to online engagement due to COVID-19;
- Round 1 engagement: June 15 - September 21;
- Round 2 engagement: November 10 - January 6;
- Visioning process is the first step in the OCP update - big ideas for the future;
- Round 2 feedback - "Did we hear it right?" online feedback forms (30 minute, 5 minute and virtual community circles collaboration and youth);
- Round 2 outreach: posters, handouts to local businesses, print copies of questionnaires;

- Community Vision Participation - received 2,157 feedback forms and comments;
- Majority of Round 2 participants include:
  - Full time West Kelowna residents;
  - New or lived here over 21 years residents;
  - Youth age group;
- Final Draft includes: 5 foundations, shortened #OURWK overview and 23 key directions;
- Thanked APC members for contributing to the process with participation in workshops and comments in online feedback forms.

Highlights of the discussion include:

- Draft Vision is well done;
- Large volume of information;
- Is there a possibility of a shortened version? Not part of our plan for a summary document. Draft vision is a high level overview of areas of focus. Draft will be uploaded to our website;
- Information may be less overwhelming once it is accessible online;
- Our five foundations chart page was a great overview page;
- Suggestion to replace 'Our Places' page picture;
- Was there 2 or 3 major themes that came out of this vision? 2-5 major areas of focus, reflective of community discussions. Key focus areas are Active Transportation, Westbank Centre and Waterfront.

It was moved and seconded

**THAT** the Advisory Planning Commission supports adoption of the Community Vision Final Draft.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

## **8.2 Z 20-11, Zoning Amendment, 2416 Saddleback Way**

Highlights of the presentation include:

*Applicants Keith Funk, Neil Braun and Jessie Alexander, joined the meeting via. Teams*

### Zoning

- R3 - Low Density Multiple Residential Zone;
- Site Specific Text Amendment already in place to permit Apartments within R3 zone;

### Subject Property

- Located in Shannon Lake Neighbourhood;
- Near transfer station on Asquith Road;
- 3.6 acres;
- Currently vacant;
- BC Hydro Transmission Lines along north property;

### Background

- Broadview Neighbourhood Plan - envisioned Low Density multiple family;
- Rezoned in 2004 from RU2 to R3A under Bylaw No. 871 as Multiple Housing Low Density;
- Previous R3A Zone permitted apartments with a maximum density of 30 units/ha and maximum height of 12.0 m or 3 storeys;
- Current R3 Zone does not permit Apartment Use in new Zoning Bylaw No. 154;
- Site specific text amendment to six R3 properties to permit Apartments:
  - Rationale for 2416 Saddleback Way:
    - Site is located at entrance to a neighbourhood (vs. embedded within);
    - Fronts a local road but is close to an urban collector road (120m from Asquith);

### Proposal

- Zoning Amendment to permit Congregate Housing use on the property;
  - Residential hotel setting with options for meals, housekeeping and laundry;
  - Fully independent units with bistro, dining room, lounges and fitness facilities;
  - Seniors Congregate Housing development;
  - If approved by Council, subsequent development permit would be obtained;

#### Policy & Bylaw Review

##### *Official Community Plan*

- In the Neighbourhood Growth Management Designation;
- Land Use Designation: Low Density Multiple Family;
- Residential objectives:
  - Ensure housing is appropriate and sensitive to the surrounding uses and surrounding form and character of the area;
  - Encourage sensitive integration of different housing forms in residential growth areas;
- Residential policies:
  - Low density multiple family developments in residential neighbourhoods to be ground oriented;
  - Utilize pedestrian scale, massing, form and detailing;
  - Consider ground oriented residential forms;

##### *Zoning Bylaw*

- R3 Zone permits Care Facility use in Townhouse or Duplex form;
- Proposed use Congregate Housing in Apartment form - independent living units with some supportive services such as: laundry, meals, shuttles;

- Congregate Housing is permitted within the following zones: Westbank Centre Multiple Residential Zone (R5), Urban Centre Commercial (C1), Institutional and Assembly (P2);

#### Technical Review

##### *Traffic*

- Congregate care has lower trip generation than Apartments;
- Planned improvements to Shannon Lake Road identified;
- Recommended for developer to contribute 7% of the cost for the northbound Shannon Lake Road left-turn lane;

##### *Transit*

- Currently route 28 Shannon Lake;
- Recommended for developer to construct landing and sidewalk and illuminated crossing on Asquith Road;

##### *Servicing*

- Frontage improvements are not anticipated;
- Property can be serviced by existing services;

#### Key Considerations

- Council has permitted apartment use on this property through a Site Specific Text Amendment (Bylaw No. 871 to Bylaw No. 154);
- Site retained Low Density Multiple Family future land use designation;
- Current Zones that permit Congregate Housing (R5, C1, P2) envision this use in an urban or neighbourhood centre.

#### Highlights of the discussion include:

- Application allowed for 3 stories is applicant seeking height variance? Currently looking at Site Specific Zoning Amendment for congregate use, in future stages a height variance may be addressed;
- How many R3s have tried for apartments, any approved for congregate? At the time of transition to Zoning Bylaw 0154 in 2014, a number of properties zoning was reconsidered. 6 R3 sites did receive a Site Specific Text Amendment for apartment use;

- Why are they building outside of the 3 permitted zones? Proposal is independent living style residential development without medical care. There will be a shuttle or they could drive to town for city centre services;
- Will the property be only senior residential housing and not hotel/motel use? Applicant is not proposing a hotel. It is proposed as long term residential units. Congregate housing use does not permit short term stays;
- Concern with lack of parking. Planners response: At the development permit stage the technical review will ensure parking requirements are met or if a variance is required;
- Distance to a local elementary school? Close to Shannon Lake Elementary;
- Suggestion to restrict this congregate housing proposal to Seniors residents;
- Could it be a transitional home? Group home permitted in this zone in townhouse or duplex form. Care facilities and group homes would require a license. Congregate housing does not require a license and could be a private facility;
- Would this amendment exclude group home? Zoning amendment would not remove any existing permitted uses, it would add the use of congregate housing in apartment form;
- Question for applicant - Any research on the benefit of congregate housing being away from city centre? Applicant, Keith Funk responded: Extensive research completed. Existing need for advance seniors housing units for this use. Allows seniors to age in the community they lived in while still being close to family. Adjacent to primary road system and transit - shuttle service will be offered. The proposal is strictly for senior care.
- Proposal is a benefit to the community;
- Not all retirement housing needs to be in the Westbank Centre;
- Research has been done that there is a demand for this type of housing;
- Designed for people who are mobile;

- Sensitivities to traffic impacts - lesser number of traffic than apartment, spread throughout the day;
- Nice for independent seniors to have options for where they live;
- Concern of future height variance for the neighbourhood.

It was moved and seconded

**THAT** the APC support Z 20-11, Zoning Amendment, 2416 Saddleback Way with consideration for covenant that would restrict occupancy to seniors.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

### **8.3 Z 21-01, Rezoning Application, 2377 Thacker Drive**

Highlights of the presentation include:

- Subject property in Lakeview Heights neighbourhood;
- Flat upper portion adjacent to Thacker Drive and Bridgeview Road;
- Existing single family home and agricultural worker dwelling;
- Proposal: rezone a portion of the property RU4 to R1 to accommodate 10 lot single family subdivision;

Background

- Similar application submit in 2018 (File Z18-08) was withdrawn;
- 2021 revisions include:
  - Reduce R1 area;
  - Reduce number of proposed lots (17 to 10);
  - no development, rezoning proposed for the lower portion of the property;
- Previous application identified servicing upgrades, frontage improvements, pedestrian pathway construction, wildfire mitigation, etc. that will carry forward with current application;

*Official Community Plan*

- Split land use designation - Single Family Residential (upper) and Steep Slope (lower);



### *Zoning Bylaw*

- Current parcel zoned Rural Residential Large Parcel (RU4);

### *Technical*

- Applicant has provided:
  - Functional Servicing Report;
  - Geotechnical Report;
  - Wildfire Hazard Assessment Report;
  - Environmental Assessment Report;
- Conditions and recommendations will be established through rezoning at third reading;

### *Referrals*

- Referred to various external agencies and internal departments;
- No issues identified;
- Fire department noted fuel reduction for wildfire mitigation which will be addressed later in the application process;
- Notice of application signage has been installed on the property;

### *Key Considerations*

- Proposed R1 Zone is consistent with existing Single Family Residential land use designation;
- Should Council give first and second reading, a Public Hearing will be scheduled;
- Future conditions for geotechnical, wildfire, environmental, servicing and frontage improvements may be applied at time of third reading of the amendment bylaw.

### *Highlights of the discussion include:*

- Concern with future storm water management and impact for neighbourhood below;
- Lower portion incredibly steep and unusable;

- Development and Building permits will address storm water concerns later in the application;
- Why split land use designation? Steep slope area is not suitable for single family residential. Land use designations do not need parcel boundaries. Steep slope is not suitable for Single Family Residential therefore limited to upper portion on this property;
- Signage installed on property, has there been any public input received to date? Received a few inquiries regarding submitting feedback through Public Hearing;
- Why has the applicant chosen to leave the bottom portion as RU4? Council and staff were not supportive of lower portion on the previous application regarding steepness and access. New application is addressing concerns that were previously not supported.
- Rezoning application fits the design of the neighbourhood.

It was moved and seconded

**THAT** the APC support the Rezoning Application for 2377 Thacker Drive.

CARRIED; J. Gluska opposed

## **9. CORRESPONDENCE AND INFORMATION ITEMS**

### **9.1 A 20-02, Decision Letter, 3536 Paynter Road**

## **10. OTHER BUSINESS**

## **11. ADJOURNMENT OF THE MEETING**

The meeting adjourned at 10:50 a.m.

---

CHAIR

---

RECORDING SECRETARY