

THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF VERNON

**MINUTES OF A COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE MEETING  
HELD FRIDAY, JULY 16, 2008**

---

PRESENT: Mayor Wayne Lippert

Councillors B. Beardsell, B. Baumbrough, P. Cochrane  
(J. Cunningham, P. Nicol, J. Gilroy, absent)

Staff: L. Gous, CAO  
K. Flick, Long Range Planner  
L. Holowachuk, Transportation Engineer  
B. Marshall, Environmental Planner  
P. Bridal, Corporate Officer  
S. Blakely, Deputy Corporate Officer  
T. Martens, Acting Finance Manager  
E. Stranks, Acting Municipal Engineer (10:52 am)

Others: Members of the public

**CALL TO ORDER** Mayor Wayne Lippert called the meeting to order at 9:03 am

**AGENDA ADOPTION** Moved by Councillor Cochrane, seconded by Councillor Baumbrough:

THAT the Agenda for the July 16<sup>th</sup>, 2008, Special Committee of the Whole meeting be adopted.

**CARRIED.**

**NEW BUSINESS**

**COUNCIL WORKSHOP –  
REVIEW OF 2008  
OFFICIAL COMMUNITY  
PLAN** Council directed questions and comments to staff regarding the proposed 2008 Official Community Plan. The following issues were discussed and input provided:

- 'Hospital Hill' & West - desired use (mixed/med. density)
- Mapping – difficult to interpret colours
- Other side of 'Hospital Hill' to 34<sup>th</sup> difficult to determine what uses should be permitted - should be higher density without one or two small lot areas bordering 34<sup>th</sup>
- Central core area should be higher density reaching all the way up to Seaton School
- No need for delineation of two areas, as flexibility needed between 2 approaches, so either one is an option.
- Underlying factor is higher density.
- 'Hospital Hill' West – if you only do from 32nd St to 33 St. you won't have enough land base for higher density.
- McMechan Reservoir is a city resource providing a unique opportunity for higher density in a new area

- **Staff Response** – ‘cluster’ approach to development is being used throughout City of Vernon. Hesperia is a ‘master plan’ development – broad range of uses in large area – not the same as reservoir lands
- Neighbourhood Districts – Polson – Does that area justify a separate neighbourhood district? Suggests extend City Centre District to include.
- **Staff Response** – lines drawn to accommodate commercial core and areas for redevelopment. Polson Neighbourhood Centre is considered somewhat different than that. Believes there is some residential role in that area due to excellent proximities and views.
- ‘to do’ list is massive and may not be realistic – needs to be prioritized and timeframe attached for each item.
- Unclear where we stand on Neighbourhood Plans and where do they fall in priority list
- Few white areas on map – not for development – why are we showing them that way? (Bench Road & The Rise example).
- **Staff Response** – 2001 OCP designation kept, explained not really isolated – just agricultural which may be surrounded by ALR or DND
- Neighbourhood Plans – City Centre is number one priority. Neighbourhood Centers are next priority.
- Status of Neighbourhood Plans discussed.
- Key guiding principle – ‘Ensure Development Pays for Itself’ needs to be more elaborate and detailed.
- Priority list should perhaps assign responsibilities (ie. specified area, developers, etc)
- Is it clear in the OCP that if an application received to coincide with the OCP – may not be granted due to infrastructure development (ie. priorities for development list)?
- **Staff Response** – Neighbourhood Plans provide certainty and instructions to developers and property owners as to what the COV is willing to entertain, although it is ultimately Council’s decision for approval. ‘Leap Frog’ development is not encouraged, and should be noted in the document. Neighbourhood Planning process is driven by the COV and developers would cover costs for this
- Needs clarity in OCP regarding timing for future development with priorities assigned
- **Staff Response** – OCP does discuss future development, phased approach is very sound management practice which is market driven.
- Sustainability check list – is there a way to incorporate concerns regarding ‘leap frog’ development into this?
- **Staff Response** – This is actually one of the key ways which it could be addressed.

- Are all Neighbourhood Centers Development Permit areas? Is this process going to be onerous on staff and property owners?
- **Staff Response** - commercial developments already need Development Permits, and there is intention to streamline process – one permit per development (1-2 years)
- 'Easthill Conservation Area' didn't get Council support years ago, as the residents didn't want complicated processes, aren't Neighbourhood Centers similar to 'Conservation Areas'.
- **Staff Response** - staff shares concerns – commercial, mixed use or multi family will require development permits, but single and two family dwellings are exempted.
- Should have this spelled out in the document – 'partnership' reference too vague.
- **Staff Response** - Definition of densities – not an expectation that maximum would be achieved in every area. Text will be clarified.
- Map – referral – Paraiso Point Area – called hillside residential with north identified as – residential low density. No comparison to Zoning Bylaw – does it match? Are they coordinated?
- **Staff Response** - northern section need to be checked for slope. Paraiso Point already has zoning to accommodate (C10 – limited to camping) would be 'out of sync' with OCP and may take years to correct use.
- Annexation policy – should jump ahead, and say COV is not going to look at any more annexations, until policy is reviewed.
- **Staff Response** – When OCP is adopted, new policy will supercede once in place.
- TDM concerns – doesn't believe plan will work. Commercial Property Owners won't 'buy in'.
- Should have paid parking on private lots, if no more free parking, citizens would implement change
- Strategy is to get the roads reach capacity and public will then change habits and this won't happen for long time.
- BC Transit presentation – indicated that improved routing and new buses, introduced in January, resulted in ridership increase of 11% - indicative how investment can work.
- **Staff Response** – TDM – works on 'basket of carrots and sticks' philosophy by providing alternatives, and allowing congestion and costs to increase. Combination leads to different choices. Aggressive TDM is needed in order to be successful – huge investment required (carrots) – parking fee increases rolled out on a strategic basis. Determination and effort is needed to achieve goals.
- Agricultural 'land exchange' proposal reviewed in conjunction with the practicality, due to lack of control of lands in the Regional District.

- **Staff Response** - Correct no control – hopefully this can be addressed in the Regional Growth Strategy. Principal is to ensure that Agricultural lands are available for food production.
- The Rise noted for their use of reclaimed water.
- Queried as to the tremendous potential for use of reclaimed water and increased agricultural use.
- Discussion regarding which has more priority eco systems preservation (grasslands), or agricultural use? OCP should clarify
- Reclaimed water on Bella Vista side through The Rise – does staff see opportunities for expanded agricultural use on these lands?
- Study being done at Summerland to use reclaimed water for food products as it is currently only used on crop products
- With the 'No net loss' philosophy, whose responsibility would it be to find the other property?
- **Staff Response** – The property owner or the Developer.
- Would an Agricultural Committee assist with this through mapping/information?
- **Staff Response** – This is something that could be done through an Agricultural Area Plan
- What does the Agricultural Land Commission think of this plan?
- **Staff Response** - formal comments have not been received at this point.
- Agricultural - page 67. Section 12.11 - What does 'resource protection' mean?
- **Staff Response** – Agricultural and grasslands conservation can be compatible. Grazing is part of the ecosystem and can be managed. Use of reclaimed water on grasslands not part of natural ecosystem – study needs doing and areas defined.
- Public should be advised to use reclaimed for expanded agricultural use as it would be better to do exchange for agricultural land inside COV limits.
- **Staff Response** – no plan for aggressive pursuit of agricultural lands but this can be included, if Council chooses. Soil quality and desire of owner to pursue could be explored.
- DCC's lowest for downtown core discussed
- How are you going to work the existing DCC fund when different areas exist?
- **Staff Response** – reviewed process. Restructure of DCC's is a huge task, and all will have to be reviewed and allocated, and come up with new formulas.
- Suggests consultant should be hired to get moving on this project.
- Staff reviewed issues / problems related to DCC restructure
- Easthill showing every street with new sidewalks. Not major pedestrian collectors – not needed and destroys greenspace?

- **Staff Response** - principal is to allow residents easy access to City Centre and Neighbourhood Plans. Easthill shows deficiency in sidewalks. Neighbourhood consultation process will be held to determine desire
- Densification in area bordered by 27<sup>th</sup> Street beside downtown core – needs more goals for this area (Civic Arena area – park)
- Residents in densified area should all have to pay percentage to the green area that will service it (Civic Arena park) Specified Area could be developed.
- **Staff Response** - Northern City Centre – goals will be spelled out more clearly. Civic Centre block is identified for parkland. Creating a specified area requiring a surrounding area to pay for, could present future problems. Implications will need to be explored.
- Developers should have to pay for parkland due to increased density allowance – definition ‘ensure development pays for itself’ should cover this.
- **Staff Response** - need to create incentives for redevelopment to encourage desired direction.
- Eastside property owners have been in contact to suggest that ‘promises were made’ relating to services through their properties - comments?
- **Staff Response** - infrastructure must be built to meet full ‘build out’ in OCP – not a promise – just logical infrastructure planning – assumptions may be made by some regarding development approvals. Potential created but development processes must be followed.
- Section 6 #12 Local Convenience Retail outlets - that still means rezoning process required?
- **Staff Response** – yes.
- Properties along OK Landing Road – between Marshall Fields and Tronson currently zoned ‘Airport Industrial’, yet separated from airport by the creek – latecomer class. Should change all to residential?
- **Staff Response** - property owners approached staff during planning. Residents wanted changed zoning, and they will speak at Public Hearing regarding this issue.
- Eastside Road – Mr. Mike Davies, Beverly Hills Estates – preplanning showed as future growth area – thoughts?
- **Staff Response** - staff have met with Mr. Davies and he will speak at the Public Hearing. Access is an issue.

**CLOSE**

Mayor Wayne Lippert closed the meeting at 11:23 am.

**CERTIFIED CORRECT:**

---

Mayor:

---

City Clerk: