

**Planning Advisory Committee Meeting**  
Tuesday, February 20, 2024  
1450 KLO Road - Regional District of Central Okanagan  
(Woodhaven Boardroom)

Committee in Attendance:

B. Hayden  
D. Chatterson  
D. Kyle  
J. Fehr  
R. Whittingstall  
R. Von Andrian

Committee Absent:

V. Muir (arrived late, did not vote)

Staff in Attendance:

S. O'Dea, Senior Planner  
J. Maximuik (recording)  
C. Fleischmann, Deputy Corporate Officer  
S. Horning, Deputy Corporate Officer

Guest in Attendance:

C. MacPherson (Z23/04) (online)  
M. Kellerman, W. Tullis (Z23/07)  
M. Kenchington / G. Tebbutt (Z23/05 & Z23/06)

**1. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 5:33 pm.

**Land Acknowledgement**

The RDCO acknowledges our presence on the traditional, ancestral, and unceded  $\text{tr}\acute{\text{x}}\text{w}\acute{\text{u}}\text{l}\text{a}\text{?}\text{x}\text{w}$  (land) of the syilx / Okanagan people who have resided here since time immemorial. We recognize, honour, and respect the syilx / Okanagan lands upon which we live, work, and play.

**2. Inaugural Meeting**

- a. Election of Chair and Vice Chair

KYLE / VON ANDRIAN

THAT B. Hayden be nominated and elected as Chair.

CARRIED

HAYDEN / VON ANDRIAN

THAT D. Kyle be nominated elected as Vice-Chair.

CARRIED

- b. Meeting Schedule

FEHR / CHATTERSON

THAT the following dates of May 28, Aug. 27 and Nov. 5 be approved recognizing additional meetings may be scheduled as needed.

CARRIED

**3. Referrals**

- a. Z23/07 – 4440 Maxwell Road

To allow an increase to the maximum allowable square footage for an accessory home.

Staff provided an overview of the application. Referral comments were reviewed.

Discussion:

- What is the definition of an accessory home? Staff noted an accessory home is a second dwelling on a property, whichever is the smallest of the two.
- If the basement was not finished, would it meet the requirements? Staff noted that is correct further noting the covenant requirement that it be used for a caretaker.
- Discussion occurred regarding septic being undersized. The owner indicated that it has been remedied and the covenant has been registered.
- Is there a well for each residence? Owner indicated that is correct.

KYLE / FEHR

THAT the Committee supports the application as presented.

CARRIED

- b. Z23/04 – 5932 Old Vernon Road  
To allow a petting zoo on the subject property.

Staff provided an overview of the application. Referral comments were reviewed.

Discussion:

- Discussion occurred regarding the designated parking area being close to capacity. Have there been any complaints from the public? Staff advised that no complaints have been received.
- Has there been any change in support/opposition from the Regional Board? Staff noted that there was one member who had initially been opposed to the use, but having since visited the operation, has no concerns.
- Concerns regarding connection to highway. Staff noted the applicant identified that there had been an incident at this intersection, but that it was determined there was no correlation between incident and use of the farm. The applicant has provided signage directing Kelowna-bound traffic to the right when existing the petting zoo to minimize patrons turning left at Old Vernon Rd / Highway 97 intersection.

KYLE / VON ANDRIAN

THAT the Committee supports the application subject to the conditions that there be a mechanism in place to maintain spatial use and conditions as outlined in the Temporary Use Permit.

CARRIED

- c. Z23/05 & Z23/06 – Alpine and Firwood Roads  
To permit OCP and zoning amendments to allow for future subdivision.

Staff provided an overview of the application. Referral comments were reviewed.

Discussion:

- What is the maximum allowable lots under the current zoning? The 58ha property to the north has RU1 zoning which has a 30ha minimum lot size, so multiple parcels could not be created. The 36ha lot to the south has P1 zoning which is flexible in terms of minimum lot size, however residential subdivision would not be permitted under the current zone. Staff noted the current zoning would allow a principal dwelling, and two accessory homes.
- Discussion occurred regarding access and potential for an additional access for emergency egress. Informal access through provincial park already exists. Would BC Parks allow this? The applicant noted the access already exists however it has not

been fully explored at this time but noted that the preliminary review by Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure did not identify any concerns.

- Is there any obligation on RDCO to develop and maintain the park? Staff noted that RDCO parks have not identified any acquisition interests in the area and the have commented that despite the dedication of land, the associated operational cost of maintaining a park in that location may be an issue.
- Discussion occurred regarding other developments and lots in the area remain undeveloped.
- Is this proposal in alignment with RDCO growth policies? Staff noted policy directives identified in RGS, OCPs, and GHG emission targets and protecting environmental assets are not in alignment with the proposal.
- The committee requested clarification on the archaeological review process. Staff advised that the applicant had commissioned an overview assessment which had identified areas of potential archaeological significant. Whilst the subdivision layout had been configured to avoid residential development in these areas, a full review of archeological considerations and obligations under the Heritage Conservation Act will form part of the subdivision review process administered by the Ministry of Transportation.
- The agent noted that preliminary discussions with the Electoral Area Director, Director of Development Services and Manager of Development services regarding the proposal to discuss community water, site conditions, having engaged a consultant for wildfire mitigation and archaeological aspects, he left feeling encouraged he was going in the right direction. The agent further noted that after meeting with regional director, was very affirmative wanting to see a school site.
- Discussion regarding fire protection and design proposals. Staff noted the proposal will require a Development Permit review, potential restrictive covenants and design guidelines in accordance with risk, which will form part of the permit.
- Staff noted the outstanding technical components would be outlined and defined during the subdivision process, further noting the amount of detail to be provided before the proposal goes before the Regional Board to consider 1<sup>st</sup> Reading can be expensive and cost prohibitive. More detailed reports come further in the process should the proposal receive 1<sup>st</sup> Reading.
- The committee noted Interior Health Authority comments identifying there is currently no water or sewer connection, further noting key elements for a healthy built environment include considerations to reduce urban sprawl, climate impact, and wildfire interface issues.
- Discussion occurred regarding Westside Road, traffic and safety concerns.

FEHR / CHATTERSON

THAT the committee does not support that application as presented due to insufficient information regarding fire protection, transportation, and wastewater systems.

CARRIED

CHATTERSON / FEHR

Meeting adjourned at 7:15 PM.

**CERTIFIED TO BE TRUE AND CORRECT**

Original signed by \_\_\_\_\_  
B. Hayden, Chair