1. CALL TO ORDER

2. AMENDMENTS TO AGENDA

3. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

4. PRESENTATIONS AND DELEGATIONS
   A. Daffodil Month - Cancer Society Campaign
      Pam Andersen, Canadian Cancer Society (5 minutes)
   B. Biosolids Land Application at Brenda Mines
      Peter Rotheisler, Manager of Environmental Services Regional District of Central Okanagan (10 mins)
   C. Boys and Girls Club Services in Peachland - Update on Operations
      Diane Entwhistle, Manager of Operations - Okanagan Boys and Girls Club (10 mins)

5. ADOPTION OF MINUTES
   A. COTW Meeting Minutes held Tuesday, March 11, 2014

6. REPORTS / DISCUSSION
   A. Official Community Plan Amendment - Form and Character Development Permit Guidelines
      Dave Smith, SmithPlan Consulting
   B. Medical Marihuana Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 2068, 2014
      Request for Decision
   C. Affordable Housing Action Plan
      Request for Decision
      Request for Decision
   E. 2014 Financial Plan
      For Discussion
7. OTHER BUSINESS

8. ADJOURNMENT

Polly Palmer
Corporate Officer
March 21, 2014
Fact sheet: About Daffodil Month

Daffodil Month

- April is Daffodil Month, a time for Canadians to unite and fight back against cancer.
- The daffodil is a bright symbol in the Canadian Cancer Society's fight against all cancers.
- We encourage Canadians to unite in the fight against cancer by buying and wearing a daffodil pin throughout April.
- By buying a daffodil pin, you show people living with cancer they are not alone on their journey.
- Daffodils are available for donation and will be distributed across Canada in several ways this April, including:
  - volunteer street sales
  - boxes in retail outlets, including through our corporate partners
  - direct mail campaigns
  - special events
  - door-to-door canvasses
  - Canadian Cancer Society offices
- Visit cancer.ca to find out where you can buy your daffodil pin.
- Money raised during Daffodil Month supports the Society's continued efforts to prevent cancer by raising awareness and advocating for healthy public policies, funding the most promising cancer research, and offering community-based support programs and services to cancer patients, their families and caregivers.

The history of the daffodil
It all began over a cup of tea. In 1954, daffodils were used to decorate tables at a fundraising tea hosted by Lady Eaton in downtown Toronto. More than 700 women attended the event, which raised money for the Canadian Cancer Society. The bright and cheerful blooms proved to be so popular that Society volunteers realized they could raise funds and awareness by selling the flowers. The sale of fresh-cut bunches quickly became a popular annual tradition of the Society and has since blossomed into Daffodil Month.

In 2000, the Canadian Cancer Society adopted the daffodil as our official logo. For many, the vibrant springtime flower has come to symbolize brightness and hope in the fight against all cancers — of which there are more than 200 different types.
Memorandum from the desk of Director of Corporate Services

TO: Mayor & Council
DATE: March 19, 2014
RE: Land Application of Biosolids at Brenda Mines

Peter Rotheisler, Manager of Environmental Services for the Regional District of Central Okanagan (RDCO) will be providing an update at the March 25th, 2014 Committee of the Whole Meeting, on the RDCO land application of biosolids, specifically those generated from the Westside Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant, at the Brenda Mines site off Highway 97c.

A presentation was given to Council at the November 12, 2013 Committee of the Whole (COTW) Meeting. The letter of request for support that was presented to COTW at this meeting is attached for reference.

The following resolution was passed by Peachland Council at their November 12, 2013 Regular Council Meeting:

“RC-11/12/13-014 THAT Council supports in principle the land application of biosolids, specifically from the Westside Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant, at Brenda Mines subject to:

- Confirmation of Interior Health’s support
- The project being a one year pilot project; and
- Public consultation taking place prior to implementation

Unanimously Carried.”
District of Peachland  
5806 Beach Avenue  
Peachland, BC V0H 1X7  

November 5, 2013  

RE: Request for Letter of Support from District of Peachland  

The Regional District of Central Okanagan requests that the District of Peachland provide a letter of support for the land application of biosolids, specifically those generated from the Westside Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant, at the Brenda Mines. Glencore Xstrata, owner of the property, is committed to site reclamation at Brenda Mines and highly values the relationship they have built with the District of Peachland. As a result, Glencore Xstrata requires formal support from the District of Peachland prior to moving forward with the land application of biosolids at Brenda Mines. The land application of biosolids at the Brenda Mines site serves as an extremely cost effective and environmentally sustainable solution for the disposal of RDCO biosolids and provides a low cost fertilization solution to Glencore Xstrate in their effort to reclaim the site. Currently, Glencore Xstrata fertilizes the site utilizing relatively high cost aerial fertilization.

The land application of biosolids is supported as a beneficial reuse of this material by the Canadian Council of Ministers of Environment and is strictly regulated by the Provincial Organic Matter Recycling Regulation. The accompanying presentations will provide additional information about the social, environmental and financial benefits of this program and the science underpinning biosolids land application.

Sincerely,

Peter Rotheisler, M.Sc., P.Ag.  
Manager of Environmental Services
March 18, 2014

Mayor and Council
5806 Beach Avenue,
Peachland, B.C. V0H 1X7

Re: Presentation to District of Peachland Council on March 25, 2014

Dear Mayor and Council,

Thank you for providing the Okanagan Boys and Girls Clubs the opportunity to present our annual update on operations of the Peachland Boys and Girls Club at the Council meeting on March 25, 2014.

Some highlights of the Peachland Club presentation for 2014 include our move to the Historic Peachland Primary School and our growth in programs and services this year.

Thank you,

Diane Entwistle
Director of Operations
Okanagan Boys and Girls Clubs
THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF PEACHLAND

Committee of the Whole Meeting Minutes
Held Tuesday, March 11, 2014 at 9:10 a.m.
In the Council Chambers – Community Centre

PRESENT:
Mayor Fielding, Councillors Fortin, Hall, Kerbes, Moberg and Schierbeck
CAO Elsie Lemke
Corporate Officer Polly Palmer
Director of Finance Doug Pryde
Director of Operations Joe Mitchell
Director of Planning Cory Gain (part of meeting)
Director of Community Services Cheryl Wiebe
Fire Chief Dennis Craig
Members of the Public
Members of the Media

ABSENT:
Councillor Condon

CALL TO ORDER
Mayor Fielding called the meeting to order at 9:11 a.m.

AMENDMENTS TO AGENDA
Nil.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA
MOVED by Councillor Schierbeck:
COTW-11/03/14-001 THAT the agenda be approved as presented.
CARRIED.

PRESENTATIONS AND DELEGATIONS

RCMP WEST KELOWNA / KELOWNA RURAL DETACHMENT
Staff Sergeant Duncan Dixon of the West Kelowna / Kelowna Rural RCMP Detachment presented the 2013 yearly policing activity report for the District, noting that:

- figures provided reflect the statistics for the entire West Kelowna / Kelowna Rural Detachment areas to provide an overall policing picture for the unit
- there are four positions assigned to Peachland
- no anticipated increases in manpower for the coming year are planned for Peachland
- crime in the area is low; low number of calls for service
- it is anticipated that with the planned growth and development in Peachland that the detachment work will result in a corresponding increase
- the total number of calls in 2013 for Peachland areas was 994

Discussion ensued relative to:
- Impaired driving infractions in Peachland including Highway 97 through Peachland averages at two per month
- Crime rate is very low in Peachland
- 56 Motor Vehicle Accidents in total
- The vast majority of motor vehicle accidents are on highways and
intersections

- Marihuana Regulations and Laws – on April 1st the laws change and there may be an enforcement issue including the possible increase of residential grows being dismantled

MOVED by Councillor Moberg:


CARRIED.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

COTW MEETING MINUTES

It was noted that on page 8 of the COTW Meeting Minutes, under the first 'Discussion' heading, point three, the word 'budget' is to be removed for clarity, so that the point reads:

- “Next year budgeting process – combine one set of variance between actual previous year and proposed budget of current year”.

MOVED by Councillor Kerbes:

COTW-11/03/14-003 THAT the COTW Meeting minutes held Tuesday, February 25, 2014 be adopted as amended.

CARRIED.

REPORTS / DISCUSSION

ONE PEACHLAND - THE ASSOCIATION MEDIC

CAO Elsie Lemke presented a report from the facilitator, the Association Medic regarding "One Peachland", noting that:

- in February 2013, a subcommittee of Council met to discuss options to support the Peachland Economic Development Committee's (PEDC) Strategic Plan, it was then further planned that the Chamber of Commerce, PEDC and the Tourism Advisory Committee be asked to seek models that dealt effectively with duplication of effort to enhance efficiency, coordination and improving resource capacity
- when these groups had difficulty coming to consensus, Martin Salloum of the Association Medic was engaged to assist
- the One Peachland report identifies recommendations which include the formation of a new overarching organization "One Peachland"
- a strategic planning workshop is recommended for further consideration of the recommendations considered in the One Peachland report

Discussion ensued relative to:

- the need for a workshop for Council to be able to review and discuss the recommendations in the report
- Visitor Information Centre (VIC) budget
- the intention for everything to go through the overarching group before coming before Council
- TAC and PEDC would present ideas to One Peachland
- the plan creates a unified vision
- the role of Chamber of Commerce involvement in One Peachland
Comments from the gallery included:
  • One Peachland being a model of communication rather than governance

MOVED by Councillor Fortin:

COTW-11/03/14-004 THAT COTW recommends that Council receives the report entitled "One Peachland - a unified approach to business development" for information; and

THAT staff be directed to arrange for a strategic planning workshop for future consideration of the recommendations contained in the report.

CARRIED.

COMMUNITY WORKS GRANT FUND – PRIMARY SCHOOL PROJECT

CAO Elsie Lemke presented a report regarding allocating funds from the Community Works Grant Fund for expenditures required for unanticipated costs of the Peachland Historic Primary School, noting that:
  • some problems were encountered in the pursuit of cost reductions which resulted in unanticipated costs to fully complete the project
  • the HVAC system was donated and lacked important system features which needed to be purchased and the ducting required removal and replacement
  • additional issues included a smaller than expected labour pool, underground electrical service issues, and an extended project schedule

The main points made in favour of the motion were:
  • the project was contingent on getting volunteer labour and in kind services
  • the project will be in compliance of Council’s resolution of not spending more than $200,000 from taxation revenues
  • the staff report identifies reasons for the need to allocate money from the Community Works Grants Fund

The main concern raised about the motion were:
  • accountability for the delays and the cost overages

Discussion ensued relative to:
  • details of budgetary shortfalls
  • Community Works Grant Fund
  • the nature of the project that was dependant on in-kind labour, volunteers and donations
  • accountability
  • Contracting and Servicing Policy

MOVED by Councillor Schierbeck:

COTW-11/03/14-005 THAT COTW recommends that Council approves the allocation of $96,245 for energy efficiency retrofits from the Community Works Grant Fund for expenditures required for unanticipated costs of the Peachland Primary School.

CARRIED.

RECESS

The meeting recessed at 10:15 a.m.
The meeting reconvened at 10:24 a.m.

CAO Elsie Lemke presented a letter from the Regional District of Central Okanagan regarding an amendment to the Parks Service Establishment Bylaw, noting that:

- the Regional District's 2014-2018 Financial Plan must be adopted by March 28th, and requires Peachland's consent to amend their Parks Service Establishment Bylaw in order to increase the requisition level to a maximum of $0.20 per $1,000 of assessment
- the current requisition level is set at $0.16 per $1,000 of assessed value

Discussion ensued relative to:

- 25% increase being excessive, however there hasn't been an increase in many years for this service
- the costs are different for each member municipality because they are based on assessment and for services that each area participates in

MOVED by Councillor Hall:

COTW-11/03/14-006 THAT COTW recommends that Council gives consent to Regional District of Central Okanagan Parks Service Establishment Amendment Bylaw No. 1347

CARRIED.

Director of Community Service, Cheryl Wiebe presented a letter from the Rubber Ducky Race Committee, requesting gratis use of supplies from the District for the inaugural Rubber Ducky Race, noting that:

- the race is being held on Saturday, April 19, 2014 at Trepanier Creek and Trepanier Bench Park
- the gratis use request is for tables and chairs, garbage and recycling containers, barricades, display boards, and special event supplies such as thermoses, Gatorade containers, safety vests, stop signs, event in progress signs and snow fencing

Discussion ensued relative to:

- Trepanier Creek will be running fast in April
- Peachland Sportsman Association will be assisting in retrieving the ducks with nets and boats, each duck is numbered and precautions will be put in place for spectator safety
- viewing areas will be at the mouth of the creek as well as a traffic reduction along the road
- preservation of the water way for the Kokanee as well as the safety of spectators
- tables and chair use and staff time are the only costs associated with this request
COTW Meeting Minutes
March 11, 2014
Page 5

MOVED by Councillor Schierbeck:

COTW-11/03/14-007 THAT COTW recommends that Council supports the Rubber Ducky Race being organized through the Tourism Advisory Committee, by providing gratis use of the following:
- tables and chairs
- garbage and recycling containers
- barricades and snow fencing
- display boards, event in progress signs
- special event supplies - thermoses, Gatorade containers, safety vest and stop signs

CARRIED.

2014 FINANCIAL PLAN - OPERATING AND UTILITY BUDGET

The Visitor Information Centre information package showing 2013 actual budget figures and various small community Fee For Service Agreements were reviewed.

Peachland Visitor Information Centre (VIC) budget request in order to meet the demands for service:
- 2014 - $77,434.20
- 2015 - $78,982.88
- 2016 - $80,562.54
- 2017 - $82,173.79
- 2018 - $83,817.27

Discussion ensued relative to:
- would like to see the building operated for one year prior to approving future budgets
- increased traffic through the VIC in the summer
- meeting the demands for service
- the model of business license fees being allocated to the Chamber of Commerce and VIC, this funding model would make it mandatory for all Peachland businesses to take out a Chamber of Commerce membership with their business license
- $46,000 is the current budget for the Chamber of Commerce/VIC through the Fee for Service Agreement
- Hours of operation of the VIC Centre and the possibility of closing the VIC during the winter months
- 2013 Business License revenue was approximately $30,457
- opportunity to restructure the fee for service to include the Business License model in the upcoming year
- separation of Chamber of Commerce and VIC

MOVED by Councillor Schierbeck:

COTW-11/03/14-008 THAT COTW recommends that Council increase the Chamber of Commerce Fee for Service by the cost of living percentage.

DEFEATED.
Councillor Fortin OPPOSED.
Councillor Kerbes OPPOSED.
Councillor Hall OPPOSED.
Councillor Moberg OPPOSED.
MOVED by Councillor Moberg:

COTW-11/03/14-009 THAT COTW recommends that Council approves that the Chamber of Commerce Fee for Service be maintained at $46,000 for 2014, and revisited during the 2015 budget process.

CARRIED.

Operations Budget discussions continued as follows:

Fleet Management Program Benefits:
- 15% fuel savings
- safety features - assisting employees who are often out of cell phone range
- risk management – investigating claims is expensive, the District’s deductible is $10,000 per incident
- with the fleet management system it can prove due diligence and we can see if we have met our policy obligations
- customer service – Operations Clerk can see where snow trucks are located in the District and let residents know when their road will have snow removal
- crew efficiencies

Discussion:
- developing a policy on surveillance
- the program sends immediate information to the Operations Clerk and an email notification to supervisors if something went wrong with a vehicle such as motor fails or if an air bag deploys
- the pricing of the program for municipalities regardless of size
- attaching the GPS device to the District’s snowmobile
- reporting after one year to understand the effectiveness of the program, cost savings and employee feedback

Councillor Hall left the meeting at 11:31 am

Ponderosa Drive Pedestrian Safety Improvements:
- As part of the Ponderosa Pincushion Development, some road upgrades are necessary to accommodate both construction traffic and pedestrian traffic
- the Developers have offered to pay half of the cost
- Community Works Grant funding is available for this project
- Pedestrian safety during construction

Councillor Hall returned to the meeting at 11:33 am

- Ponderosa Drive had pre-existing pedestrian safety issues before the Ponderosa Pincushion development started
- Additional access road is required after 350 units are built
- Construction and logging truck traffic on Ponderosa Drive
- The design will factor in the vehicle sizes so that they can travel the route, the proposal is to create a barrier from the construction traffic
- Questioning if there are trucks being limited to Tandem Dump Trucks
- Signs are installed and e-mails are sent out when load requirements are reduced to 70%
The connecting access road between Princeton and Ponderosa through Sommerset is not complete or recognized as a road.

Requesting the developers to encourage the delivery trucks to take an alternate route if possible.

Director of Finance Doug Pryde noted that the Special Operating and Capital Budget is prioritized by the following guidelines:
- Life safety
- Legislated changes
- Opportunity – through grants and coordination with other projects
- Strategic – Council’s Strategic Plan, looking at favorable results through a cost benefit analysis

Discussion relative to the prioritized budget schedule:
- Cousins Park top dressing being a priority
- reducing business tax multiplier to 1.8% 
- the loss in revenue by reducing the business tax multiplier to 1.8% being approximately $12,000
- relocating the Village Potters to a garage of a house that the District owns

Visitor’s Guide – Remove from Budget:
- 2,500 homes plus that receive mail, if they have a “no flyer” request than they don’t receive the guide
- report didn’t come forward this year from the Visitor’s Information Centre showing the results of the delivery of the guide to every household in 2013

Community Centre Upgrades Carry Forward:
- Some upgrades were underway in 2013 and have not been finished yet.

CIIF grant funding program includes:
- Waterfront Infrastructure Improvements
- Chevallier Park Playground Replacement
- Vadim Filesaver Replacement

Tree Replacement Program:
- Planting trees to maintain the canopy in Peachland

Community Centre asbestos testing – identifying potential risk areas

RECESS
The meeting recessed at 12:22 p.m.

RECONVENE
The meeting reconvened at 12:49 p.m.

Dog Park Fencing – Reducing budget by $15,000:
- $10,000 left in budget for the fencing along the Highway 97 near the Princeton intersection
- the OCP and Parks Bylaw will be amended to allow dogs off leash in certain areas

Community Sign – Beach Avenue and 6th Street:
- digital rolling electronic sign to display information about non-profit events
Community Centre Renovations:

Main points made in favor of the motion were:
  • feasibility to include Council Chamber renovations
  • improvement to accessibility and life safety issues
  • improved community asset
  • funding available in the Community Amenity Reserve

Main concern raised about the motion were:
  • spending money on renovations for Council Chambers
  • only addressing life safety issues

MOVED by Councillor Moberg:

COTW-11/03/14-010 THAT COTW recommends that Council approves $250,000 in the 2014 Budget for the renovations outlined in the 2014 Budget Briefing for the Community Centre upgrades.

CARRIED

Councillor Fortin OPPOSED.

Councillor Hall OPPOSED.

Peachland (Deep) Creek Water Treatment Plant Development:
  • feasibility study for one or two water projects – direct line transmission and water filtration
  • first step towards filtration referral
  • working towards IHA requirements for 2017
  • establishing feasibility to qualify for grant opportunities

Water Utility Budget:
  • Administration
  • Operations
  • General Projects
    o WEAP Program
    o Asset Management
    o Peachland Creek Channel Assessment
    o Gas Alert Deep Creek Turbidity Control Gate
    o Water Audit
    o Water Testing

Sewer Utility:
  • Administration
  • Operations
  • RDCO Contract
  • RDCO Treatment Plant costs (Peachland)

OTHER BUSINESS

Nil.
ADJOURNMENT

MOVED by Councillor Moberg:

COTW-11/03/14-011 THAT the COTW meeting adjourn at 2:00 p.m.
CARRIED.

Certified Correct.

Mayor

Corporate Officer

Dated at Peachland, B.C.

This 25th day of March, 2014.
Mayor and Council
District of Peachland
5806 Beach Avenue
Peachland, BC
V0H 1X7

March 14, 2014

RE: Development Permit Area Form and Character Guidelines in the OCP

BACKGROUND:

The District of Peachland has stated a priority to update and improve the present Development Permit (DP) requirements for “form and character” in the OCP. “Form and character” in the development approval process refers to the exterior appearance of a site and buildings or structures on a site. “Form and character” provisions convey a minimum standard of design which considered to be acceptable in the community, in an attempt to achieve attractive development. In moving forward to implementation, an amendment to the Official Community Plan will be required.

A Development Process Review report undertaken for the District was completed by Urban Systems Ltd.-USL and Young Anderson, Solicitors completed in June 2013 suggested that the current Development Permit guidelines could be better articulated to reduce confusion and improve clarity. It recommended:

“the District clarify expectations with respect to project design for pre-zoned land by strengthening OCP form and character guidelines .”

At present, The Beach Avenue Neighborhood Plan (amendment to the OCP) and the Sustainable Downtown Peachland Plan (amendment to the OCP) and the OCP represent the “form and character” design guidelines that are in place in Peachland. Smithplan Consulting have been engaged to undertake to strengthen, improve and update the OCP form and character guidelines. Considerable research has been undertaken on this issue, including examining requirements used in many communities across BC. Some fundamental updating will be undertaken by:

- Consolidating all development permit “form and character” guidelines into the main OCP document
-Formulating the guidelines in such a manner as to provide consistency and avoid duplications, or possible contradictions.

-Improving the clarity of the design guidelines through language or graphic illustrations.

DISCUSSION:

It is intended to proceed with the approval process through:

1. Preparing a power point presentation for COTW. [March 25, 2014]
2. Holding a public open house, includes:
   -the public and power point presentation (q & e)
   -wall posters
   -proposed updated guidelines for discussion (similarities to recent updates in other locations)
   -exit surveys
3. Completing updated form and character guidelines - OCP amendment
4. Proceeding to the Council approval process – two readings, public hearing, third reading, final adoption.

At the March 25, 2014 COTW meeting, Mr. Smith will present a PowerPoint presentation (#1 above) as the first step in moving the project ahead. Attached is a draft copy of OCP amendments for presentation at the open house.

Additional Issue

It should be noted that the USL report also suggested that the possibility of establishing a Joint Advisory Design Panel for reviewing Development Permit “form and character” guidelines in the District’s of West Kelowna, Summerland and Peachland be explored. Both jurisdictions suggested there would be no interest in a partnership of this nature.

I look forward to the presentation to Council.

Yours truly,

Dave Smith RPP, MCIP
Smithplan Consulting Inc.

dsmith51@shaw.ca
www.smithplanconsulting.com
DRAFT

OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN AMENDMENT

FORM AND CHARACTER
DEVELOPMENT PERMIT GUIDELINES

March 20, 2014
6.0 RECOMMENDED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT “FORM AND CHARACTER” DESIGN GUIDELINES

Below are the proposed Development Permit “form and Character” design guidelines and the numbering corresponds to the numbering in the current OCP. A proposed amendment to the OCP is shown below:

Section 6.0: Land Use Strategy

6.1 Introduction (new clause is added)

“9. Development Permit Design Guidelines - are included in the OCP to provide a high quality of urban design and aesthetics related to building exteriors, including development of the exterior site for commercial, revitalization, multi-family residential and industrial development. Design guidelines are implemented through the approval of Development Permits or are included in CD Comprehensive Development Zones or in zoning bylaw amendments. Design guidelines are also included in the OCP for purposes of:

- protecting the natural environment
- protecting development from hazardous conditions
- establishing objectives to promote energy conservation, water conservation and the reduction of greenhouse gases.”

1. Section 15.0: Land Use Designations

   a) 15.3 Low Density Residential Policies (delete and add)

      - Delete all of clause “8.”

      - Add new clause:

        “8. Any site which is within the Multi-family Development Permit Area and contains greater than 4 dwelling units and is being rezoned to R.2A Townhouse Residential Zone or R.3 Multiple Family Residential Zone (Low Density) shall be subject to the Multi-Family Development Permit Area Design Guidelines as stipulated in Section 16.11 of this plan.”

   b) 15.4 Medium Density Residential Policies (add)

      - Add new clause:

        “9. All sites designated as Multiple Family Development Permit Area in Figure 4 of the OCP shall address the design guidelines in Section 16.11, General Multiple Family Development Permit Area.”
c) 15.5 Integrated Residential Policies (add)

- Add new clause:
  “9. All sites designated as Mult-Family Development Permit Area (Integrated Residential sub-area) in Figure 4a of the OCP shall address the design guidelines in Section 16.11, Multi-Family Residential Development Permit Area”, where there is reference to the Integrated Residential sub-area.”

d) 15.6 The Gateway 13th Street (delete and add)

- Delete all of clause “5.”

- Add new clause:
  “5. All sites designated as “The Gateway Mixed-Use Development Permit Area” in Figure 6 of the OCP shall address the design guidelines in Section 16.10. The Gateway Mixed-Use Development Permit Area.”

e) 15.7 Blue Water Residential (delete and add)

- Delete all of clause “3.”

- Add new clause:
  “3. All sites designated as “Multi Family Development Permit Area” in Figure 4b of the OCP shall address the design guidelines in Section 16.11, Multi-Family Residential Development Permit Area”, where there is reference to the Blue Water Residential sub-area.”

f) 15.17 Waterfront Residential (add subsection)

“15.17 Waterfront Residential

Interpretation

Includes lands extending along the waterfront of Okanagan Lake as shown in Figure 4c of the OCP.

Policies

1. The following uses will be supported:
   a. Low Density Residential
   b. Medium Density Residential
   c. Special Needs / Affordable or Social Housing
   d. Parks and Public Open Space
2. Crossings of Beach Avenue throughout the area will be designed in accordance with and incorporating traffic calming measures. Crossing locations shall be at intersections or at intervals not greater than 200m apart or as determined by a traffic study undertaken by an accredited traffic professional.

3. Rezoning applications for multi-family residential will only be considered by the District if all conditions for servicing and infrastructure upgrades are met.

4. Compatibility with adjacent low density residential development and taking advantage of lake views will be key design guideline elements of consideration for future development in this area.

5. All sites designated as Waterfront Residential shall address the design guidelines in Section 16.9 Waterfront Residential Development Permit Area.”

g) 15.8 Core Commercial Policies (delete and add)

- Delete all of clause “10.”

- Change the name “Core Commercial” to “Downtown Mixed-use Development Permit Area”.

- Add new clause:
“10. All sites designated as Core Commercial Zone in the Zoning Bylaw and shown on Figure 5 shall address the design guidelines in Section 16.6 Downtown Mixed-Use Development Permit Area, unless such guidelines are addressed through a Comprehensive Development Zone”.

h) 15.9 Highway Commercial Corridor Policies (delete and add)

- Delete all of clause “6.”

- Add a new clause:
“6. All sites designated as Highway Commercial Corridor Development Permit Area in Figure 7 of the OCP shall address the design guidelines in Section 16.7, Highway Corridor Development Permit Area.”

i) 15.10 Tourist Commercial Policies (add)

- Add a new clause:
4. Design Guidelines for Tourist Commercial Development shall be incorporated into a “Comprehensive Development District”, as a requirement for any new application.

j) 15.11 Resort Commercial Policies *(delete and add)*

- Delete all of clauses “5.” and “6.”

- Add a new clause:

  “5. Design Guidelines for Tourist Commercial Development shall be incorporated into a “Comprehensive Development District”, as a requirement for any new application.”

k) 15.12 Light Industrial Policies *(addition to clause 3)*

- Add to clause “3.”

  3. “...All sites designated as ‘Industrial Development Permit Area’ in Figure 8 of the OCP shall address the design guidelines in Section 16.11 Industrial Development Permit Area.”

Section 16.0: Development Permit Areas *(rewrite section)*

16.1 What is a Development Permit Area?

A Development Permit Area (DPA) is designated under the *Local Government Act*. There are specific purposes for which lands can be designated within a DPA, including the following:

- Protection of natural environment, its ecosystems and biological diversity;
- Protection of development from hazardous conditions;
- Protection of farming;
- Revitalization of an area in which a commercial use is permitted;
- Establishment of objectives for the form and character of commercial, industrial or multi-family residential development;
- In relation to an area in a resort region, establishment of objectives for the form and character of the development in the resort region;
- Establishment of objectives to promote energy conservation;
- Establishment of objectives to promote water conservation;
- Establishment of objectives to promote the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.

Local governments cannot withhold issuance of a development permit where the proponent has addressed the applicable guidelines. A DPA is designated to
acknowledge that there is some special feature or characteristic of the lands that requires additional attention during development. A DPA is not designated to prevent a development from occurring, but rather is intended to guide development so that it is mindful of the special features and that construction and alteration of lands is undertaken with due care and consideration. DPAs may be designated to protect environmental features, regulate the aesthetics of a development’s built form, or protect people and property from hazardous conditions. DPAs may also be designated to achieve sustainable development objectives. Council issues the development permit and may attach conditions to the permit which will assist with achieving the specific objectives outlined in the guidelines.

DPAs are triggered by the construction, alteration or subdivision of land within the DPA and unless the proposed activity is specifically exempt, a DPA is required prior to commencing works. DPAs are required to be designated spatially (i.e. they must be shown on a map) and must include guidelines for landowners that are relevant to the specific purpose of the DPA.

In circumstances where varying the zoning bylaw requirements will facilitate the proponent meeting the objectives of the DPA guidelines, Council may authorize the consideration of the variance in conjunction with the development permit.

Reference should be made to Figures 1 – 11 to establish whether a specific property may be subject to DPA requirements.

The established DPAs are provided in Sections 16.3 to 16.11.1.

It should be noted that properties may be subject to more than one DPA designation and in such cases the guidelines of each DPA are to be addressed.

On parcels where agriculture is a permitted use, activities that are deemed “normal farm practices” pursuant to the Farm Practices Protection Act are exempt from the requirements of a DPA.

For DPAs that contain landscaping guidelines, the District may require the proponent to provide bonding in an amount that will cover the cost of materials and labor for the installation of the landscaping as indicated on the applicable landscape plans. Bonding shall be for 100% of the amount provided in the landscaping quote, including labour costs. Prior to release of the security the District may require confirmation from a qualified professional that the landscaping has been installed in compliance with the terms of the development permit.
16.2 General Requirements for all Development Permits

16.2.1 Parking Relaxations

Variances to off-street parking and loading requirements may be considered as part of a Development Permit. In support of a parking variance request, the District may require that an applicant provide, at his or her cost, a parking analysis report prepared by a qualified Professional Engineer with relevant expertise. In no case shall a development permit authorize a relaxation to the number of spaces below 80% of the required number of parking spaces.

16.2.2 Development Permit Exemptions

A development permit is not required in the following instances:

- For internal alterations to a building, unless the internal alterations to the building result in a change in parking or exterior landscaping requirements for the site.
- For an alteration or addition to a principal building where the value of the construction is less than $50,000 and the as long as the proposed construction conforms to the applicable DPA guidelines.
- For the subdivision of land or buildings.
- For construction or alteration of a sign where the sign conforms to the Districts Sign Bylaw and applicable DPA guidelines or an issued development permit.

16.2.3 Administration and Implementation Considerations in Development Permit Applications

Where it is deemed applicable by the District and as provided for under the Local Government Act:

a) The timing and phasing of development work may be included as a term of permit.

b) The recommendation from a professional report or reports provided in support of a development permit may form terms of the permit.

c) The District may require the registration of a restrictive covenant pursuant to Section 219 of the Land Title Act in order to secure the measures prescribed in professional report(s) provided in support of the development permit.

d) All new buildings must be designed by a qualified architect, registered with the Architectural Institute of BC (AIBC) and licenses to practice in BC.

e) As a term of permit, the District may require, at the property owner’s expense, written confirmation from a registered architect that buildings
and associated architectural works have been installed in substantial compliance with the issued permit.

16.2.4 Development Permit Requirements in Designated DPAs

16.2.4.1 Concealing Mechanical and Electrical Service Equipment

Requirements in Designated DPAs which apply to sections 16.6 – 16.11

The visual appearance of buildings can be seriously affected by the adverse placement of mechanical and service equipment. Many otherwise attractive structures are degraded by careless placement of rooftop mechanical units, service connections, ground-mounted transformers or refuse containers. Utility meters, cable television connections, telephone boxes and other service hardware should be visually integrated into building designs. Elements such as porches, bays, projections or false facades should be configured to visually integrate and conceal these services when they are proposed for front or flanking street faces of buildings.

a) Dryer, exhaust and heat reclamation vents, gas fireplace exhausts and other residential or mechanical elements that cannot be screened should not be placed on the front or flanking street faces of buildings.

b) Conceal roof-top mounted equipment from the street and neighboring structures with screens or high parapets.

c) Place ground mounted electrical or mechanical equipment in inconspicuous locations. Provide landscaping and other screening from front or flanking streets.

d) Refuse storage areas shall be screened and fully enclosed with fencing or landscaping a minimum of 2 meters in height, or fully concealed within a building. The District may require the applicant to provide written confirmation from the waste disposal provider that the proposed refuse storage area can be serviced.

e) Locate noise sources from electrical / mechanical sources away from habitable areas and operable windows.

16.2.4.2 Landscaping and Screening Requirements in Designated DPAs which apply to sections 16.6 - 16.11

a) Landscaping shall be designed by a Landscape Architect, registered with the BC Society of Landscape Architects and licensed to practice in BC.

b) As a term of the permit, the District may require at the owners expense, written confirmation from a registered Landscape Architect that the landscape works have been installed in substantial compliance with the issued permit and that plantings have successfully been established.
c) The District may require the applicant to submit an estimate, prepared by a qualified professional and accepted by the District, of the total cost of the hard and soft landscaping features.

d) In Downtown mixed use or in commercial areas in particular, the following to be encouraged:
   - planting, paving and seating is encouraged between the public street and the building face;
   - vegetation and landscaping should be considered so as to avoid blank wall surfaces;
   - public art and sculpture, decorative landscaping or water features should be considered adjacent to prominent intersections or at the proposed Waldo Way mews.

e) All surface parking areas should contain landscaping which buffers parking areas from adjacent properties and public spaces.

f) Landscaped pedestrian walkways should be provided to and from buildings and parking areas.

g) Plant materials need to be appropriate to the setting from a design and species perspective.

h) Native vegetation to be incorporated into the landscaping to be incorporated into the landscaping.

i) Plant species should be selected for drought tolerance.

j) Consideration should be given to provide suitable shade trees.

k) Landscaping to be provided with an underground irrigation system.

l) Landscaping needs to incorporate Fire Smart landscaping techniques (such as avoiding the use of combustible mulch).

m) Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles should be incorporated into the landscape design. All aspects of building and site design should consider CPTED principles. Some fundamental CPTED areas of focus include:
   - Lighting pathways, building entrances and pathways
   - Avoiding the use of solid walls, hedges / fencing which impairs views and may facilitate criminal behavior
   - Consider strategic placement of windows in design in order to maximize informal surveillance by building occupants
   - Ensure civic addresses are easily identified

n) Avoid surface parking lots that front onto Beach Avenue or 13th Street - the Gateway at 13th Avenue Development Permit Avenue.

o) Design should take into account negative impacts of wind and snow blowing, both in terms of building and landscape design.
16.2.4.3 Lighting Requirements in Designated DPAs which apply to sections 16.6 – 16.11

a) Particular attention should be given to the lighting of public and private areas, with a hierarchy of fixture types designed according to functional and security needs.
b) Building illumination should be façade specific.
c) More visible fixtures should be considered to distinguish entrances and the use of soffit lighting is encouraged elsewhere, where it is needed.
d) LED / energy efficient lighting is encouraged.
e) Building or site illumination should not contribute to excessive light pollution.
f) Off-street parking areas and access ways should have adequate lighting, consistent with the design of the development and compatible with surrounding uses. The use of low-level bollard lighting is encouraged for parking areas and pedestrian paths adjacent to residences and lanes.

16.2.4.4 Accessibility Requirements in Designated DPAs which apply to sections 16.6 – 16.11

a) Accessibility features should be integrated into the overall design concept.
b) Routes should be obvious and convenient, and should incorporate barrier-free universal free universal design principles and should generally be integrated into main routes and points of entry.
c) Pathways, sidewalks, trails and other pedestrian routes should be of hard, slip-resistant surface with a minimum width of 920 mm and should avoid slopes of more than one rise for every 12 units of length.
d) Overall site layout should incorporate elements such as strong contrast of colours, paving treatments, bollards and tactile strips to facilitate ease of navigation and avoidance of obstacles.
e) The use of raised curbs, landscaping or fencing beside parking spaces for persons of disabilities should generally be avoided unless suitable additional width is provided.
f) Locate and design curb let-downs to accommodate wheelchair or scooter movement.

16.2.4.5 Water and Energy Conservation and Reduction of GHG Emissions Requirements in DPAs which apply to sections 16.6 – 16.11

a) Where feasible, development projects should incorporate on-site storm water management or rain water capture features that attempt to mimic the water balance before development. Systems should be designed to achieve watershed specific performance targets established by a qualified professional.
b) Consider water efficiency measures such as:
   - low flow faucets with aerators in bathroom and kitchen sinks
   - capture rainwater in CSA approved cisterns or rain barrels
- recycle greywater for non-potable uses
- using only energy star household appliances (washers, dishwashers)
- minimizing the installation of non-essential impervious surfaces;
  Other options such as grasscrete should be considered

c) Building orientation should consider designs which optimize the benefits of
   passive solar features to conserve energy, specifically heating and cooling
   and take to advantage of natural lighting.

d) Install programmable thermostats in all new developments and renovations.

e) Consider alternative energy systems, through installation of solar systems
   or solar ready.

f) Installation of conventional systems should be as energy efficient as
   possible through using efficient furnaces and HRV heat recovery ventilation
   systems.

g) Consider roofing using energy efficient and greenhouse has (GHG)
   reducing techniques such as installing green roofs and roof terraces and
   roof gardens or utilizing reflective and high emissivity roofing materials in
   construction.

g) Consider providing energy efficient lighting standards for the entire
   development (indoor, outdoor, parking and street access).

h) In the Downtown Mixed-use DPA, consider the potential for the
   incorporation of the project into a broader District Energy System, either
   immediately or as being District Energy Ready for the future.

i) Consider promoting alternative modes of transportation by the providing
   bicycle racks, car co-operatives and the design of access oriented towards
   transit stops.

16.2.4.6 Design Principles Required in Designated DPAs which apply to
sections 16.6 – 16.11

It is important to uphold fundamental principles of good urban design. Design
guidelines are useful as a mechanism to help to achieve positive project
outcomes with regard to exterior aesthetics. Once a development is
constructed, it generally remains in place for many years, and an unpleasing
development may impose a negative image on the community. The principles
listed below are of fundamental importance to be taken into account in all
developments within all Development Permit Areas.
a) **Avoid massing** in design with long expanses of monolithic straight walls, with little or with no windows or architectural detailing. This “boxy” design approach is not desirable (examples below).

![Image 1](image1.jpg) ![Image 2](image2.jpg)

b) **Avoid development** which is out-of-scale with adjacent developments.

![Image 3](image3.jpg)

c) **Avoid colour schemes that are uncoordinated** or unfavorably contrasted with the colours on other buildings on the block.

![Image 4](image4.jpg) ![Image 5](image5.jpg)
d) **Avoid signage which obstructs other signage**, or contains colours unfavorably contrasting with surrounding buildings. Signs need to work with the building and not against it, by respecting the size, scale and design of the building.

![Image of busy street with many signs]

![Image of a building with a less cluttered sign design]

e) **Avoid materials which are** of low quality, high maintenance or unwelcoming from a pedestrian perspective. These types of metal sidings may be acceptable in industrial areas, but not elsewhere.

![Image of a building with red siding]

![Image of a modern building]

Delete current OCP Sections 16.6, 16.7, 16.8, 16.9, 16.10 and 16.11 and add the following new sections:

**16.6 Downtown Core Mixed-use Development Permit Area**

**Purpose:**

- Revitalization
- Form and Character related to Commercial and Multi Family Residential Development
- Energy Conservation
- Water Conservation
- Reduction of Greenhouse Gas Emissions
Rationale:

The downtown area is the commercial activity center of Peachland. It includes a mixture of retail commercial, office, professional and personal services and mixed and mixed commercial/residential uses. It offers a wide array of amenities for both residents and tourists alike. A viable, healthy downtown core is a critical component of a thriving community. The objective of this DPA designation is to revitalize the core by enhancing the architectural form and character of the area through the promotion of positive architecture and landscaping. It is also intended to encourage new development that incorporates energy and water conservation principles as well as designs that work towards reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

The DPA is designated pursuant to section 919 (d), (f), (l) and (j) of the Local Government Act.

Designated Areas:

The downtown area is designated as the Core Commercial in Schedule B (Land Use Designation Map) and also shown in Figure 5 - Downtown Core Mixed-Use DPA Map.

General Guidelines:

a) Buildings should respond to their location through appropriate heights, forms, setbacks and architectural expression that take into account consideration of development on adjacent properties.

b) Step building heights downwards from Highway #97 to the lake. Height maximum to be 3 storeys between Beach Avenue and the lane and stepping up to 6 storeys (plus 2-storeys for above-grade parking) towards Highway #97.
c) Step back the buildings along Beach Avenue above the first-storey up to 3-storeys in height, to enhance pedestrian appeal.

d) Buildings should relate to pedestrian scale and character through changes in materials, windows, front doors, wall decorations and the use of awnings and canopies placed in harmony with building design are encouraged.

e) Maintain a fine-grained fabric of building frontages. This can be accomplished through vertical articulation of façade frontages at intervals to avoid monolithic and monotonous patterns as in the example below.
f) Build zero and minimum lot line developments and encourage a strong connection between indoor and outdoor space.

![Image of a waterfront](image)

---

g) Protect and enhance lake views to the extent possible, in order to expose Peachland’s greatest asset, the waterfront.

h) Locate parking in stacked garages backing into the hillside along the highway and designs using well designed podium buildings are encouraged.

---

Building Treatments

a) Visually dominant materials should be indigenous natural ones such as wood, brick or stone faces;

b) Development along the lane should accentuate the pedestrian above the automobile, wherever possible.
c) Bulmarks (the lower area of a building façade located beneath the window sills) are to be articulated differently than for other areas of the building, using materials that have the appearance of stone, wood, polished concrete or natural tile.

d) Development above the bulmarks should be articulated differently by techniques such as by the use of:
   - balconies or outdoor decks
   - different fenestration or corner windows
   - different materials and / or colours
   - canopies and false roofs
   - trim and accents
   - articulation in walls / façades

e) Siding materials may include wood planting (such as tongue and groove siding) concrete lap siding, brick or stone).

f) Generally, stucco should not be a principal building material but may be used as part of façade improvements to an existing building where already significantly featured. As part of façade improvement, the addition of decorative elements such as colour or textural bands, natural and decorative tile, wood trim, awnings and false decorative vents should be considered.

g) Large featureless blank walls are discouraged to avoid monolithic development patterns which are undesirable.

Roof Forms

a) Roof forms are one of the major elements which express the character of a building. A combination of flat and / or sloped roofs is preferred for commercial buildings. Flat roof portions are encouraged for use as green roofs or roof terraces. Expressive pitched roof forms are preferred for mixed use / residential buildings and multi-family residential buildings, if flat roofs are proposed, the use should be for green roofs or roof terraces.

b) Laminated Asphalt Roofing systems which provide colour variation, texture and detail are acceptable. Tile materials such as clay, concrete, or composite material are encouraged in colours compatible with the local environment. Standing seam or deep profile metal roof tiling in appropriate colours (earth-tone, weathered wood or natural slate colour are also acceptable.

c) Capping and flashing and valley flashing should:
   - Match the roofing. Asphalt shingle ridge caps should be heavy butt to add texture.
   - Be a pre-finished metal colour for valley flashings matched to the roofing material.
   - Match the flashing to the chimney and vertical wall surfaces in a colour match with these adjacent vertical surfaces.
Door Entry Ways and Window Treatment

a) Entrances should offer pedestrian weather protection and should be used to create building identity and sense of place.
b) Entryways or doorways should be of a pedestrian scale portraying small village commercial setting.
c) Windows on ground floors should be encouraged to provide a relationship between store interiors and the public sidewalk.
d) Sliding glass doors at grade are discouraged on walls facing onto the fronting street.
e) Vehicle access needs to be provided from side streets and not from Beach Avenue or the lane (Waldo Way).

Awnings, Canopies and Signs

a) Awnings and canopies should be integrated into the overall architectural design of the building. They should respect and respond to architectural features, such as relating well to windows and their shape and other building features such as pilasters and brickwork.
b) Awnings should only run the length of the window frames or doorways.
c) Awnings should not be of a barrel, convex, casement sign box or other similar vertical forms.
d) Awnings should be of a more traditional straight slope or wedge form with limited vertical bands.
e) Signs must relate to architectural features in a way that maintains and reinforces the integrity of those features. Avoid covering windows, string courses, pilasters, decorative brickwork or ornamentation. Establish a positive relationship between edges or sides of a sign and horizontal / vertical elements of the façade.
f) Signs should be used to attract attention and deliver a message about the business or establishment by:
   - limiting letter styles or alphabets used on each sign to not more than two;
   - limiting the number of colours used;
   - having background colours that are subdued or muted; and
   - being simple and direct, and by not over-stating the message.
g) Signs should be of pedestrian scale that enhances the pedestrian friendly experience, adding interest without creating clutter.
h) Signage on the windows should not exceed 15% of the total surface area of all windows on a given frontage.

Colours

a) Colours are encouraged that reflect the local surrounding natural environment of the area and includes earth tones, natural pastels and colours of native and weathered materials such as wood, stone and brick.
b) Local colours include sandy browns, sage grays, pine and juniper green, sunflower yellow and contrasted with lake and sky blues. Within this context, a great range of colours and intensities can be observed to draw inspiration from.

c) Colours for large expanses of surface area should be lighter and more neutral with earth tones being highly desirable.

d) Colours for smaller areas such as for access trim, door entries or window frames can be more intense and contrasting.

Other Considerations

a) The provisions of Section 16.2.4.1 – 16.2.4.6 are included in the Downtown Mixed-Use Development Permit Area Guidelines.

16.6.1 Commercial Development Permit Area

Purpose

- Form and character – Commercial development
- Energy Conservation
- Water Conservation
- Reduction of Greenhouse Gases

Rationale

There are opportunities for commercial development to occur within or adjacent to residential neighborhoods and throughout the District. To ensure the developments take place in an orderly, aesthetic manner which is compatible with the surrounding development.

The DPA is also intended to encourage new development that incorporates energy and water conservation principles as well as designs that work towards reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

Designated Areas

Although few areas other than the downtown area and the shopping center throughout Peachland, sound design guidelines are provided for the entire District for instances where future changes may occur. New DPAs may become established through new designations in the form of OCP amendments, in conjunction with rezoning applications.
Development Permit Area Guidelines

a) Buildings should respond to their location through appropriate heights, forms, setbacks and architectural expression that takes into account consideration of adjacent properties.

b) Buildings should generally be designed to respect the privacy of surrounding areas, particularly with regard to noise. Emphasis should be placed on appropriate screening when located next to lower density residential properties.

c) Building treatment should be of visually dominant materials and be indigenous natural ones such as wood, brick or stone faces;

d) Siding materials may include wood planting (such as tongue and groove siding) concrete lap siding, brick or stone.

e) Generally, stucco should not be a principal building material but may be used as part of façade improvements to an existing building where already significantly featured. As part of façade improvement, the addition of decorative elements such as colour or textural bands, natural and decorative tile, wood trim, awnings and false decorative vents should be considered.

f) Large featureless blank walls are discouraged to avoid monolithic development patterns which are undesirable.

g) Expressive pitched roof forms are preferred. Where flat roofs exist, consideration should be given to using false facades or architectural ornamentation to create interest in the building.

h) Entrances should provide weather protection with consideration for canopies or awnings.

i) Colours for large expanses of surface area should be lighter and more neutral with earth tones being highly desirable.

j) Colours for smaller areas such as for access trim, door entries or window frames can be more intense and contrasting.

k) Care should be taken to protect site lines and safe traffic access to development sites.

l) The provisions of Section 16.2.4.1 – 16.2.4.6 are included in all Neighborhood Commercial Development Permit Area Guidelines.

16.7 Highway Corridor Development Permit Area

Purpose

- Form and Character – Commercial and Multi-family Residential Development
- Energy Conservation
- Water Conservation
- Reduction of Greenhouse Gases
Rationale

The Highway Corridor Development Permit Area contains sites which are highly visible to the travelling public. This designation is intended to achieve aesthetically pleasing development of commercial and residential development located along Highway #97 so that a positive image of the community is presented.

Designated Areas

The Highway Corridor DPA designation is shown on DPA Map Figure 7a

Development Permit Area Guidelines

a) Buildings should respond to their location through appropriate heights, forms, setbacks and architectural expression that takes into account consideration of adjacent properties.

b) Building treatment should be of visually dominant materials and be indigenous natural ones such as wood, brick or stone faces;

c) Siding materials may include wood planting (such as tongue and groove siding) concrete lap siding, brick or stone).

d) Generally, stucco should not be a principal building material but may be used as part of façade improvements to an existing building where already significantly featured. As part of façade improvement, the addition of decorative elements such as colour or textural bands, natural and decorative tile, wood trim, awnings and false decorative vents should be considered.

e) Large featureless blank walls are discouraged to avoid monolithic development patterns which are undesirable.

f) Expressive pitched roof forms are preferred. Where flat roofs exist, consideration should be given to using false façades or architectural ornamentation to create interest in the building.

g) Colours for large expanses of surface area should be lighter and more neutral with earth tones being highly desirable.

h) Colours for smaller areas such as for access trim, door entries or window frames can be more intense and contrasting.

i) Care should be taken to protect site lines and safe traffic access to development sites.

j) The provisions of Section 16.2.4.1 – 16.2.4.6 are included in the Highway Corridor Development Permit Area Guidelines.

16.8 Shopping Center Development Permit Area

Purpose

- Revitalization
- Form and Character – Commercial
- Energy Conservation
- Water Conservation
- Reduction of greenhouse gas emissions

The area includes an existing shopping center where over the course of time, redevelopment or intensification of development on the site may occur.

This is a highly visible site located adjacent to one of the two major entrances to into the downtown core of the District. A high level of architectural design and landscaping for this prominent location is important.

**Designated Areas**

The DPA affects those lands within the shopping center and is shown on Shopping Center Development Area Map Figure 8.

**Design Guidelines**

a) The scale, size, massing, shape, siting, roofline and exterior finish of buildings should be sufficiently varied to avoid monotonous views from the street.

b) Entrances should offer weather protection with consideration of canopies or awnings which might be considered.

c) Building treatment should be of visually dominant materials and be indigenous natural ones such as wood, brick or stone faces;

d) Siding materials may include wood planting (such as tongue and groove siding) concrete lap siding, brick or stone).

e) Generally, stucco should not be a principal building material but may be used as part of façade improvements to an existing building where already significantly featured. As part of façade improvement, the addition of decorative elements such as colour or textural bands, natural and decorative tile, wood trim, awnings and false decorative vents should be considered.

f) Large featureless blank walls are discouraged to avoid monolithic development patterns which are undesirable.

g) Expressive pitched roof forms are preferred. Where flat roofs exist, consideration should be given to using false facades or architectural ornamentation to create interest in the building.

h) Colours for large expanses of surface area should be lighter and more neutral with earth tones being highly desirable.

i) Colours for smaller areas such as for access trim, door entries or window frames can be more intense and contrasting.

j) Care should be taken to protect site lines and ensure safe traffic access to development sites.

k) The provisions of Section 16.2.4.1 – 16.2.4.6 are included as part of the Shopping Center Development Permit Area Guidelines.
### 16.9 Gateway on 13th Mixed Use Development Permit Area

#### Purpose

- Revitalization
- Form and character – Multi-family residential
- Energy Conservation
- Water Conservation
- Reduction of greenhouse gas emissions

#### Rationale

It is apparent that 13th Street is an important access into Peachland and it is a significant first impression/image individuals will have of Peachland. The area will contain a mix of commercial, institutional and multi-family uses.

#### Designated Areas

Includes properties on either side of 13th Street to a depth of about 3 lots, extending from Okanagan Lake to Highway #97, and the Gateway on 13th Development Permit Area designation is shown on Figure 6.

#### Design Guidelines

- **a)** The height and scale of buildings should maintain a rhythm and shall not exceed more than 3-storeys between Lake Avenue and Highway #97. Consideration can be given to 4-storeys at the corners between Lake Avenue and Beach Avenue.
- **b)** There should be sensitivity in building design to provide views of Okanagan Lake from all sites within the DPA. Design should consider varied rooflines, bay windows and other architectural techniques to achieve lake views.
- **c)** Court yard designs with setbacks at the corner of 13th Street and Beach Avenue shall help to open-up views to the lake.
- **d)** Doorways and windows should be oriented towards 13th Street with facades either actually fronting onto 13th Street or having the appearance of doing so.
- **e)** The scale, size, massing shape siting, roofline and exterior finish of buildings should be sufficiently varied to avoid monotonous views from the street.
- **f)** If multi-family residential is to be developed as part of a mixed-use development, step back the residential component above the floor containing ground level commercial as shown below:
g) Entrances should offer weather protection with consideration of canopies or awnings which might be considered.

h) Building treatment should be of visually dominant materials and be indigenous natural ones such as wood, brick or stone faces.

i) Siding materials may include wood planting (such as tongue and groove siding) concrete lap siding, brick or stone).

j) Generally, stucco should not be a principal building material but may be used as part of façade improvements to an existing building where already significantly featured. As part of façade improvement, the addition of decorative elements such as colour or textural bands, natural and decorative tile, wood trim, awnings and false decorative vents should be considered.

k) Large featureless blank walls are discouraged to avoid monolithic development patterns which are undesirable.

l) Bulmarks (the lower area of a building façade located beneath the window sills) are to be articulated differently than for other areas of the building, using materials that have the appearance of stone, wood, polished concrete or natural tile.

m) Expressive pitched roof forms are preferred. Where flat roofs exist, consideration should be given to using false facades or architectural ornamentation to create interest in the building.

n) Colours for large expanses of surface area should be lighter and more neutral with earth tones being highly desirable.

o) Colours for smaller areas such as for access trim, door entries or window frames can be more intense and contrasting.

p) Avoid surface parking lots that front onto Beach Avenue or 13th Street in the Gateway on 13th DPA.

q) The provisions of Section 16.2.4.1 – 16.2.4.6 are included as part of the Gateway on 13th Development Permit Area Guidelines.
16.10 Industrial Development Permit Area

Purpose

- Form and character - Industrial
- Energy Conservation
- Water conservation
- Reduction of greenhouse gas emissions

Rationale

The industrial area is located at the top of Princeton Avenue at the southern edge of the District's municipal boundary. The area is considerable distance from the municipal sewer system and many roads and not paved and the area is of a rural standard of development. The objective of the DPA is to ensure that the development of this area is done in a uniform manner with effective landscape screening and other design elements in order to promote visual aesthetics of the area.

Designated Area

The Industrial DPA consists of industrial lands within the District which are designated on the map shown as Figure 8 in the OCP.

Design Guidelines

a) Light industrial buildings and office buildings associated with general industrial use should be treated with painted metal, wood or textured concrete or other suitable finishing. Untreated flat concrete finishes or unpainted metal finishes should be avoided.
b) The size and shape of buildings should relate to adjacent development wherever possible
c) Architectural design elements and details which enhance visual appearance and articulate the façade are encouraged.
d) The use of bright unnatural colours should be avoided.
e) Areas of landscaping should be provided adjacent to roadways.
f) Outdoor storage areas should be screened with walls, fencing, hedging trees, planting or other screening materials or combination of these materials.
g) The provisions of Section 16.2.4.1 – 16.2.4.6 are included as part of the Industrial Development Permit Area Guidelines.
16.11 Multi-Family Residential Development

Purpose

- Form and Character – Multi-Family Residential, Intensive Residential
- Energy Conservation
- Water Conservation
- Reduction in Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Rationale

The majority of multi-family residential developments are located next to major roadways, areas next to low density residential use, areas near the lake and also areas going through transition from low density residential to medium density residential use. Because of their prominent size and location, especially in a hillside community, multi-family developments can have a significant impact on the surrounding area. The objective of this designation is to good design guidelines as a tool to help development be attractive and be compatible with the surrounding area.

Designated Areas

The designated areas for Multi-Family development are shown as:
- Multi-Family Residential Development Permit Area – Figure 4
- Integrated Multi-Family Residential sub-area – Figure 4 a
- Blue Waters Multi-Family Residential sub-area – Figure 4 b
- Waterfront Multi-Family Residential sub-area – Figure 4 c

Design Guidelines

a) Buildings should respond to their location through appropriate heights, forms, setbacks and architectural forms, setbacks and architectural expression that takes into account adjacencies; Particular attention should be paid to landscape screening for those sites adjacent to single unit residential developments.

b) Significant existing views of the lake, mountains and/or natural areas should be preserved and enhanced where possible.

c) Building design should avoid large expanses of any one material.

d) Buildings with multiple streets frontages should be designed to give equal emphasis to each frontage with respect to building massing, materials, details and landscaping.

e) Buildings should be oriented and designed to reduce shadow and impact on outdoor spaces and to permit penetration of natural light into building interiors.

f) Building entrances should be designed to provide weather protection.
g) Colours for large expanses of surface area should be lighter and more neutral with earth tones being highly desirable.
i.) Colours for smaller areas such as for access trim, door entries or window frames can be more intense and contrasting.
ii.) The use of bright unnatural colours should be avoided and colours and finishes that are consistent with the natural heritage of the area should be employed.
iii.) Sloped or pitched roof forms are preferred for residential buildings and multi-family residential buildings, if flat roofs are proposed, the use should be for green roofs or roof terraces. Attention should be paid to designing roofs which are which are compatible with adjacent properties and which preserve some a reasonable amount of views for adjacent properties.
iv.) All new buildings should be designed by a registered architect.
v.) As a term of permit, the District may require, at the owner’s expense, written confirmation from a registered Architect that buildings and associated architectural works have been installed in substantial compliance with the issued permit.
vi.) Buildings should generally be designed to respect the privacy of surrounding areas, particularly with regard to noise.
vii.) Notwithstanding other provisions in this Multiple Family DPA, special attention should be given to design guideline elements in particular areas:

- **Integrated Residential sub-area (Figure 4 a)** – design of the building and site to be designed with recognition of development in surrounding areas and sensitive to adjacent single-family residential densities. Developments should be constructed to be compatible with the scale, height and form of neighbouring developments.

- **Blue Waters Residential sub-area (Figure 4 b)** – design of the building and site to be designed with recognition of development in surrounding areas and sensitive to adjacent single-family residential densities. Developments should be constructed to be compatible with the scale, height and form of neighboring developments.

- **Waterfront Residential sub-area (Figure 4 c)** – design of the buildings and the site to be in harmony with the natural setting and views of the lake. The design of the building and site to be compatible with the development on surrounding areas and sensitive to adjacent single family residential densities. Special emphasis in design to include:
  - Encourage a strong connection between indoor and outdoor space
  - Design to protect and enhance views
  - Consider marine type elements including post and beam type construction or wood cladding within the façade design
The provisions of Section 16.2.4.1 – 16.2.4.6 are included as part of the design guidelines in all of the Multi-Family Development Areas. “
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District of Peachland
Request for Decision

To: COTW
From: Corine (Cory) Gain, Director of Planning & Development Services
Date: March 12, 2014
Subject: Z14-01 Zone Amendment Bylaw No. 2068, 2014
Medical Marihuana Production Facilities

Recommendation: THAT COTW recommends that Council amend Zoning Bylaw No. 1375, Amendment Bylaw No. 2068, 2014 prior to second reading to reduce the specified minimum lot size from 20 hectares (49.40 acres) to 8.09 hectares (20 acres).

Implications of Recommendation:

General: Amendment of the Zoning Bylaw provides Council with the authority to regulate the location of Medical Marihuana Production Facilities in the District of Peachland.

Organizational: A procedure is under development for handling notifications received from potential operators under the legislation to ensure that land use and business license requirements are satisfied.

Policy: Federal Marihuana for Medical Purposes Regulation, SOR 2013-119 (the "MMPR") effective April 1, 2014

BACKGROUND:

Council Resolution RC-02/25/14-009 gave first reading to the zone amending bylaw intended to address new Federal legislation governing Medical Marihuana Production Facilities within the District.

Further research activity and consultation with the Agricultural Land Commission has been completed since Council’s initial consideration of the amending bylaw. An explanation of the proposed change to the amending bylaw is provided including results of the analysis conducted to verify that the amending bylaw regulates, but does not prohibit, the establishment of a Medical Marihuana Production Facility in Peachland.

A separate report will be provided to Council to address community impact issues to be handled under the Business License process.

DISCUSSION:

Preparation of the initially proposed bylaw amendment included a review of the parcel sizes of all properties designated as Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR) within the District of Peachland. Staff also considered parcels greater than 20 hectares (49 acres) in size currently zoned either RR-1 Rural Residential Zone or A-1 Rural/Agricultural. It was determined that the large minimum lot size would restrict the subject use to less than eight existing properties and the further limitation to permitting the use only on land designated as ALR would reduce number of potential locations to three properties.
The proposed bylaw amendment was again referred to the Agricultural Land Commission for comment. The result of the second referral was the same as the first. The comment received was, “Medical marihuana facilities are deemed a “farm” use and as such are permitted in the ALR”. A link was provided to the ALC website to the policy/Information Bulletin pertaining to Medical Marihuana. No further comments were provided to guide staff in meeting the expectations of the ALC policy. A copy of the bulletin updated to January 2014 is attached to this report for your reference.

Following the discussion at Committee of Whole (COTW) and Council and the repeated response of the ALC, staff conducted further research to isolate and verify potential locations based on the proposed bylaw provisions, including whether the property is located within the ALR and whether the minimum setbacks to property lines could be achieved.

Our focus continues to be on minimizing the impact of any proposed facilities on adjacent properties. As such, setbacks are specified to property lines rather than to existing uses. The 100 m setback to property lines is consistent with land use regulations originally proposed in immediately adjacent Regional District areas. Currently, intensive agricultural uses are required to be located a minimum of 30 m (100 ft) from property lines abutting a road right-of-way and/or zone boundaries. The intention is to provide a significant buffer between the subject use and neighbouring properties to mitigate any deleterious impacts and to be consistent with Council’s initial direction to staff.

Health Canada’s building and production security requirements for Medical Marihuana Production facilities are very rigorous. Building construction standards, physical barrier and security monitoring requirements are expected to result in a site that is distinctly different in character from other farm uses. Practical issues related to air filtration systems and the availability of a back-up power supply for on-site security systems, which will likely involve the installation and use of on-site generators, have been considered in determining recommended setbacks to property lines.

Recognizing that the proposed setback requirements to property lines effectively result in a Medical Marihuana Production Facility use being restricted to parcels larger than 200 m x 200 m (40,000 m² or 9.88 acres) in size, consideration was given to removing the minimum lot size requirements. However, considering the irregular shape and topographical characteristics of properties in Peachland, it is recommended that the use be restricted to parcels having a minimum area of 8.09 hectares (20 acres) rather than the originally stated 20 hectares (49.40 acres). There are currently two properties in Peachland that could satisfy the setbacks to property lines, the minimum lot size requirement and the need to be designated as Agricultural Land Reserve. There are three properties not currently designated as ALR that could meet the minimum setback and lot size requirements. However, it is unlikely that an application to have these properties included in the reserve would be successful.

Staff was also requested to investigate the response of both the Union of BC Municipalities (UBCM) and the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) to determine what support is being offered by these organizations to municipalities struggling to deal with the changes to the federal medical marihuana regulations. To date there has been limited information made available to municipalities. In July 2013 UBCM requested that the federal ministry work with local governments to “ensure that all prospective licensed producers comply with local government regulations before a license is issued” and further, “to develop transition measures that will be needed to move smoothly from the old regulation to the new regulation”. To date, there is no indication that any assistance has been or will be offered in this regard.

A statement issued in December 2012 by the FCM in response to the changes to regulations included the following summary comments: “FCM is pleased to have worked with Health Canada to bring municipal expertise and input in to developing an approach to the production of medical marihuana that clarifies the rights and responsibilities of the producer, protects community safety, and supports our police and emergency services.” The improved ability of local government to “monitor or enforce compliance with health and safety standards” was highlighted as a significant benefit of the legislative changes. Therefore, in light of the additional analysis conducted, staff recommends the following amendments to the zoning bylaw (change from initial reading bolded for emphasis):
1. A new definition be added to “Part 1” of the zoning bylaw as follows: “Licensed Medical Marihuana Production Facility means a facility for the growing of marihuana which is licensed under the Marihuana for Medical Purposed Regulations (MMPR) by Health Canada”

2. That the permitted uses each of the “A-1 Rural/Agricultural Zone” and the “RR-1 Rural Residential Zone” be amended to add “Licensed Medical Marihuana Production Facility, if located on lands designated as Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR).”

3. That an “Additional Regulations” section be added to each of the A-1 and RR-1 zones to require that:
   a. The use must be located on a parcel having a minimum area of 8.09 hectares (20 acres);
   b. All buildings used for medical marihuana production shall be setback a minimum of:
      - 150 m (492 ft.) from any school site;
      - 100 m (328 ft.) from all property lines; and
      - 50 m (164 ft.) from all watercourses.
   c. No sites or buildings used for medical marihuana production shall discharge or emit odorous toxic or noxious matter or vapour, heat glare or radiation, recurrently generated ground vibration, noise in excess of ambient noise at the property boundary, electrical interference or any other health or safety hazards.

REPORT/DOCUMENT: Attached: X Available: Nil:

   1. Bylaw 2068, 2014
   2. ALC Bulletin

OPTIONS: 1. COTW CAN SUPPORT THE RECOMMENDATION
          3. COTW CAN MAKE AMENDMENTS TO THE RECOMMENDATION.
          4. COTW CAN REQUEST ADDITIONAL INFORMATION OF STAFF PRIOR TO PASSING A RESOLUTION.
Health Canada’s Marihuana for Medical Purposes Regulation (MMPR) http://www.laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/regulations/SOR-2013-119/ has changed the parameters for the production of medical marihuana in Canada. The current system of personal use licenses and designated person licenses will be phased out by April 1, 2014. In its place, new Federal licenses are geared to larger scale production/distribution facilities. For further information about the changes see the following website http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/dhp-mps/marihuana/index-eng.php.

Various local governments in British Columbia are looking at their zoning bylaws to determine where these larger scale commercial production facilities should be directed. A number of local governments are considering industrial, commercial and agricultural zones, within purpose built structures and with siting regulations from property lines and residential uses. Others are looking to restrict this land use or direct to particular areas of their community.

The Agricultural Land Commission Act and regulations determine land use in the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR). Due to the number of inquiries from local governments and Medical Marihuana production proponents, the ALC provides the following for clarification purposes with regard to Medical Marihuana production in the ALR.

Section 1 of the Agricultural Land Commission Act defines “farm use” as:

An occupation or use of land for farm purposes, including farming of land, plants and animals and any other similar activity designated as farm use by regulation, and includes a farm operation as defined in the Farm Practices Protection (Right to Farm) Act.

Based on the above definition, if a land owner is lawfully sanctioned to produce marihuana for medical purposes, the farming of said plant in the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR) is allowed and would be interpreted by the Agricultural Land Commission as being consistent with the definition of “farm use” under the ALC Act.

Notwithstanding the farming of land for the production of medical marihuana, not all activities associated with its production would necessarily be given the same “farm use” consideration. Accessory uses associated with the farm use include a small business office, testing lab, processing and drying, packaging shipping areas, cloning room and anything else directly related to the growing and processing of the plant. Determining an accessory use is contingent on the use being necessary and commensurate with the primary function of the property/building to produce an agricultural product. If a land use activity is proposed that is not specifically related to the growing of an agricultural product including a stand-alone research and development facility, an application to the ALC for non-farm use would be required.

Municipalities are responsible for governing the use of land within the respective municipality’s jurisdiction. Zoning bylaws enacted by municipalities may set out restrictions on land use, including but not limited to the use of land for medical marihuana production. Where such restrictions may apply to land within the ALR, such restrictions with respect to the particular land use of lawfully sanctioned medical marihuana production would not in and of themselves be considered as inconsistent with the ALC Act.

Proponents of medical marihuana production facilities should contact their local government to determine the applicability of zoning bylaws, approval processes and to determine building permit requirements that may apply.
WHEREAS the Council of the Corporation of the District of Peachland has adopted Zoning Bylaw Number 1375, 1996

AND WHEREAS it is deemed necessary to amend Zoning Bylaw Number 1375, 1996

NOW THEREFORE, the Council of the Corporation of the District of Peachland, in open meeting assembled, enacts the District of Peachland Zoning Bylaw Number 1375, 1996 (the “Zoning Bylaw” be amended as follows:

1. THAT a new definition be added to in “Part 1” of the zoning bylaw as follows:

   “Licensed Medical Marihuana Production Facility means a facility for the growing of marihuana which is licensed under the Marihuana for Medical Purposes Regulations (MMPR) by Health Canada.”

2. THAT the text in “Part 10”, “A-1 Rural/Agricultural Zone” under “B. Permitted Uses”, be amended by adding the following additional permitted use in that zone:

   “6. Licensed Medical Marihuana Production Facility, if located on lands designated as Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR).”

3. THAT the text in “Part 10”, “A-1 Rural/Agricultural Rural Zone” be amended by inserting a new section “J. Other Regulations” following section “I Landscaping” as follows:

   “1. Additional Regulations pertaining to Licensed Medical Marihuana Production Facilities:

   a) The use must be located on a parcel having a minimum area of 8.09 hectares (20 acres);
   b) All buildings used for medical marihuana production shall be:
      i. 150 m (492 ft.) from any school site;
      ii. 100 m (328 ft.) from all property lines; and
      iii. 50 m (164 ft.) from all watercourses.
   c) No sites or buildings used for medical marihuana production shall discharge or emit odorous toxic or noxious matter or vapour, heat glare or radiation, recurrently generated ground vibration, noise in excess of ambient noise at the property boundary, electrical interference or any other health or safety hazards.”

4. THAT the text in “Part 12”, “RR-1 Rural Residential Zone” under “B. Permitted Uses”, be amended by adding the following additional permitted use in that zone:

   “6. Licensed Medical Marihuana Production Facility, if located on lands designated as Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR).”

5. THAT the text in “Part 12”, “RR-1 Rural Residential Zone” under “K. Other Regulations”, be amended by adding the following additional clause:
“3. Additional Regulations pertaining to Licensed Medical Marihuana Production Facilities:
   a) The use must be located on a parcel having a minimum area of 8.09 hectares (20 acres);
   b) All buildings used for medical marihuana production shall be:
      i. 150 m (492 ft.) from any school site;
      ii. 100 m (328 ft.) from all property lines; and
      iii. 50 m (164 ft.) from all watercourses.
   c) No sites or buildings used for medical marihuana production shall discharge or emit odorous toxic or noxious matter or vapour, heat glare or radiation, recurrently generated ground vibration, noise in excess of ambient noise at the property boundary, electrical interference or any other health or safety hazards.”

6. This Bylaw may be cited as Zoning Bylaw No. 1375, Amendment Bylaw No. 2068, 2014

7. This Bylaw shall take effect upon its adoption by the Council of the Corporation of the District of Peachland.

READ A FIRST TIME, this 25th day of February, 2014.
READ A SECOND TIME, this th day of , 2014.
PUBLIC HEARING HELD, this th day of , 2014.
READ A THIRD TIME, this th day of , 2014.

_________________________________________  ______________________________
Mayor                                    Corporate Officer

Dated at Peachland, B.C.
This th day of , 2014
To: COTW
From: Corine (Cory) Gain, Director of Planning & Development Services
Date: March 17, 2014
Subject: Housing Action Plan to Achieve Affordable Housing

Recommendation:
THAT COTW receive the report of the Director of Planning & Development Services dated March 17, 2014 entitled “Housing Action Plan Discussion Paper” as information; and
THAT COTW directs staff to prepare:
   a) A Housing Action Plan consistent with the recommendations of the “Housing Action Plan Discussion Paper”;
   b) A text amendment to the Official Community Plan to support creation of a Housing Action Plan and to modify policies as may be required to reflect refined policy direction; and
   c) An Affordable Housing Contribution Policy to support a Housing Opportunities Reserve Fund and the Housing Action Plan.

Implications of Recommendation:

General: The District of Peachland will further define and adjust affordable housing policies to reflect the needs of both small and large developments in the community.

Organizational: District of Peachland staff will be better positioned to address a variety of housing opportunities.

Financial: New policies and bylaws will provide clarity to all participants in the development process and create a sustainable implementation plan to support identified housing needs in the community.

Policy: New policy will guide future development of housing in the community.

BACKGROUND:
Issues related to the provision of affordable housing continue to absorb a very significant amount of staff time and have hindered progress on in-stream development applications. Clarity of policy and procedures would allow staff, Council and the development community to work together more effectively to achieve the common goal of providing a mix of housing types that meet community needs and support Council’s Strategic Plan.

In particular, the District’s request for affordable housing in situations that do not involve density bonuses, comprehensive development zones and/or Phased Development Agreement processes are at issue. The apparent impasse on this subject has delayed progress on at least three development applications. Pre-occupation with the issue of what constitutes an appropriate provision of affordable...
housing has over-shadowed pressing questions regarding site suitability for development related to hillside, environmentally sensitive areas and site servicing feasibility.

It is duly recognized that much of the land available in Peachland for development or redevelopment is subject to physically challenging conditions. As such, the cost of development is elevated above the standard cost of flat land development. Concurrently, the attainable development density is reduced; it is difficult for developers to achieve the density currently allowed in the Official Community Plan (OCP) and/or the Zoning Bylaw due to site constraints. The established mechanism of receiving affordable housing units in exchange for bonus density is largely impractical on smaller sites, both physically and economically. While the existing ‘inclusive’ affordable housing policy can be applied to large comprehensive developments such as Ponderosa/Pincushion Ridge and New Monaco through density bonuses, comprehensive development zones and/or Phased Development Agreements, these tools cannot be practically implemented for smaller scale developments. The administrative costs associated with the establishment and maintenance of the required agreements and processes is simply not feasible with current District resources.

On April 24, 2012, Council resolved to receive the “District of Peachland: Affordable Housing Opportunities” report prepared by Cherie Enns for the District of Peachland and CHMC and referred the matter to staff “for consideration in the preparation of policies indicated in the report in further consultation with Council”. This report is provided to address both Council’s 2012 resolution and the need to responsibly address current development proposals.

DISCUSSION:

THE CHALLENGE:

The concept of integrating affordable housing, however it may be defined, into any community is a socially-responsible goal that supports long-term community health and sustainability. The challenge is to determine what the needs of our community are and how we may best serve these needs in the context of the governance framework in which we operate. At present, the Local Government Act and Community Charter provide a limited set of tools for our “tool box”.

We must be ever conscious of the core functions of local government. The “downloading” of responsibilities from senior levels of government to local government have been widely discussed and shall not be explored here, except to the extent that definition of what the goal of the District is in facilitating affordable housing within our community. What are the identified needs in our community? What can the District do to meet these needs and how might that best be accomplished? Evidence suggests that the answers are close at hand and need only be clearly identified and articulated.

THE SOLUTION:

The District of Peachland needs to establish what our priorities are with respect to affordable housing and work to attain our goals in a practical way, suitable to the scale of our community. As such, staff recommends that all of the valuable information gathered to date be distilled into an action-oriented document that will allow us to measure our success in creating a complete, healthy and sustainable community. A Housing Action Plan would provide the framework for achieving this important goal.

Recent Council support for the Habitat for Humanity Project demonstrates that Council has already embraced a very practical way to facilitate the provision of affordable housing in our community. This is a great example of the ability of housing providers in the community to identify a specific need and to engage mutual resources to realize tangible results. This type of activity is appropriate to the scale of the District of Peachland. The availability of funds in a Housing Opportunities Fund would allow the District to continue supporting these types of projects and may even put the District in the position of partnering with non-profit housing providers to leverage government funding as opportunities arise for the long awaited Seniors Housing Project.

The attached discussion paper summarizes the information already received by Council and highlights opportunities for implementation of a responsive and responsible action plan. It outlines a
more comprehensive scheme for providing affordable housing in our community beyond the ‘inclusive zoning’ proposed for large multi-year comprehensive developments. It suggests that the District should focus on providing the types of housing that have already been identified as important to the community. The presence of secondary suites within the existing housing stock, interest in creating secondary suites in accessory buildings (garden suites), partnerships with established housing providers such as Habitat for Humanity and demonstrated community support for seniors housing all represent realistic and achievable goals for affordable housing in Peachland. A Housing Opportunities Reserve Fund would provide the District with funds to pursue a Housing Action Plan.

REPORT/DOCUMENT: Attached: Discussion Paper Available: Nil

OPTIONS: 1. COTW CAN SUPPORT RECOMMENDATIONS.
2. COTW CAN MAKE AMENDMENTS TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS.
3. COTW CAN REQUEST ADDITIONAL INFORMATION OF STAFF PRIOR TO PASSING A RESOLUTION.
DISTRICT OF PEACHLAND
Housing Action Plan Discussion Paper

Planning & Development Services
March 17, 2014
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The District of Peachland Housing Action Plan discussion Paper outlines a simple and practical proposal to extend the ability of individual residential property owners and both small and large-scale multi-family developers to contribute to increasing the availability of affordable housing options in Peachland. The goal is to create a healthy and sustainable community by providing a variety of safe, legitimate and relevant housing options.

The discussion paper addresses in turn the challenge of providing affordable housing, the regional context including how Peachland fits into that larger picture, community demographics and then summarizes existing information found in the District of Peachland Affordable Housing Opportunities Report, the Official Community Plan, the Amenity Contribution Policy, Area Structure Plans and the Ponderosa/Pincushion Ridge Phased Development Agreement. The discussion concludes with consideration of the components of an “actionable” plan that would ensure real progress towards achieving housing goals identified by Council and the Official Community Plan.

The proposed Housing Action Plan recommends creation of a cash-in-lieu Affordable Housing Amenity Contribution Policy to support a Housing Opportunities Reserve Fund; amendment of the Zoning Bylaw to authorize secondary suite in all residential zones; creation of a program to encourage legitimization of existing secondary suites; continued pursuit of partnerships with not-for-profit agencies including gifting of land and/or waiving, reducing or payment of fees and charges; and exploration of incorporating the concept of “adaptable housing” into District policies and bylaw requirements to support aging-in-place.

INTRODUCTION

The term ‘Housing Action Plan’ has been borrowed from the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC, "A Guide for Canadian Municipalities for the Development of a Housing Action Plan”, 2010, p. 1). Author and Affordable Housing Consultant, Tim Wake advises that the process of creating a Housing Action Plan usually begins with identifying a specific housing need and then conducting a needs assessment. Over the course of the last decade the District has completed considerable research into the community's housing needs and has responded by including high level planning objectives in the Official Community Plan and Area Structure Plans. What is lacking is a simple and practical action plan to achieve community-wide results.

On April 24, 2012, Council resolved to receive the “District of Peachland: Affordable Housing Opportunities” report prepared by Cherie Enns for the District of Peachland and CHMC and referred the matter to staff “for consideration in the preparation of policies indicated in the report in further consultation with Council”. This report is provided to address both Council's 2012 resolution and the need to responsibly address current development proposals.

The intention of this document is to review existing information and present a concept for creating a Housing Action Plan that will extend the ability of both small and large-scale developments to contribute to the availability of affordable housing options in Peachland. It is envisioned that such a plan will maintain the existing affordable housing policies as they apply to large comprehensive developments but will also establish simple and practical ways that smaller-scale development and individual property owners may contribute to providing a variety of safe and legitimate housing options in the community. The Plan should provide a framework for measureable results. It is entirely possible that in future the District may wish to expand the level of detail included in the plan to include project-specific development plans, but at this time the intention is to focus on addressing the most immediately available housing opportunities. The proposed Housing Action Plan will require Council acceptance prior to implementation.
THE CHALLENGE

The concept of integrating affordable housing, however it may be defined, into any community is a socially-responsible goal that supports long-term community health and sustainability. The challenge is to determine what the needs of our community are and how we may best serve these needs in the context of the governance framework in which we operate. At present, the Local Government Act and Community Charter provide a limited set of tools for our “tool box”.

On March 14, 2014 the Ministry of Community, Sport and Cultural Development released documents intended to provide guidance to BC local governments on the topic of community amenity contributions (CACs) including, “Community Amenity Contributions: Balancing Community Planning, Public Benefits and Housing Affordability”. The recommended approach is largely consistent with the existing District of Peachland CAC Policy and the opportunities outlined in this discussion paper. Any policies crafted in response to this discussion paper will give due consideration to the principles highlighted in both new and relevant existing publications. In particular, best practices for cost sharing associated with Development Cost Charges as endorsed by the Ministry, UBCM and the development industry will be utilized in determining a schedule of appropriate CAC amounts.

The District of Peachland needs to establish what our priorities are with respect to affordable housing and work to attain our goals in a practical way, suitable to the scale of our community. One of the community’s identified priorities is that any development that occurs within the District meets high quality standards and is physically and economically sustainable into the future. This will undoubtedly be no less the case with affordable housing. A Housing Action Plan would provide the framework for achieving this important goal.

THE REGIONAL CONTEXT

The District of Peachland is in a unique position in that it is a small community nestled within a larger region that has experienced statistically significant growth in recent years. Expectations for the provision of affordable housing must be consistent with our community's resources, and should not be derailed by expectations created in larger communities that have the benefit of greater resources. While the District of Peachland should accept that we have a role to play in the regional context, we need to be mindful that our goals for the provision of affordable housing must be consistent with the needs identified in our own community. If these needs are coincident with needs identified in larger communities, then we may choose to implement some of the tools used in those larger more resource-rich jurisdictions. Well defined practical goals with measurable results, defined by an understandable plan are much more easily attained than vague high-level conceptual strategy. Including objectives and policies in the Official Community Plan for affordable housing is the first step. Achievement of the objectives requires a practical strategy and an Action Plan including tools for implementation.

The “Regional Growth Strategy Housing Discussion Paper – “Your Home…Your Future” was completed as part of the RDCO “Future OK” Regional Growth Strategy (RGS) process. The document asked the question, “What are the appropriate roles for the Regional District and municipalities to facilitate meeting complex long-term demands for adequate, affordable and appropriate housing?” As I understand it, the District was hopeful that through the RGS process a regional authority would be created that would have the resources to assist with the provision of affordable housing in the District and would as such, remove the need for the municipality to independently address the implementation of OCP housing policies. This concept for a regional authority was not embraced by other partners in the RGS process. As such, the District of Peachland is left to address affordable housing independently of a regional coordinating body. There is a distinct benefit to this situation in that the District is able to create a “made-in-Peachland” strategy for addressing affordable housing in a way that is suited to the unique characteristics of our community.

The “Your Home…Your Future” discussion paper advised that there is a need to create an average of 1,600 new dwellings annually through 2036 to meet the anticipated demand for housing in the region. Given the relative size of the District of Peachland to the remainder of the RDCO municipalities and the apparent regional understanding of the need to share responsibility of providing adequate, affordable and
appropriate housing, the number of units of housing to be provided over the next twenty-five years in Peachland is relatively modest. The “Central Okanagan Economic Development Commission District of Peachland 2009 Demographic Profile” advises that the District of Peachland is 15.98 km² in size or 0.6% of the land area of the Regional District. While it is duly recognized that there are other factors to be considered, based on a simple area calculation, the District of Peachland portion of the projected annual housing demand through 2036 would be approximately 240 dwelling units. A similar calculation based on the estimated 2011 population figures (Peachland: 5,200 (3% of the total)) and RDCO: 179,830) suggests that it would be appropriate if 46 dwelling units were to be constructed in Peachland annually; a total of 1,150 by 2036.

Of particular note is the fact that the 2006 population density per square kilometer in Peachland was 305.6/km² in comparison with a population density in the RDCO of 55.9/km² and in BC of 4.4/km². Peachland is already achieving higher density development than many other jurisdictions.

Clearly, these overly simplistic calculations provide figures far below the number of units anticipated for construction in the District of Peachland over the next twenty five years. However, it serves to demonstrate the relative share of social responsibility of the District of Peachland with respect to the provision of affordable housing in the regional context. In fact, the number of affordable housing units promised through existing Phased Development Agreements well exceeds our regional responsibilities in this context and represent a significant accomplishment in laying the foundation for sustainable development in Peachland. How these affordable units will be effectively provided and administered will be the subject of a separate discussion. The District of Peachland should continue to pursue inclusionary policies with respect to large comprehensive developments. However, a suitable mechanism for the provision of affordable housing in smaller developments that are not subject to comprehensive development zoning nor phased development agreements should be addressed. That is the intention of this discussion paper.

DEMOGRAPHICS

Peachland is widely recognized as a popular retirement community as evidenced by the recent article in the Globe and Mail recommending Peachland as an affordable retirement community. Population demographics indicate that the population in Peachland consists of a considerably higher percentage of persons 55 years or greater in age than other jurisdictions. This would seem to indicate that there should be a strong demand for housing options suitable for retired persons and the ability to accommodate the concept of aging in place. As such, the concept of adaptable housing may be particularly relevant in Peachland and may be appropriately considered as a “next step” in Housing Action Plan development. The various forms of adaptable housing would serve the spectrum of residents from young families to seniors.

Standard income statistics as presented in the “Affordable Housing Opportunities” report may not provide an accurate representation of the true need for affordable housing in Peachland, especially considering that 85% of Peachland households own the property in which they reside. It is entirely possible that reductions in competing financial needs in later stages of life allow households to make the choice to expend a greater percentage of income on housing, especially where home ownership has been realized. It is also possible that the standard Canada Mortgage and Housing (CMHC) definition of housing affordability may be outdated or misleading in our community. Concern for the provision of affordable rental housing, especially for seniors who may have depleted financial resources is a widely recognized issue that warrants attention. The availability of funds in a Housing Opportunities Reserve Fund would provide the opportunity to facilitate the construction of spectrum of seniors housing that would meet the needs of the community.
BACKGROUND

Council clearly recognized the need to explore and identify community housing needs in supporting the “Peachland Seniors’ Housing Market Study”, completed in July 2006 by CitySpaces Consulting for the Peachland Wellness Centre Society, the Seniors’ Housing Steering Committee and the District of Peachland. The “Update on Housing: Final – Need and Demand for Seniors Housing – Peachland” prepared by CitySpaces for the District of Peachland as an update to the 2006 report (with revisions to April 2013) provides updated information to potential funders regarding the supply and demand for seniors’ housing facilities regionally and more particularly on the west side of Okanagan Lake; it addresses key seniors’ demographic and housing indicators and provides guidance for determining the appropriate bedroom mix for a seniors’ housing development in Peachland. These reports provide valuable information regarding outstanding housing needs in the community.

In 2008, Section 7.5 Affordable Housing was inserted into the Official Community Plan (OCP) to address the increasingly challenging issue of the availability of affordable housing in our community. The first and most significant OCP policy states, “The District of Peachland will implement an affordable housing strategy that considers and recognizes residents’ diverse housing needs.” Although selected components of such as strategy have been considered (i.e. cash-in-lieu provisions), to date, no implementation strategy has been created. Activities to date have largely been considered in the context of individual development applications, most particularly the Ponderosa-Pincushion Ridge Development. There is no comprehensive plan to address our communities’ unique needs. High level policies have not been translated into simple actionable solutions appropriate to the broader community. While the inclusion of land use regulations addressing secondary suites into the zoning bylaw are expected to be very helpful to the broad community, these will not satisfy needs of small-scale multi-family residential developers.

It is apparent that many of the initiatives developed in response to the housing affordability challenge in the previous decade are no longer financially viable for either developers or local governments. Solutions, particularly those previously proposed in several larger communities have less relevance in the current economic climate. In fact, many tools remain untested or have been abandoned in larger jurisdictions where results have fallen short of expectations. A local example of this is the City of Kelowna’s September 2013 decision to abandon existing housing agreements covering 38 suites in 10 different developments. The reduced cost of housing, the considerable staff time expended and cost of monitoring compliance with agreements were cited as contributing factors (The Daily Courier, Tuesday, September 10, 2013, p. A3). The District’s Phased Development Agreement with the developers of Ponderosa/Pincushion Ridge cements the agreement by each party to provide 10% of the units constructed as affordable housing. However, the District intends to partner with a non-profit housing provider to administer the related housing agreements when the applicable phase of development triggers provision of those units. It is anticipated that this alternative administrative approach should avoid the issues encountered in Kelowna. Another thing that is demonstrated by this example is that pre-determined affordability measurements may not continue to be relevant over time. Flexibility in the determining appropriate costs and income measures are important.

DISTRICT OF PEACHLAND: AFFORDABLE HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES REPORT

The introduction to the 2012 District of Peachland: Affordable Housing Opportunities Report states that the “District of Peachland is showing leadership regarding affordable housing through the implementation of inclusionary zoning, which according to Peachland is defined as a 10% inclusion of affordable housing in all new development” (p. 1). The 10% affordable housing target is established in the Official Community Plan and Area Structure Plans. Currently, the only reference in the Zoning Bylaw to affordable housing is the definition of “density bonus” in the CD-7 Zone. Affordable housing has been secured through the Ponderosa-Pincushion Development Agreement adoption which was coordinated with the adoption of the CD-7 Zone.
The report provided some discussion of current and future priorities for the development of affordable housing including identification of the need for affordable housing to be “context specific, integrative, family friendly and located near amenities, services and transit”.

Opportunities for public education and in-fill development were highlighted as current priorities. Inclusion of affordable housing in new residential, mixed-use and seniors/assisted living developments was identified as the priority within the ten year timeframe. More specific types of housing such as young professional, young family and more comprehensive seniors housing were identified as appropriate for the 20-year horizon (p. 13).

Recommendations provided in the Enns report reiterated the importance of supporting a “wide range of housing choices reflecting the life stage, income, good design and special needs identified within the community” (p. 19). The report also recommended that an Affordable Housing Policy be articulated and incorporated into the OCP with emphasis on four priorities:

a) Entry level ownership housing;

b) Low end market rental housing;

c) Subsidized rental housing; and

d) Aging in place – intermediate/extended care.

The recommendations also suggest that in an effort to create a complete community, “increased emphasis should be placed on housing opportunities for younger individuals and families”; “exemptions to Development Cost Charges for affordable housing units where they are provided as part of a Housing Agreement”; and an annual budgeted contribution to an Housing Opportunities Reserve Fund be considered” (p. 19). Recommendations regarding the use and content of housing agreements and the concept of partnering with others for the administration and management of affordable housing were also provided. Four methods for providing affordable housing were recommended as follows:

a) Require 10% of units within a development be developed as affordable;

b) Negotiate density bonuses at a ratio of one affordable unit for each additional one unit of market housing (1:1);

c) Adopt a cash-in-lieu policy where it is deemed impractical to provide on-site affordable housing (following further study of how best to calculate contributions); and

d) Establish partnerships with senior levels of government and/or non-profit Housing Authorities (p. 20).

Two of these recommendations have already been incorporated into the OCP. The intention to enter into partnership agreements has been expressed. The Cash-in-lieu policy remains outstanding.

The consultant also recommended that the District consider other policy issues such as:

a) Permitting secondary suites in an expanded number of residential zones;

b) Utilizing Comprehensive Development Zones as a means of encouraging and facilitating innovative solutions for affordable housing;

c) Protecting individuals who are displaced by the destruction of affordable housing stock and/or the conversion of rental housing to a different form of tenure (i.e. strata conversion); and

d) Lobbying both the Federal and Provincial governments for increased grants and funding for affordable housing initiatives.

These recommendations are within the ability of the District to address within the short term.

Recommendations with respect to design issues were also offered including considerations for flexible and adaptable housing, work-live-shop relationships, green building/energy efficiency, access to community gardens, functional indoor-outdoor space relationships, reduced parking requirements where cooperative transportation opportunities are provide and the accommodation of small pets (p. 21). These
ideas are worthy of further consideration in due course, perhaps as “next steps” to the initial Housing Action Plan.

The stated goal of the Enns report was to “…provide information and tools for developers that will be of value as the District of Peachland works to implement their inclusionary policy”. The report provided an overview of various interpretations of the definition affordable housing, a table showing how many municipalities throughout BC have attempted to address the issues, selected project examples and some interesting design concepts for affordable housing. However, it has only marginally advanced the District towards creation of a strategy to promote the development of affordable housing in Peachland. Many of the concepts and tools identified in the report are impractical in the District of Peachland. Many solutions implemented in larger jurisdictions do not have applicability (i.e. employee housing) to our community with respect to needs, resources and scale of development activity. Aspirations for affordable housing in our community need to be consistent with the capacity of the development community, non-profit housing agencies and the District to satisfy those aspirations and should support a relevant mix of housing types along the affordable housing continuum recognizing that not all segments are of equal relevance in our community.

Several of the project examples and concepts contained within the Enns report describe secondary dwellings, whether contained in a principle dwelling or in some form of accessory building. Labeling these units as secondary suites, garden suites, granny flats, carriage houses, laneway housing, cohousing cabins, hybrid bungalows or micro units does nothing to increase the number of available options. Clearly, secondary dwellings, whether located within a building as a secondary dwelling or within an accessory building to the principle residential use are just that, secondary dwellings traditionally referred to as secondary suites. Many multiple unit residential options require leadership from an independent housing agency. As such, the District would be well served by considering what can be offered to potential social and affordable housing providers to encourage construction of a project such as the Apple Valley Seniors Housing Project recently constructed in Kelowna by several partners for operation by the Society of Hope or the project envisioned by the Peachland Seniors Support Society. Provision of a cash-in-lieu option as an alternative to construction of on-site affordable units in small to medium size developments could be directed to a reserve for such a project.

EXISTING POLICY:

OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN

The following is an overview of the existing policies contained in the District of Peachland Official Community Plan.

Section 7.3 (1) of the Official Community Plan (OCP) states that one of Council’s objectives is to, “Provide a range of residential opportunities for citizens of the District, regardless of financial resources, age and household composition”. (OCP, p. 32)

Section 7.4 (5) states that, “The District of Peachland will support compact housing for seniors and other groups, affordable housing and rental housing in those areas designated for Medium Density and Mixed Density Transition”. (OCP, p. 33).

Section 7.5 Affordable Housing Policies states that the District of Peachland will implement an affordable housing strategy that considers and recognizes residents’ diverse housing needs.” (OCP, p. 34).

The policy that, “The District of Peachland shall enter into housing agreements with developers in the provision and support of affordable housing, where affordable housing units are provided” has not yet been implemented as the affordable units negotiated to date remain unconstructed. It is anticipated that the first units will be realized when the Ponderosa-Pincushion development reaches the threshold requiring the provision of affordable housing identified in their Phased Development Agreement (PDA). All affordable housing units promised to date were specifically provided for as part of Comprehensive Development Zones. This seems to be the extent of the District’s exploration of “inclusionary measures for affordable housing which could include mixed income and use neighbourhoods within Area Sector Plans.” (OCP, p. 34)
While the OCP provided that, “The District of Peachland may create an affordable housing society”, there is no indication that such an organization has been pursued. An initiative to create a regional housing authority through the Regional Growth Strategy process was abandoned during the course of document consultation as a result of non-support by the City of Kelowna.

The District of Peachland has acted upon the following two OCP policies in supporting the Habitat for Humanity Project by undertaking to provide the land and development fees for the construction of four to six units on Princeton Avenue:

“The District of Peachland:

- may, where opportunities exist and are deemed beneficial to the community, provide municipally owned land for the provision of affordable housing; and
- will consider waiving or reducing Development Cost Charges for not for profit rental housing…” (OCP, p. 35).

While the OCP provides that the District “may provide density bonuses to developers who provide affordable housing in new larger developments”, to date no developments have been constructed utilizing this provision. It is unclear from the policy statement what constitutes a “larger development”. Further, it is noted that the realization of addition density in a hillside environment is often impractical.

A thorough discussion of the opportunities and limitations associated with a density bonus zoning approach is available in two documents: “Affordable Housing and Amenity Contributions from Urban Development Projects in Kelowna: Interim Report”, Draft dated February 2008 prepared by Coriolis Consulting Corp. and the “Draft District of West Kelowna Affordable Housing Strategy” dated February 11, 2010 prepared by CitySpaces Consulting, available on the City of Kelowna and District of West Kelowna websites respectively. Anyone interested in pursuing this approach further would be well informed by a review of each of these documents.

According to the Coriolis report (p. 4), Peachland is a community in transition. As such land owners and developers need to be made aware of Council’s expectations relative to amenity contributions and the impact on land valuation pre-development approval (existing zoning) and post-development approval (OCP and/or Zoning amendments) so that local land values do not preclude the provision of the identified benefits to the community. Affordable housing is frequently identified as a community amenity; an asset that improves community livability and in the case of seniors housing can considerably extend the ability of residents to remain in the community as they age. Applicants for rezoning can be encouraged to consider assisting in the challenge of providing affordable housing in the community either through a voluntary contribution to the District’s Housing Opportunities Reserve Fund or by way of voluntary construction of affordable housing units. However, in the case of smaller developments the preference for cash-in-lieu contributions could be promoted.

**AMENITY CONTRIBUTION POLICY**

On September 6, 2011 Council adopted Official Community Plan Amending Bylaw Number 1969, 2010 to include text in the Official Community Plan (OCP) reflecting the District’s vision of providing high quality public facilities to the community and the means to accomplish that goal through a Community Amenity Contribution Policy. On October 25, 2011 Council adopted the District of Peachland Community Amenities Reserve Fund Establishment Bylaw Number 2015, 2011. Community Amenity Contribution Policy DEV-100 was authorized by Council effective January 22, 2013. This mechanism provides certainty to the community with respect to support for and funding of, identified future community infrastructure needs that cannot be funded through Development Cost Charges.

Implementation of Community Amenity Contribution tool is dependent upon the voluntary participation of developers; contributions to the established reserve fund are facilitated by two processes; density bonusing and Phased Development Agreements. While these tools are appropriate for very large scale developments such as Ponderosa-Pincushion and New Monaco, these cannot be practically implemented for smaller scale developments. The administrative costs associated with the establishment and
maintenance of the required agreements and processes are simply not supportable for small to moderate-size developments, with current District resources.

The model provided by the existing OCP language and the Community Amenity Contribution Policy may be applied to the provision of affordable housing if affordable housing is duly recognized as a form of community amenity. OCP section 17.7.3 states that, “amenity contributions be collected based on mutual agreement between the District of Peachland and the applicant, as a result of:

   “a) Establishment of a “bonus density” zone under section 904 under the Local Government Act that requires the amenity contributions in relation to a density bonus, at either the subdivision or building permit stage for single family dwellings and at the building permit stage for multiple family residential, commercial and industrial buildings.

   b) Agreed to as part of a Phased Development Agreement enabled under Section 905 of the Local Government Act, or other mechanisms authorized by the District’s enabling legislation.” (OCP Amending Bylaw Number 1969, 2010).

However, there is no legal impediment to a developer volunteering to contribute to the Community Amenities Reserve Fund in cases where neither of these mechanisms are utilized.

The Community Amenity Contribution Policy does not currently address affordable housing as a community amenity. As such, applicants may refuse to provide affordable housing as part of their proposed development. Establishing a parallel policy to the Community Amenity Contribution Policy to support a Housing Opportunities Reserve Fund would demonstrate Council’s desire to address housing challenges. It is duly recommended that contributions to such a fund be consistent with similar donations received by the District in the past. Ultimately, it is for Council to decide whether a deviation from OCP policy is acceptable or not, but this pair of reserve funds would provide a viable framework for meeting community needs. Voluntary contributions to reserve funds are largely reliant on the cooperation of individual developers who appreciate the legislative restrictions experienced by local governments and wish to demonstrate support for the concept of creating a complete and well served community.

AREA STRUCTURE PLANS

It appears that there was a flurry of activity in the District of Peachland in mid-2011. Each of the three adopted ASPs was subject to either amendment or adoption and the Amenity Contribution Bylaw was adopted by Council in September 2011. The text of each of the adopted and consolidated Area Structure Plans (Lower Princeton, Ponderosa/Pincushion Ridge and New Monaco) has been surveyed for reference to affordable housing.

LOWER PRINCETON ASP

The Lower Princeton ASP repeats the policies stated in the OCP to:

- “Coordinate and cooperate with non-profit organizations in the provision of affordable and special needs housing”; and
- Identify the sites suitable for affordable and special needs housing” (p. 7).

The Lower Princeton plan goes on to state that, “While an overall goal of 10% of the units in the plan area to be affordable housing would be desired, it is difficult to facilitate in the situation of multiple owners within a plan area. Therefore, in order to ensure housing is more attainable for entry level purchasers and young families, the District should encourage developers within the plan area to:

- Enter into housing agreement for non-profit housing units;
- Bonus density to be used in exchange for the provision of affordable housing, and
- If the 10% target cannot be practically achieved, cash-in-lieu to be provided in agreement with the District of Peachland.”
The Lower Princeton plan further states that, “The District of Peachland has established new affordable housing policies in April which permit the District to provide density bonusing to developers who provide affordable housing in new large developments” (p. 28). As previously noted, it is not clear what number of units qualifies as a “larger” development.

PONDEROSA/PINCUSHION RIDGE ASP & PHASED DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT (PDA)

The Ponderosa/Pincushion Ridge ASP was the result of the District’s first efforts to responsibly address the issue of affordable housing in a “larger development”. The plan advises that, “By providing for a variety of housing choices, the settlement will address the needs of affordable housing and age-in-place livability, and will offer a lifestyle-enriching, interactive social setting” (p. 3). Emphasis seems to be on the opportunity for residents to “age-in-place”. The plan calls for 210 affordable housing units to be provided within the development. In particular subsection 5.3.8 addresses affordable housing as follows:

“A component of affordable housing will be included in the Plan Area to make housing more attainable for entry level purchasers and young families. The development proposal is to:

- Enter into housing agreements for non-profit housing units;
- Develop an affordable housing target of 10% of residential units being developed;
- Bonus density to be used in exchange for the provision of affordable housing at the option and in agreement with the District of Peachland;
- If the target of 10% cannot be practically achieved, cash-in-lieu to be provided at the option and in agreement with the District of Peachland;
- Encourage the District of Peachland to define affordable housing; and
- Assist the District of Peachland in establishing the relationship between the provision of affordable housing and density bonuses in accord with the Local Government Act s. 904” (p. 14).

While section 7.1 of the ASP makes reference to an affordable housing strategy, the text simply reiterates the reference to density bonuses pursuant to LGA s. 904 found in the OCP. The optimization of land use is recommended as a means of both “minimizing urban sprawl” and “keeping the land cost component per unit as low as practical to help assist purchased in attaining housing” (p. 21). Subsection 7.9.4 makes reference to encouraging the inclusion of “affordable/attainable, entry level housing within each precinct in as much as is practical and in accord with the provision of LGA s. 904” (p. 28).

The Ponderosa/Pincushion Ridge Phased Development Agreement stipulates the timing for the provision of “affordable” units (before or concurrent with construction of the first 200 residential units), the mix of units provided within each phase of the development and the format for the Housing Agreements to be registered on title for each affordable unit.

File information indicates that the District contemplated the inclusion of rental accommodation as an affordable housing option for the development. It was clearly articulated that in any case, whether ownership or rental, affordable housing should be operated and administered by suitably qualified non-profit agencies. The administrative tasks of selecting purchasers or renters of the affordable housing units, the application of eligibility criteria and management of the ongoing affordability based on the Consumer Price Index should be made independently by the non-profit agency rather than by the developer or the District. Discussion on the establishment of a maximum unit price for ownership units included concern that the unit price not be based exclusively on the developer’s cost to build the unit and that due consideration be given to constructing units that satisfy identified community needs particularly with respect to size and location relative to community amenities and services.
NEW MONACO ASP

Subsection 5.1.1.9 of the New Monaco ASP makes specific reference to the suitability of “secondary dwellings” as a means of satisfying the demand for affordable housing by, “serving as”:

- Rental units ("mortgage helpers" for young families);
- Accommodation for care givers;
- Independent living for elderly family members” (p. 29).

The plan recognizes the importance of providing a diversity of housing types throughout the development site and recognizes in statement 5.1.1.12 that the provision of affordable housing will determined in cooperation with the District. It is not clear whether the suitable type of affordable housing will be determined on an ongoing basis as the development proceeds based on identified demand or whether a decision will be made in creating the comprehensive development zone and Phased Development Agreement. Subsection 5.8.1.1 states that, “New Monaco will include the provision of affordable non-market housing”. However, the who, what, where and when remain to be negotiated through the Phased Development Agreement process. The plan does state that, “community amenities will be provided at the time of rezoning” and “Amenities will match the District and developer's shared objectives of a diverse community vision and community facilities” (p. 43).

The Regional Housing Discussion Paper identified population and housing trends over the previous ten years. It is clear that the demand evident in earlier years of the decade to 2007 has considerably subsided. Development activity fueled by the inflated demand proved unsustainable. Much of the willingness of the development community to participate in addressing issues such as affordable housing has similarly faded in response to economic realities.

The New Monaco Comprehensive Development Zone and the Phased Development Agreement (PDA) are under consideration by District staff in preparation for presentation to Council and the community. The changed economic climate is evidenced by the fact that the proposed PDA terms are consistent with neither the New Monaco ASP nor the Ponderosa/Pincushion Ridge PDA terms. It is duly recognized that consideration of the agreement will necessarily involve reconsideration of existing policies, including a reconsideration of the 10% inclusive zoning policy. There is an opportunity to explore functional ways that the housing continuum may be addressed moving forward.

PROPOSED HOUSING ACTION PLAN COMPONENTS

As stated in “Community Amenity Contributions: Balancing Community Planning, Public Benefits and Housing Affordability” (Ministry of Community, Sport and Cultural Development, p. 16), it is widely recognized that, “Strategies that facilitate an increase in the supply of housing have a positive effect on affordability”. As such, increasing the number of options available along the housing continuum within our community will enhance community health.

A Housing Action Plan, as defined by CMHC, provides municipalities with a framework that allows them to implement strategies intended to create and develop housing opportunities; it lays the foundation for success by identifying housing needs within the community and translates them into solutions. Council’s acceptance of the recommendations in this report and concurrent authorization for staff to proceed with policy and bylaw amendments will initiate the process. Creation and implementation of a Housing Action Plan, including the various supporting elements (OCP and Zoning Bylaw amendments, formal policy documents, etc.) would allow in-stream applicants of developments between three and one hundred units the ability to choose to have their developments considered relative to either the existing affordable housing policies or the refined policies as outlined in the new Plan.

The RGS Housing Discussion Paper states that, “…the Central Okanagan is on-course to have an additional 40,000 households by 2036, to continue the inevitable shift to an older population, and to
continue to experience fluctuating prices, rents, and affordability in pace with the regional economy". (p. 11). As such, we can be assured that housing challenges will continue to be experienced.

The following activities are within the legislative authority of the District to implement within a Housing Action Plan and are offered as the initial components of the proposed Housing Action Plan. Each component is supported by existing information. A brief explanation of each proposed activity follows the table.

Table 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Activity</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Timeline for Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Create a cash-in-lieu Affordable Housing Amenity Contribution Policy to support a Housing Opportunities Reserve Fund as an option for developments of greater than 3 units and less than 100 units outside of the Ponderosa-Pincushion Ridge and New Monaco ASP areas.</td>
<td>Provides greater flexibility for smaller scale developments; avoids the need to secure a non-profit housing provider(s) to administer housing agreements, particularly where a limited number of affordable housing units will be constructed. Does not affect the existing Community Amenity Contribution Policy.</td>
<td>Dependent on Council accepting the recommendations in this report and authorizing staff to proceed with policy and bylaw amendments. Intention is to make this option available to small-scale developers as soon as possible. No changes are proposed for the existing Community Amenity Policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Amendment of the Zoning Bylaw to authorize secondary suites in all residential zones.</td>
<td>Most commonly used method of increasing the availability of affordable rental housing; increases the feasibility of home ownership for households willing to share their dwelling.</td>
<td>Dependent upon Council’s adoption of the new Zoning Bylaw in 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Partnerships with not-for-profit agencies (i.e. Habitat for Humanity or Peachland Seniors Support Society) including gifting of land and/or waiving, reducing or payment of DCCs.</td>
<td>Immediate construction of housing specific to the needs of identified individuals using suitably qualified specialists.</td>
<td>Immediate/Underway. In future, contributions to a Housing Opportunities Reserve Fund would be available to support ongoing activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Exploration of the concept of “adaptable housing”</td>
<td>Integration of requirements for adaptable housing into policy and bylaws as appropriate.</td>
<td>Housing Action Plan “Next Step”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Cash-in-lieu Affordable Housing Amenity Contribution Policy would support a Housing Opportunities Reserve Fund that could be used for projects identified in the Housing Action Plan. In particular, this could be used as a funding source for partnership activities with non-profit housing providers such as Habitat for Humanity or others, as appropriate opportunities are identified. It is envisioned that a per unit contribution would be calculated based on identified activity targets including support for a Seniors’
Housing Project to be located in the fan area of the community. It is anticipated that such a policy would be more appealing to developers of smaller developments (three to 100 units) than the provision of actual housing units within each development as the financial commitment would be considerably less. In this way, both the needs of families and the senior population could be addressed. It is likely that the per unit contribution (for three or more units) will be in the neighbourhood of $1000/unit. This amount would be consistent with the per unit amount previously negotiated for the proposed Princess Street multi-family residential development and similar policies in Langford and Saanich.

Recent Council support for the Habitat for Humanity Project demonstrates that Council has already embraced a very practical way to facilitate the provision of affordable housing in our community. This is a great example of the ability of housing providers in the community to identify a specific need and to engage mutual resources to realize tangible results. This type of activity is appropriate to the scale of the District of Peachland. The availability of funds in a Housing Opportunities Fund would allow to the District to continue supporting these types of projects and may even put the District in the position of partnering with non-profit housing providers to leverage government funding as opportunities arise.

Secondary suites and other forms of secondary housing were highlighted as practical solutions to providing affordable housing, particularly for rental tenure. Successful implementation will be dependent on a program to facilitate legalization of existing suites, including a communication plan to alert owners to the benefits of legalized suites. Council has previously reviewed proposed regulations and an implementation strategy as part of the Zoning Bylaw replacement project. The Housing Action Plan will incorporate the relevant action items.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

The challenge of ensuring that affordable housing is provided along the housing continuum has absorbed a tremendous quantity of resources over the last decade or more in British Columbia. The information available is plentiful and can be financially complex. The tools identified in this report are brought forward for Council’s consideration because they are common, practical and easily implemented.

There is an immediate need in the community for affordable housing that will not be satisfied for a considerable and undetermined length of time by the proposed large developments underway in Peachland (Ponderosa/Pincushion Ridge and New Monaco). Therefore, it would seem appropriate for the District to consider options for the provision of affordable housing that are more immediate and within the current capacity of the District to facilitate.

The District’s pursuit of affordable housing through mandatory inclusionary housing policies has not to date, resulted in the construction of any “affordable housing units”. As such, alternative approaches are due Council consideration. In particular, the requirement that developers construct affordable units within their proposed developments and register a Housing Agreement against the title seem to be discouraging smaller scale developments (three to 100 units) from proceeding because of the considerable cost associated with providing 10% of the units constructed at below market prices, whether rental or ownership units. There needs to be a practical way for smaller developments to contribute to the provision of affordable housing; a way that does not unnecessarily burden the process with the creation and cementing of development concepts into comprehensive development zones and/or phased development agreements. If the District wants to encourage infill development this considerable issue needs to be addressed.

Further, given the considerable administrative burden that establishment and management of affordable housing agreements would place on the District, entering into such agreements is impractical at this time when only a very limited number of units would be involved. Adequate resources will need to be dedicated to the task of establishing procedures and protocol for the administration of Affordable Housing Agreements prior to the construction of the units promised to date. That challenge will be met in due course.

Outside of large multi-year comprehensive developments, the District should focus on providing the types of housing that have already been identified as important to the community. The presence of secondary suites within the existing housing stock, interest in creating secondary suites in accessory buildings
(garden suites), partnerships with established housing providers such as Habitat for Humanity and demonstrated community support for seniors housing all represent realistic and achievable goals for affordable housing in Peachland. A Housing Opportunities Reserve Fund would provide the District with funds to pursue the activities identified in a Housing Action Plan.

Over the last several years many approved developments have failed to come to fruition as originally anticipated. It is duly recognized that developers require the flexibility to respond to market demand in a way that is consistent with the current economic climate. The District should focus on providing developers a stable and predictable policy environment that facilitates the creation of complete communities served by the appropriate community amenities.
District of Peachland
Request for Decision

To: COTW
From: Director of Finance Doug Pryde
Date: March 14, 2014
Subject: 2014 Water Rates Bylaw

Implications of Recommendation:
General: N/A
Organizational: N/A
Financial: The average residential water bill will increase by $21 per year.
Policy: N/A
Strategic Plan: N/A

Background:
The water operating budget was presented at the Committee of the Whole on March 11, 2014 identifying additional operating projects including a $35,000 water audit, a $13,500 turbidity control gate at Deep Creek, and a $39,600 Peachland Creek Channel Assessment (partially funded by a $29,800 Okanagan Basin Water Board grant). As a result, user fee revenue must increase by approximately $56,600 above actual 2013 user fee revenue in order to fund these projects. This converts to a 5.9% increase in user fees assessed to the average residential water consumer. Keeping the base rate the same, the residential consumption rate will increase from $0.30 to $0.35 per cubic meter. In addition, the agricultural rate will increase by one cent from $0.10 to $0.11 per cubic meter.


Options: 1. COTW MAY CHOOSE TO SUPPORT THE RECOMMENDATION
2. COTW MAY CHOOSE TO REFER BACK TO STAFF FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
3. COTW CAN CHOOSE TO NOT SUPPORT THE RECOMMENDATION
THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF PEACHLAND

BYLAW NUMBER 2073, 2014

A Bylaw to amend the Water Rates Bylaw No. 1931, 2010

WHEREAS the Council of the District of Peachland has adopted Water Rates Bylaw No. 1931, 2010;

AND WHEREAS it is deemed desirable to amend the Water Rates Bylaw No. 1931, 2010;

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the District of Peachland, in open meeting assembled, hereby ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:


2. This Bylaw may be cited for all purposes as “Water Rates Bylaw No. 1931, 2010 Amendment Bylaw Number 2073, 2014”.

3. This Bylaw shall take effect upon its adoption by the Council of the Corporation of The District of Peachland.

READ A FIRST TIME, this day of , 2014.

READ A SECOND TIME, this day of , 2014.

READ A THIRD TIME, this day of , 2014.

FINALLY RECONSIDERED AND ADOPTED, this day of , 2014.

Mayor

Corporate Officer

Dated at Peachland, B.C.

This day of , 2014.
## RATES AND CHARGES

### Metered Water Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single Detached Residential Allocation Fee</th>
<th>Base Fee</th>
<th>$55.50</th>
<th>per quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consumption Fee (0 – 400 m³ of water use)</td>
<td>$0.35</td>
<td>per m³ per quarter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption Fee (&gt; 400 m³ of water use)</td>
<td>$0.58</td>
<td>per m³ per quarter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple Unit Residential and Non-Domestic Allocation Fee</th>
<th>Base Fee based Meter Size:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Up to 38mm (1.5”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50mm (2”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75mm (3”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100m (4”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>150mm (6”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200mm (8”) or greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consumption Fee (for each m³ of water use)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agricultural Allocation Fee</th>
<th>Base Fee</th>
<th>$0.00</th>
<th>per quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consumption Fee (for each m³)</td>
<td>$0.11</td>
<td>per m³ per quarter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grey Area Properties</th>
<th>Base Fee for Cultivation Area Irrigation</th>
<th>$0.00</th>
<th>per quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consumption Fee (0-1250 m³ per acre) of Cultivation Area Irrigation</td>
<td>$0.35</td>
<td>per m³ per quarter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption Fee (&gt; 1250 m³ per acre) of Cultivation Area Irrigation</td>
<td>$0.58</td>
<td>per m³ per quarter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unmetered Water Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Allocation Fee</th>
<th>Initial Fee</th>
<th>$120.00</th>
<th>per quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fee after First Written Warning for non-installation of water meter</td>
<td>$160.00</td>
<td>per quarter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee after Second Written Warning for non-installation of water meter</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>per quarter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee as of April 1, 2010</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>per quarter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple Unit Residential and Non-Domestic Allocation Fee</th>
<th>Initial Fee</th>
<th>$300.00</th>
<th>per quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fee after First Written Warning for non-installation of water meter</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
<td>per quarter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee after Second Written Warning for non-installation of water meter</td>
<td>$900.00</td>
<td>per quarter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee as of April 1, 2010</td>
<td>$1,200.00</td>
<td>per quarter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agricultural Allocation Fee</th>
<th>Initial Fee</th>
<th>$300.00</th>
<th>per quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fee after First Written Warning for non-installation of water meter</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
<td>per quarter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee after Second Written Warning for non-installation of water meter</td>
<td>$900.00</td>
<td>per quarter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee as of April 1, 2010</td>
<td>$1,200.00</td>
<td>per quarter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Fees for New Meter Installations on New Construction

Actual cost of water meter plus the cost of meter inspection

### Water Connection Charges

**Serviced Property** *(i.e. existing connection between watermain and property line)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Size</th>
<th>Charge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 25mm (1”) service</td>
<td>$375.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25mm (1”) service</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38mm (1.5”) service</td>
<td>$550.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50mm (2”) service</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 50mm (2”) service</td>
<td>At Cost Plus 15% administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Un-serviced Property** *(i.e. no connection between watermain and property line)*

Actual Cost of installation, plus charges above for Serviced Property

### Temporary Fire Hydrant User Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Charge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connection Fee</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fire Hydrant Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Charge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application for a new fire hydrant</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation of a new fire hydrant</td>
<td>Actual cost plus 15% administration costs per hydrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of a hydrant without approval</td>
<td>$1,000.00 per occasion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Fire Hydrant Flow Test:</td>
<td>$330.00  per test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional tests in immediate area at the same time</td>
<td>$100.00 per test</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Charge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meter Re-read at Customer’s Request</td>
<td>At Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meter Testing at Customer’s Request</td>
<td>At Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstructed Meter Read</td>
<td>$200.00  per occasion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Meter Tampering Fee</td>
<td>$200.00  per occasion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee for Damage Due to Tampering</td>
<td>Water Meter Tampering Fee plus Cost for New Meter Installation per occasion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation of Backflow Device (pit)</td>
<td>At Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing of Back Flow Assembly</td>
<td>$50.00   per occasion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn-Off / Turn-On Fee</td>
<td>$75.00   per occasion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Hours Call Out</td>
<td>$265.00  per occasion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Golf Course Water Rates

A discount of ten percent will be applied to the Multiple Unit Residential and Non-Domestic base rate and consumption rate for golf course irrigation on the condition that irrigation would take place during off-peak hours *(i.e. night time watering only)*.