## Public Hearing No. 2

Mayor Calls Public Hearing to Order for "Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 2023-19"
Reads Opening Statement and Introduction of Bylaw
"Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 2023-19"
Purpose: To amend Zoning Bylaw No. 2023-08 as follows:
Rezone Lot B District Lot 3 Group 7 Similkameen Division Yale (Formerly Yale Lytton) District Plan EPP112534, located at 951 Dynes Avenue, and Lot A District Lot 3 Group 7 Similkameen Division Yale (Formerly Yale Lytton) District Plan EPP112534, located at 963 Dynes Avenue, from R2 (Small Lot Residential) to RM3 (Medium Density Multiple Housing), with the following site specific provision:

1. Apartments shall not be a permitted use.

The applicants are proposing to develop the subject properties into a multifamily residential development in the form of townhouse units. The development proposes 13 townhouse units, 3 storeys in height, with one block of 6 townhouse units facing Dynes Avenue and another block of 7 townhouse units facing towards the laneway.

Notice: Pursuant to the Local Government Act the Public Hearing was advertised on Friday, June 9, 2023 and Wednesday, June 14, 2023 in an online news source and the newspaper.

CO No letters have been received regarding the Zoning Amendment Bylaw (as of noon Wednesday, June 14, 2023).

Mayor Requests Development Services staff describe the proposed bylaw
Mayor Invitation to applicant for comment or elaboration on the application
Mayor Invitation to electronic and in person participants to present their views
Mayor Invites Council members to ask questions
Mayor Invites applicants to respond to questions

## Regular Council Meeting

held at City Hall, Council Chambers
171 Main Street, Penticton, B.C.
Tuesday, June 6, 2023
at 1:00 p.m.

## Resolutions

### 8.3 Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 2023-19

Development Variance Permit PL2022-9370
Development Permit PL2022-9369
Re: 951 and 963 Dynes Avenue

## It was MOVED and SECONDED

THAT Council give first reading to "Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 2023-19", for Lot B District Lot 3 Group 7 Similkameen Division Yale (Formerly Yale Lytton) District Plan EPP112534, located at 951 Dynes Avenue and Lot A District Lot 3 Group 7 Similkameen Division Yale (Formerly Yale Lytton) District Plan EPP112534, located at 963 Dynes Avenue, a bylaw to rezone the subject properties from R2 (Small Lot Residential) to RM3 (Medium Density Multiple Housing), with the following site specific provision:

1. Apartments shall not be a permitted use.

AND THAT Council forward "Zoning Amendment Bylaw. No. 2023-19" to the June 20, 2023 Public Hearing;
AND THAT Council, subject to adoption of "Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 2023-19", consider denying the associated "Development Variance Permit PL2022-9370", a permit to vary the following sections of Zoning Bylaw No. 2023-08:

1. Section 10.10.2.3: to increase maximum lot coverage from $50 \%$ to $56.5 \%$;
2. Section 10.10.2.7: to reduce the minimum interior side yard from 4.5 to 2.1 m ;
3. Section 10.10.2.9: to reduce the minimum rear yard from 6.0 m to 1.5 m ; and
4. Section 5.2 , Table 5.1 to waive the requirement for landscaping buffers along the east and west property line.
AND THAT Council, subject to consideration of "Development Variance Permit PL2022-9370", consider denying the associated "Development Permit PL2022-9369", a permit for the construction of 13 residential units in the form of two rows of townhouses.

THAT Council, in accordance with Section 507 of the Local Government Act, require the following excess and extended services:

- Upgrade of the existing 100 mm water main from the development to Sydney Street.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

## Council Report

Date:
June 6, 2023
To:
From:
Address:

Subject: Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 2023-19
Development Variance Permit PL2022-9370
Development Permit PL2022-9369
Donny van Dyk, Chief Administrative Officer
Nicole Capewell, Planner II
951 and 963 Dynes Avenue

File No: RMS/951 Dynes Ave

## Staff Recommendation

## Zoning Amendment

THAT COUNCIL give first reading to "Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 2023-19", for Lot B District Lot 3 Group 7 Similkameen Division Yale (Formerly Yale Lytton) District Plan EPP112534, located at 951 Dynes Avenue and Lot A District Lot 3 Group 7 Similkameen Division Yale (Formerly Yale Lytton) District Plan EPP112534, located at 963 Dynes Avenue, a bylaw to rezone the subject properties from R2 (Small Lot Residential) to RM3 (Medium Density Multiple Housing), with the following site specific provision:

1. Apartments shall not be a permitted use.

AND THAT Council forward "Zoning Amendment Bylaw. No. 2023-19" to the June 20, 2023 Public Hearing;

## Development Variance Permit and Development Permit

AND THAT Council, subject to adoption of "Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 2023-19", consider and deny the associated "Development Variance Permit PL2022-9370", a permit to vary the following sections of Zoning Bylaw No. 2023-08:

1. Section 10.10.2.3: to increase maximum lot coverage from $50 \%$ to $56.5 \%$;
2. Section 10.10.2.7: to reduce the minimum interior side yard from 4.5 to 2.1 m ;
3. Section 10.10.2.9: to reduce the minimum rear yard from 6.0 m to 1.5 m ; and
4. Section 5.2, Table 5.1 to waive the requirement for landscaping buffers along the east and west property line.

AND THAT Council, subject to consideration of "Development Variance Permit PL2022-9370", consider and deny the associated "Development Permit PL2022-9369", a permit for the construction of 13 residential units in the form of two rows of townhouses.

THAT Council, in accordance with Section 507 of the Local Government Act, require the following excess and extended services:

- Upgrade of the existing 100 mm water main from the development to Sydney Street.


## Strategic Priority Objective

Livable and Accessible: Proactively plan for deliberate growth; focused on an inclusive, healthy, safe and desirable place to live.

## Proposal

The applicants are proposing to develop the subject properties into a multi-family residential development in the form of townhouse units. The development proposes 13 townhouse units, 3 storeys in height, with one block of 6 townhouse units facing Dynes Avenue and another block of 7 townhouse units facing towards the laneway (Figure 1).


Figure 1 - Conceptual Rendering of Proposed Development

In order to accommodate the development as designed, the following applications are required:

1. Rezone the subject properties from R2 (Small Lot Residential) to RM3 (Medium Density Multiple Housing), with the provision that an apartment building is not permitted to be consistent with the OCP,
2. Vary several sections of the Zoning Bylaw as follows:
a. Increase lot coverage from $50 \%$ to $56.5 \%$,
b. Reduce the minimum interior side yard from 4.5 to 2.1 m ,
c. Reduce the minimum rear yard from 6.0 m to 1.5 m , and
d. Waive the requirement for landscaping buffers along the east and west property lines
3. Development Permit for the form and character of the development.

At this time, staff are supportive of the request to amend the zoning on the properties, as this amendment is aligned with the OCP vision for the property. However, staff are not supportive of the development as proposed, as there are a significant number of variances needed, which staff do not consider are justified in this instance. The option staff is recommending would allow the zoning on the properties to be amended, but require that the applicant continue to work with staff to develop a proposal that is more aligned with the OCP guidelines and the Zoning Bylaw regulations.

## Background

The subject properties (951 and 963 Dynes Avenue) are located within the northern end of Penticton (Figure 2). This area of the City is known for its local amenities, including Lakawanna Park, Okanagan Lake, the Channel (Okanagan River) Riverside Plaza, the South Okanagan Events Centre (SOEC), Community Centre, and Cleland Theatre, among others. The properties are along the north side of Dynes Avenue, and are outside of the boundary of the North Gateway plan area.

The subject properties are currently zoned R2 (Small Lot Residential) and designated by the City's Official Community Plan as ‘Ground Oriented Residential' (Figure 4). Each lot is approximately $723.4 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ in size, and once consolidated they will be 0.35 acres ( $1,446 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ ).

## Climate Impact

Council adopted the Community Climate Action Plan (CCAP) in 2021. The proposed development is consistent with the following aspects of the CCAP:


Figure 2 - Property Location Map

- Shift Beyond the Car: Encourage active \& accessible transportation and transit
o Class 1 and Class 2 bicycle parking spaces provided, meeting the Zoning Bylaw requirements.
o Transit nearby - bus routes exist along Churchill Ave to the north of the properties.
- Step Up New Buildings: All new buildings will be required to meet the BC Energy Step Code requirements at the time of construction.
o The two proposed buildings will be required to meet Step Code 3 as a minimum standard of energy efficiency.


## Technical Review

The application package has been reviewed by the Technical Planning Committee, a group of internal staff who review development applications. A number of comments were provided by various departments relating to the current proposal, and future requirements for subsequent applications if the planning applications were successful.

Staff have worked for several months with the applicant to resolve many design concerns that were present in the original submission. While some were able to be resolved, related to parking, hard surfacing, balcony projections, floor projections, etc. many concerns were not able to be resolved. There were several plan iterations that were submitted and reviewed by many City staff in an attempt to progress the application.

Most significantly, it was identified that there is infrastructure in this area of the City that will need to be upgraded to allow for multifamily developments and increased density. In order to obtain the required fire flow from the hydrant for the development as proposed, the applicant would be required to upgrade the 100 mm water main from Sydney Avenue to the eastern edge of the property (Figure 2).


Figure 3 - Location of Water Main Requiring Upgrade

## Infrastructure - Storm Water

The other significant item identified was regarding storm water management. In the City of Penticton, it is a requirement for storm water to be managed and disposed of on-site. Due to the high water table in this area of the City, on-site disposal of storm water is challenging, although it is possible for most multi-family developments. For the proposed development the high lot coverage and development design leave only a small amount of space available for on-site disposal. The developer is proposing to dispose of their storm water off-site and as they not be able to design a system to accommodate storm water on-site. This would require the applicant to extend storm water infrastructure from Power St , approximately 200 m to the property (Figure 3). This would be a significant cost, in excess of $\$ 250,000$. It will be the applicant's responsibility to determine if this is required at future building permit stages. If extension of the storm water system is required, it will be solely at the applicant's expense.


Figure 4 - Location of Storm Water Extension, if required

## Infrastructure - Electrical

Additionally, as proposed, the design requires the removal and relocation of a power pole. The way that the applicant has designed the front of the property and the interface with the City boulevard, they will be required to move the existing power pole to make room for the required sidewalk. This will require review and likely relocation of many other power poles along this block of Dynes Avenue. The applicant has discussed this with the electrical department, and is aware of this additional cost and has chosen to proceed with the design as is.

## Cash-in-lieu Parking

Zoning Bylaw 2023-08 (Section 6.1.2.2) includes a provision that allows applicants to pay cash-in-lieu of providing vehicle parking spaces for specified zones. For the proposed development, the RM3 (Medium Density Multiple Housing) zone allows cash-in-lieu, but it shall not be used to lower the total number of parking spaces to below one parking space per dwelling unit. The current rate is $\$ 13,000.00$ per space and the applicant is proposing to utilize this for one visitor parking space. These funds will be deposited into the Off-Street Parking Reserve and Alternative Transportation Infrastructure Reserve at the rate of $75 \%$ to the Off-Street Parking Reserve and 25\% to the Alternative Transportation Infrastructure Reserve. The applicant is proposing to use cash-in-lieu for one parking space not provided on site.

## Development Statistics

The following table outlines the proposed development statistics on the plans submitted with the development application:

|  | RM3 Zone Requirement | Provided on Plans |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Minimum Lot Width*: | 25 m | 36.58 m |
| Minimum Lot Area*: | $1,400 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | $1,447 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| Maximum Lot Coverage: | $50 \%$ | $56.5 \%$ * Variance Requested |
| Maximum Hard Surfacing | $60 \%$ | $56.5 \%$ |
| Maximum Density: | 1.6 Floor Area Ratio (FAR) | 1.3 Floor Area Ratio (FAR) |
| Vehicle Parking: | 1 space per unit resident | Total provided |


|  | 0.25 space per unit visitor <br> Total required: <br> 13 resident <br> 3 visitor | 13 resident <br> 2 visitor** <br> ** 1 visitor space not provided <br> (cash in lieu) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bicycle Parking | Class 1 required 0.5 per unit ( 7 required) <br> Class 2 required 0.1 per unit (2 required) | Class 1 provided: 13 spaces Class 2 provided: 4 spaces |
| Required Setbacks <br> Front Yard (Dynes Ave): <br> Side Yard (east): <br> Side Yard (west): <br> Rear Yard (lane): | $\begin{aligned} & 3.0 \mathrm{~m} \\ & 4.5 \mathrm{~m} \\ & 4.5 \mathrm{~m} \\ & 6.0 \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | 4.29 m <br> 2.1 m * Variance Requested <br> 2.1 m <br> 1.5 m * Variance Requested |
| Amenity Space | $20 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ per dwelling unit $25 \%$ must be provided at grade Total amenity required $=260 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ with $65 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ at grade | Total amenity space provided = $728.9 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$, which includes each unit having a private rooftop patio ranging in size from $44.5 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ to $57 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$. <br> $113.8 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ provided at grade |
| Landscaping Buffer | Required along south, east and west property lines | Provided along south property line only *Variance Requested |
| Maximum Building Height | 24 m | 12.35 m |
| Other Information: | *Lot width and lot area are only applicable at the time of subdivision. ** Zoning Bylaw Section 6.1.2.2 allows cash-in-lieu at the rate of $\$ 13,000.00$ per parking space not provided. The applicant plans to use this for one parking space. |  |

## Analysis

## Zoning Amendment

The Official Community Plan (OCP) designation for the subject property is 'Ground Oriented Residential', which supports medium density residential areas with multi-family developments where each unit has an exterior door, or bareland stratas (Figure 4). Townhouses, duplexes with suites, cluster housing and fourplexes are some of the building types envisioned in this designation. The applicant is proposing to construct two rows of townhouse units (total 13 dwelling units) on the property. In order to comply with the OCP designation, staff are proposing a site-specific provision for the subject properties that would not allow an apartment to be constructed, as this type of building is usually permitted by the RM3 zone but is not supported through the 'Ground Oriented Residential' designation. Amending the zoning to RM3, with a site specific statement will align the properties with the vision of properties designated within the 'Ground Oriented Residential' designation, and avoids the potential for a new plan to come in for an apartment building after the property is rezoned which is not the intent of the 'Ground Oriented Residential' designation.

| Land Use | Description | Building Type(s) | Uses | Height/ Density | Zone(s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ground Oriented Residential | Medium-density residential areas with multi-family developments where each unit has an exterior door and construction is primarily wood frame, or bareland stratas. | - Duplexes with suites <br> - Cluster housing <br> - Fourplexes higherdensity rowhouses <br> - Townhouses and stacked townhouses <br> - Bareland strata developments | - Residential <br> - Limited Service/ <br> Retail | - Up to 3 ½ storeys | - RM2 <br> - RM5 <br> - C2 |

Figure 5 - OCP Land Use Designation
In addition to alignment with the future land use designation, staff consider that the proposed zoning amendment will also allow for a development that is supported through the following OCP Goals and Policies:

OCP Policy Focus new residential development in or adjacent to existing developed areas.
4.1.1.1

OCP Policy Encourage more intensive "infill" residential development in areas close to the 4.1.3.1 Downtown, to employment, services and shopping, through zoning amendments for housing types compatible with existing neighbourhood character, with form and character guided by Development Permit Area Guidelines.
OCP Policy Ensure through the use of zoning that more-intensive forms of residential development
4.1.3.5

OCP Policy are located close to transit and amenities, such as parks, schools and shopping.
4.1.3.6 Require amenity areas in all multifamily and mixed-use projects through regulations in the Zoning Bylaw.

The proposed rezoning to RM3 to allow a townhouse development, while prohibiting apartments, is consistent with the increased density and building forms envisioned by the 'Ground Oriented Residential' designation and supported by OCP housing policies.

Given that there is policy through the OCP to support the proposed zoning amendment, staff recommend that Council give first reading to "Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 2023-19", and forward the bylaw to the June 20, 2023 Public Hearing to gather comments and feedback from the public.

## Deny Development Variance Permit

While staff are supportive of the zoning amendment request to allow a townhouse development, staff have concerns with the current development plans. Staff and the applicant have worked diligently over several months to try to address the technical concerns and reduce the number and significance of the variances being requested. However, the applicant was unable to present a development proposal that has staff support at this time.

When considering a variance to a City bylaw, staff encourages Council to consider whether approval of the variance would cause a negative impact on neighbouring properties and if the variance request is reasonable. The proposed development requires four variances in order to fit 13 townhouse units on the subject property. A summary of the variances and staff's analysis is provided below.

- Staff requested that the applicant provide further justification and explanation as to how their development was designed in such a way as to reduce the impact of the requested variances to the surrounding properties and area. However, this has not been completed.
- Staff requested that the applicant reach out to neighbouring property owners to share the development plans ahead of the Council process and inquire about the potential impacts that the requested variances may have. However, this has not been completed.
- Generally, staff do not feel that the variances have been justified, and the applicant has not demonstrated how the proposed design could mitigate the impact on neighbouring properties.
- The number of variances, and the significance of them when considered collectively, is a concern to staff. Staff do not feel that the intent of the RM3 zone is being followed, and do not support the variances.

1. Section 10.10.2.7: to reduce the minimum interior side yard from 4.5 to 2.1 m and
2. Section 5.2, Table 5.1 to not require landscaping buffers along the east and west property line.

- Note: staff's comments for the interior side yard reduction and landscaping buffer variances are related and have been noted together below:
- Staff have supported setback reductions for interior side yards in the RM3 zone from 4.5 m to 3.0 m for several developments over the years. These were often for townhouse developments, or for developments that do not reach the maximum height allowed under the RM3 zone ( 24 m or 6 storeys). Typically taller buildings should have larger setbacks, to help reduce overlook and shadowing on neighbouring properties. In this instance, staff cautioned the applicant early on that a 2.1 m interior side yard was a significant request, and without design considerations, staff were unlikely to support. Design considerations that could be demonstrated may include limited windows, or opaque windows to reduce overlook to neighbouring properties; demonstrating shadowing impacts; contacting neighbours to discuss their concerns; utilizing building materials and stepbacks to minimize the massing.
- Typically, staff do not support a setback reduction of less than 3.0 m , as this is also the desired width to ensure the required landscaping buffers are provided. In this instance, the applicant is requesting to reduce the side yard setback, and also eliminate the landscaping buffers along either side of the property, as there is not enough room to provide trees and shrubs on the side yards due to how close the proposed buildings are to the lot lines.
- There is an array of benefits that landscaping such as trees and shrubs, bring to a development, as well as to the City itself. Landscaping buffers help to create delineation between properties, streets, and different densities of development, help to beautify the area, reduce the heat island effect, assist with rainwater management, among many other benefits. Eliminating landscaping buffers on both the east and west sides of the property is not supported.
- The landscaping buffer would require the installation of 3 trees and 39 shrubs along both the east and west property lines ( 6 total between the two sides).
- Each unit has been provided with a private roof top patio, which are desirable and provide outdoor amenity space. However, the roof top patios on the end units nearest to the east and west property lines may impose on the privacy of the neighbouring properties. Having the interior side yard reduced to 2.1 m will increase the impact that this could have.

3. Section 10.10.2.9: to reduce the minimum rear yard from 6.0 m to 1.5 m ; and

- The setback reduction of the rear yard from 6.0 m to 1.5 m is a significant reduction, which locates the lane-facing row of 7 townhouse units, which is 12.35 m in height, only 1.5 m from the rear property line.
- There are no residential zones in the City that allow a structure of this height to be in such close proximity to the rear property line.
- In this instance there is a laneway to the rear, however the 6.0 m rear yard setback is required to ensure appropriate separation from other properties. Proper separation helps to maintain privacy, allows sunlight and solar access to other properties and avoids a valley of tall buildings directly adjacent to a laneway.
- Each unit has been provided with a private roof top patio, which are desirable and provide outdoor amenity space for the residents of those units. However, the roof top patios on the rear row of townhouse units nearest to the north property line, along the laneway, may impose on the privacy of the neighbouring properties. Having the rear side yard reduced to 1.5 m will increase the impact that this could have.

4. Section 10.10.2.3: to increase maximum lot coverage from $50 \%$ to $56.5 \%$;

- Staff consider that this variance could likely be eliminated or reduced if the applicant was to redesign the proposal to better align with the RM3 regulations. The significant interior side and rear yard setback reductions which are also requested allow more buildable area, which may be accountable for the increased lot coverage.
- Staff would likely not have concerns with the lot coverage variance if it was the only variance required.
- However, the impact of the number of variances when reviewed collectively are substantial, and as such, staff are not supportive of the variance requests.

Given the reasons above, staff do not recommend support for the four variances being requested. Staff do not feel that the variances have been adequately justified by the applicant within their letter of intent (Attachment ' $D$ ') and are not warranted in this instance. There may be impacts to the directly adjacent properties, and a precedence set if the variances proposed were to be supported.

Staff recommend that Council does not support Development Variance Permit PL2022-9370.

## Deny Development Permit

The proposed development is considered within the Multifamily Residential Development Permit Area of the OCP, which is established to enhance neighbourhoods and create sensitive transitions in scale and density by addressing issues such as privacy, landscape retention and neighbourliness.

Staff are not recommending support for the Development Permit application. Given that staff are not supportive of the variance requests, staff are not able to provide support for the associated Development Permit, which would approve the form and character of the development based on the requested variances being approved. Further, staff consider that the development directly contradicts with many of the OCP goals, policies and guidelines that should be adhered to including:

OCP Policy Recognize that some traditionally single-family neighbourhoods will see intensification 4.1.5.1 as the city grows, but ensure that new forms of residential development are compatible
with the neighbourhood in scale and design, and are appropriately located (e.g., greater density closer to collector roads, services and amenities).
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { OCP Policy } & \text { Use Multifamily and Intensive Residential Development Permit Area Guidelines to } \\ \text { 4.1.5.3 } & \text { direct, through the City's approval processes, the character and feel of residential }\end{array}$

## Development Permit Guidelines

| Guideline G2 | Applications shall include a comprehensive site plan - considering adjacent context for building and landscape architectural design and neighbourhood character analysis - to demonstrate that the development is sensitive to and integrated within its context and surrounding uses and neighbours. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Staff comment | - While the applicant has provided a site plan, they do not consider or provide a neighbourhood character analysis nor have they demonstrated that the development is sensitive to and integrated within its context; especially with the variances that have been requested. |
| Guideline | Enhance the Urban Forest: |
| and 35 | Urban forests are recognized for the economic, social and environmental benefits they provide. In addition to considerations for form and character, enhancement of Penticton's urban forest will support health and well-being for all |
| Staff comment | - The applicant has provided 6 trees between the two buildings, located within private backyard amenity area of some of the units, however they are requesting to eliminate the landscaping buffers required on both the east and west sides of the development, which means fewer trees will be planted than if they were able to meet the Zoning Bylaw requirements for landscape buffers. |
| Guideline G38 | Screening and Buffering |
| Staff comment | Buffer design should complement neighbourhood character and landscape setting. <br> - Landscaping buffers are not provided along the east and west side yards. A landscaping buffer is provided along the south property line (Dynes Avenue). |

As such, staff recommend that Council does not support Development Permit PL2022-9369.

## Alternate Recommendations

Council may consider that the development proposed has merit, and that the variances may be warranted. The development as proposed would introduce 13 residential units to a desirable area of the City. Although there are concerns from staff with neighbourhood character and fit, in addition to the number of variances required to meet the RM3 zone, Council may feel that the addition of 13 residential units to the subject properties provides a greater benefit to the City. If this is the case, Council may wish to proceed to public hearing for the zoning amendment, and after adoption of the bylaw, may choose to support the requested variances and development permit as proposed.

If this is the case, Council may chose Alternate Recommendation \#1, as follows:

## Zoning Amendment

THAT Council give first reading to "Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 2023-19", for Lot B District Lot 3 Group 7 Similkameen Division Yale (Formerly Yale Lytton) District Plan EPP112534, located at 951 Dynes Avenue and

Lot A District Lot 3 Group 7 Similkameen Division Yale (Formerly Yale Lytton) District Plan EPP112534, located at 963 Dynes Avenue, a bylaw to rezone the subject properties from R2 (Small Lot Residential) to RM3 (Medium Density Multiple Housing), with the following site specific provision:

1. Apartments shall not be a permitted building type or use.

AND THAT Council forward "Zoning Amendment Bylaw. No. 2023-19" to the June 20, 2023 Public Hearing;
AND THAT Council, subject to adoption of "Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 2023-19" consider "Development Variance Permit PL2022-9370", a permit to vary the following sections of Zoning Bylaw No. 2023-08:

1. Section 10.10.2.3: to increase maximum lot coverage from $50 \%$ to $56.5 \%$;
2. Section 10.10.2.7: to reduce the minimum interior side yard from 4.5 to 2.1 m ;
3. Section 10.10.2.9: to reduce the minimum rear yard from 6.0 m to 1.5 m ; and
4. Section 5.2, Table 5.1 to not require landscaping buffers along the east and west property line.

Development Variance Permit and Development Permit
AND THAT Council, subject to approval of "Development Variance Permit PL2022-9370", approve "Development Permit PL2022-9369", a permit for the construction of 13 residential units in the form of two rows of townhouses.

AND THAT Council direct staff to issue "Development Variance Permit PL2022-9370" and "Development Permit PL2022-9369" subject to consolidation of the two subject properties into one lot.

## Excess and Extended Service

THAT Council, in accordance with Section 507 of the Local Government Act, require the following excess and extended services:

- Upgrade of the existing 100 mm water main from the development to Sydney Street.


## Attachments

Attachment A - Zoning Map
Attachment B - Official Community Plan Map
Attachment C - Photos of Property
Attachment D - Letter of Intent (applicant)
Attachment E - Development Permit Analysis (applicant)
Attachment F - Draft Development Variance Permit PL2022-9370
Attachment G - Draft Development Permit PL2022-9369
Attachment H - Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 2023-19

Respectfully submitted,

Nicole Capewell, RPP, MCIP
Planner II

Concurrence

| Director of <br> Development Services | General Manager of <br> Infrastructure | A/Chief <br> Administrative Officer |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathcal{B L}$ | $K D$ | $K D$ |




Attachment C - Photos of Property


Looking towards 963 Dynes Avenue from Dynes Avenue


Looking towards 951 Dynes Avenue from Dynes Avenue

```
City of Penticton
Planning Department
1 7 1 \text { Main Street}
Penticton BC
V2A 5A9
Attention: Ms. Nicole Capewell (Planner II)
```

Re: 951 \& 963 Dynes Ave.
Letter of Intent; Application for Rezoning and Development Permit

## Dear Jordan,

This application proposes a change of zoning from R2 to RM3 with 4 variances, following with Development Permit for 13 units townhomes in 2 buildings.

This address is a total of approximately 15,580 sf parcel that currently has two single family homes.
The proposed application is for construction of two, three story townhome buildings consisting of a sixplex and seven-plex units.

There will be a total of 11 two-bedroom units \& 2 three-bedroom units. The two-bedroom units will be approximately 164.7 to $172.8 \mathrm{~m}^{2}+/-$ in size and three-bedroom units will be $190.5 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ in size (Including garage at ground floor level)

## Background, goals

Penticton unique setting, in a valley \& bounded by two lakes, Provides both challenges and opportunities from a housing perspective. The opportunities come from a willingness to intensify the existing land base through infill and densification, in a smart and sensitive manner to allow the community to grow sustainably.

Changing housing needs and preferences in addition to affordability challenges that put single detached house out of reach for many households. Row housing or townhouses enhances affordability.

In terms of needs by housing type, the greatest demand will be for duplexes and infill (rowhouses, townhouses, etc.). Development of multifamily and infill housing meet the housing needs of the population and make the most efficient use of the limited land base and valuable infrastructure while is more affordable than single detached house.

## Density, Rezoning, Active Street

The Developer recognizes the impact that a new development such as this could have on its neighbors \& is proposing a density that is in line with the context of the neighborhood regarding site coverage, height, and building type.

Site coverage will be increased from $40 \%$ for existing R2 zoning to $50 \%$ for RM3 zoning. Height will be a moderate increase from the allowable in R2 rezoning of 10.5m, and Style of building is townhouse which is ground oriented and is in line with single families.

This strategy mitigates any concerns about over shadowing of neighboring properties. In addition to the rear lane on the north side, there is a public pathway on the east of the property that separates this parcel from the neighboring parcel.

Townhomes fronting Dynes Ave will provide active frontage that engage with the public sidewalk that will be constructed.

## Approved OCP

The current proposal is inline with the approved OCP and extensive design iteration and work has gone into developing a grade-oriented design to meet objective of approved OCP.

## Rezoning application

In conjunction with the OCP amendment, Tecai Custom Homes is proposing to rezone the subject parcel from R2-Small Lot Residential to RM3 Medium Density Multiple Housing. The purpose of RM3 zoning is to provide zoning for Medium Density Multiple Housing accommodating townhome development intended for this parcel.

The site has convenient walking, cycling, and vehicle access to daily necessities such as grocery, shopping, school, parks, and employment areas. The proximity of site to amenities such as food markets, IGA, real Canadian Superstore, as well as playground, Lakawana Water Park, a few Gymnasiums, and many restaurants nearby, make it ideal for both rental and ownership community. The mixture of land uses and transportation options in the neighborhood support the development of a pedestrian oriented site and presents an opportunity to capitalize on existing infrastructure.

Below is a summary of the requested zoning requirements and proposed.

| RM3- Low Density Multiple Housing | Required |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Max Lot Coverage (building footprint) | $50 \%$ | $49.9 \%$ |
| Density | Max. 1.6 FAR | 1.4 FAR |
| Height | Max. 24m | 12.4 m |
| Front Yard Setback | Min. 3.0m | 3 m |


| Rear Yard Setback | Min. 6.0m | 1.5 m | (Variance requested) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Side Yard Setback, Interior | Min. 4.5 m | 2.1 m | (Variance requested) |
| Amenity space-20m2 per DU | $20 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 13 |  |
| Parking-1 Stall per DU | 13 | 2 |  |
| Visitor Parking- 0.25 stalls per DU | 3 | 0 |  |
| Bike Parking- Class I | 0 | 4 |  |
| Bike Parking- Class II | 2 | 2.1 m | (Variance requested) |
| Width of landscape buffer | Min. 3.0m |  |  |

Please don't hesitate to call our office at 403-608-0646, Should you have any questions or concerns. Yours Truly,

## Development Permit Analysis

G1. Analysis shall be undertaken to identify significant on-site and off-site opportunities and constraints, including built and natural elements (e.g., structures, slopes and drainage, significant landscape features, etc.)

The site is considered flat and landscape plan is incorporated the Dynes Avenue.
G2. Considering adjacent context for building and landscape architectural design and neighbourhood character. Demonstrate that the development is sensitive to and integrated within its context and surrounding uses and neighbours.

The proposed development with its articulations, projections and setbacks is sensitive in scale and character to the existing developments, neighborhood, and their articulations.
3. Private and semi-private open spaces should be designed to optimize solar access.

The proposed project provided more than 11m deep courtyard between two building to optimize solar access specially to the building located on the North of the site.

G4. Views through to the mountains and the lakes should be carefully considered and incorporated into the design of new development

The proposed design has provided unobstructed view to the lake and/or mountains by providing ample amenity roof decks with trellis for all units.

G5. Siting of buildings should support strong street definition by minimizing front yard setbacks while sensitively transitioning to neighbouring building setbacks.

6-unit building (south building), facing Dynes Ave is set back 3.3 m from property line while its second floor is cantilevered $6^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}(1.8 \mathrm{~m})$ towards the Avenue.

G6. Building placement and orientation should respect significant public water, mountain and ridgeline views.

The Proposed buildings placement, their height and designing roof deck encourage view to the lake and mountains.

G7. All designs shall consider Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles and balance the reduction of crime and nuisance opportunities with other objectives to maximize the enjoyment of the built environment.

The proposed design suggested outdoor downward lights on façade and in the landscape areas, providing green spaces with trees, bushes and benches to maximize the enjoyment of the provided amenities

G8. Secondary buildings should create comfortable and social, semi-public and semi-private spaces within interior courtyards and/or side-yards

The 11 m deep interior courtyard, provide comfortable and social, semi-public and semi-private space.

## G9. Pedestrian connectivity to adjacent properties is encouraged.

The private sidewalks are connected to front and back of the subject property to enhance pedestrian connectivity.

G11. Barrier-free pedestrian walkways to primary building entrances must be provided from municipal sidewalks, parking areas, storage, garbage and amenity areas.

Min. 1200mm wide pedestrian walkways from proposed 1500 mm municipal sidewalk, parking, garbage and amenity areas to every entrance of the south and north building is provided.

G12. Where feasible, indicate pedestrian ways with continuity of paving treatments/paving materials.
All proposed walkways are connected and finished by Paving material (surface material is indicated on landscape plan).

G13. Entry to ground-level residential units should be no more than $1.8 \mathrm{~m}(6.0 \mathrm{ft}$.$) above the grade of$ adjacent public sidewalks and walkways (see Figure G14).

The proposed dwelling unit entrances is $8^{\prime \prime}(200 \mathrm{~mm})$ above the grade of adjacent public sidewalks and walkways.

G14. The outdoor space of a residential unit should be raised no more than $1.2 \mathrm{~m}(3.9 \mathrm{ft}$.) above adjacent public sidewalks and a "front stair" pedestrian connection shall be provided

The proposed outdoor spaces are flat and connected by sidewalks
G15. Fencing facing an active public realm should be lowered and transparent or semi-transparent
The there are no fence in front or back of the proposed development.
G16. Site and building access must prioritize pedestrian movement, minimize conflict between various modes of transportation and optimize use of space:

Along the Dynes Avenue 1.5 m city sidewalk is proposed and 2 proposed walkways at East and West side of buildings are proposed to connect to the lane where north building is located.

G17. On-site parking location and design should minimize visual impact and provide safe connections for pedestrians:

In building 1, driveways from Dynes Avenue are provided to access to garages, and garages in building 2 are accessed through the rear lane. Proposed public and private sidewalks provide safe, accessible, and comfortable pedestrian connections to the entrances.

G18. Attached parking structures, their access, and associated components (doorways, ramps, etc.) should be architecturally integrated into the building so as to minimize visual impact to the public realm.

The proposed attached parking is integrated into the main floor, and it is set back about $6^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ from $2^{\text {nd }}$ floor.

G19. All multifamily developments should accommodate sustainable modes of transportation through
Attached garages on all units provide storage for bikes or mobility scooters for residence and additional bike racks are provided on the site to accommodate bike parking. Necessary infrastructure for electric vehicle charging station will also be provided.

## G20. Designs should respond to Penticton's setting and climate

The building's long axis is positioned toward solar south, which will maximize solar gain during winter months and will limit western exposure in the summer. This will also maximize the amount and frequency of the natural light to the interior spaces.

Choosing energy efficient windows and arranging them with consideration to minimize summer heat gain and maximize winter heat gain. Eaves and overhangs to permit low winter sun into building and keep high summer sun out.

Continuous insulation layer, with thickness appropriate to climate, surrounding the entire conditioned space of the building, and continuous air-barrier surrounding the entire building envelope, in contact with the insulation layer, minimizes heat loss during winter and heat gain in summer.

Carefully planned landscaping and planting aids in maximizing performance of Passive Solar Design and assist with imperfect situations and site problems. Provision of white or light-coloured single ply Vinyl roofing membranes minimize heat load and increase reflectivity.

G21. Orientation of buildings should face public spaces (e.g., street and lane) with a preference for ground-oriented types (e.g., a front door for everyone or every business).

All front doors of proposed units are ground oriented and face Dynes Avenue and the lane.
G22. Massing of larger buildings should be composed of multiple volumes to reduce visual impact on the pedestrian realm.

The proposed design is composed of multiple volumes in different levels dimensions. They are broken down both horizontally and vertically by means of projections, recesses, balconies, and decks.

G23. Articulation of building mass should include horizontal (minor) setbacks and step backs (along upper storeys) to provide visual interest and enrich the pedestrian experience. Balconies and/or cantilevered upper floors may be considered to breaking up massing while promoting overlook and/or weather protection.

Suggested balconies and roof decks is breaking up the massing while they provide viewing as well as weather protection for front entrances.

G24.Street-facing units should utilize a layering of elements - including but not limited to street-facing entries, stairs, stoops, porches, patios and landscape elements - to create transitions between the public (e.g., street, sidewalk), semi-public (e.g., walkway, ramp, stair), semi-private (e.g., stoop, balcony) and private areas.

The proposed design offers different layers of elements for articulation, including projections, horizontal setbacks, balconies, canopies, porches, and patios to create transitions between the public, semi public, semi-private, and private areas.

G27. Development should activate the public realm (e.g., sidewalks) and shared open spaces by placing active uses at street-level.

The Proposed development shares amenity spaces in front and in the courtyard between the 2 buildings which are connected to the proposed city sidewalk.

## G28. Entries should be visible and clearly identifiable from the fronting public street.

The Proposed main entrances are identified by having different materials as well as by providing porches and canopies and different articulation in facade which emphasize their visibility.

G29. Development should orient windows, porches, balconies and patios toward the public realm, allowing for casual overlook of parks, open spaces, and parking areas

The proposed development has balconies and porches towards public realm and canopies towards semiprivate amenity space. Roof decks also provide views of the Lake, Mountains, and Ridgelines.

G30. Extensive blank walls (over 5 m in length and including retaining walls) along the street should be avoided.

The proposed development does not have any fence along the streets and is only separated by means of sidewalk and landscaping.

G31. Provide screening (e.g., varied materials/textures, murals, green walls or vines) on solid walls that exist as a function of an internal program (e.g., for privacy, merchandising, etc.).

Using of different material and colour on the facade and green privacy walls between the units on balconies and walls not only provide inviting feel with visual benefits, but also outdoor green walls and facades have been found to be energy cost effective. Plants also reduce the overall temperatures of buildings when exposed to the sun. They reduce the amount of heat escaping during wintertime and they increase humidity in surrounding area. In addition, the transpiration process of plants can slightly reduce temperatures indoors, thus working as an energy cost effective solution. Having enough plants can also help reduce noise levels.

## G32. Stream and Riparian Protection

$\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ The site does not lie within a riparian area and is not close to any streams or bodies of water.

## G33. Water Conservation and Plant Maintenance: Xeriscaping, Irrigation \& Mulching

The site has been designed in such a way that there are no areas of Sod. The entire of the soft landscape areas will be planted with decorative grasses and shrubs. The vast majority of the soft landscape areas will have fine shredded bark mulch in order to retain as much water as possible for the shrubs, and portions adjacent to the central pathway will include decorative
rock mulch to allow for more permeability and to highlight the decorative plant material in contrasting colours.

Given the size of the parcel and extents of the plant material, we are proposing that the site be hand watered by the maintenance and property management to further minimize the water use by closely monitoring the actual conditions and moisture levels of each shrub bed.

## G34. Tree retention

The existing trees on the site will be removed and replaced.
Along Dynes Avenue we propose columnar species in order to increase visibility and safety along the driveways and sidewalks so that no tree branches impede views and cause a potential safety issue.

Within the central courtyard we propose flowering Lilac trees that will provide shade in Summer and allow more light through the winter.

## G35. Tree planting

We have proposed columnar tree planting along Dynes Avenue in order to enhance safety. Specifically, the vehicular pedestrian interactions along the driveways and sidewalk. The proposed trees have a $\pm 8 \mathrm{~m}$ spacing. As well, the boulevard area will include decorative grasses that will grow to approximately 4 ft in height to enhance the pedestrian realm while maintaining adequate visibility.

G36. Habitat: designs should provide for and/or enhance habitat value (e.g., birds, pollinators, etc.) through the use of selected plant material (food \& nutrients) and/or structural/grading improvements (e.g., hibernacula, pools, etc.).

The plant material has been selected to include a variety of species that will provide texture, colour and height variations. There are also flowering shrub and trees species that will attract birds and pollinators to the site.

G37. Stormwater management: mitigate impacts of runoff by diverting stormwater to infiltration galleries or other appropriate green infrastructure.

All the soft landscape areas within the central courtyard include bark mulch and areas of rock mulch to both retain water for the plant material and to provide adequate drainage from storm water runoff.

The permeable areas within the courtyard and surrounding the buildings (only areas behind the Property line) total 198.6 sq.m. for water infiltration.

The water from roof drainage will also be used to water the landscaping, particularly in the courtyard.

## G38. Screening \& Buffering

The proposed columnar trees along Dynes Avenue, in conjunction with the tall grasses between the driveways, will minimize the visual impact and vertical presence of the buildings.

Both side setbacks will include wood screen fencing to provide privacy towards the adjacent lots. Note that on the west side, the adjacent property contains a row of existing tall cedars that will provide extra privacy to that lot.

## G39. Defining the Public- and Private Realms

The public and private realms are defined by the use of plant material, both towards the street as well as between the private amenity spaces within the central courtyard

## G40. Energy

Deciduous trees planted along Dynes Avenue, along the South facing facade, will provide partial shade during the summer months and allow for additional heat gain through winter. The central courtyard provides a similar concept within the restricted space.

## G41. Softscapes

All plant material has been selected based on availability of local nurseries and from species known to thrive in Penticton. They provide a variety of texture, colour and height variation as well as flowering characteristics.

Coniferous under-stories for the deciduous trees have been provided to maintain winter interest.

The central courtyard provides a height gradient to provide private amenity spaces with privacy with 4-5 ft high shrubs while maintaining an open sensation along the pathway will lower plant material

## G42. Hardscape

We have proposed concrete pathways in a light colour. The private amenity spaces will be constructed with feature paving in light albedo colour as well (stamped concrete, precast concrete pavers, or similar)

All hardscape areas will drain into the softscape.

> G48. Lighting shall be provided for all building entrances, walkways, driveways, parking areas and loading areas and should be sufficient to provide clear orientation, personal safety and site security, including allowing for overlook from adjacent buildings

Suggested to have exterior warm (<4000K) downward light at façade, especially entrances and landscape areas around driveways.

G49. Minimize light pollution through the use of full cut-off lighting, avoiding light reflectance, and directing lighting downwards. Exceptions may be made for signage and architectural lighting (e.g., enhancing special features or aesthetic qualities).

Downwards Lighting is suggested for the proposed project.
G50. Avoid lighting that illuminates streams, wetlands, lakes and other natural areas
The proposed area is not located in Streams Wetlands, lakes or natural Areas
G51. Avoid negative light impacts on neighbours.
The proposed development suggested warm downward light. It will not direct light to any neighbour other than ground brightness.

G53. All signage shall comply to the City of Penticton's Sign Bylaw.
The proposed design suggested and will follow the bylaw requirement for the number, size, type, form and location of unit numbers based on bylaw requirements.

G54. Mechanical/Utility cabinets and transformer pads (units) shall be located at the rear of the property, behind the building.

The design has suggested mechanical room at enclosed area at roof top which reduces sound pollution, simpler maintenance, safe for vandalism and accidents. This also helps optimize the space that is better used for landscaping and public semi-private amenity space at ground level.

G56. Units shall not obstruct private views onto public space that might otherwise provide safety through passive surveillance.

As it mentioned above the design has suggested mechanical room at enclosed area at roof top, so it will not obstruct views.

G57. Units shall not be installed in riparian setbacks (SPEA) and Environmental Protection areas
Not applicable to the proposed development, the site is not located at riparian area.
G58. Garbage/recycling areas and other similar structures should be located out of public view in areas that mitigate noise impacts, and which do not conflict with pedestrian traffic,

Garbage bins will be in the garages, and rolled out at the pickup times.
G59. Garbage and recycling bins should be contained within screened enclosures that are coordinated with the overall design,

Garbage bins will be stored in the garages.
G60. Clear access to refuse/recycling areas must be provided.
The proposed design suggested Individual Garbage, recycle, compost to be stored at Garage and to be collected at Dynes Avenue and back lane.

G61. Fencing located along a street edge should be low and/or not create a solid barrier

There will be no fencing along Dynes Avenue and the lane at the back
G62. Fencing along the street edge should be supplemented with low profile landscape plantings
The proposed design shows low Profile landscape plantings and incorporates with Dynes Avenue and city landscape.

MF1. All multifamily developments should incorporate community amenity spaces that provide opportunity for recreation and play and address the needs of all age groups likely to reside within the development.

The proposed development required 260 sm of amenity space. The proposed design provided 975 sm amenity space that give residents opportunity for recreation and about 280 sm of this amenity space located at the ground that provide opportunity for play, social gathering or interacts with neighbors

MF2. To promote community and social sustainability, multifamily developments should exhibit a preference for courtyard forms with views into them from groundoriented ground floor units.

The proposed development provides 11.00 m deep courtyard at ground level.
MF3. Amenity spaces should incorporate vegetation for the purposes of active and passive recreation and/or visual interest and incorporate safe play areas in interior courtyards.

The proposed design provides vegetation area for each unit and amenity spaces for kids play areas.
MF6. Entrances to apartment lobbies should be connected to adjacent sidewalks and provide seating, as well as clear pedestrian-oriented signage. Public art is also encouraged

The proposed dwelling unit entrances are $8^{\prime \prime}(200 \mathrm{~mm})$ above the grade of adjacent walkway. The design invites residents to promenade to their entrances. All walkways on the site are connected to each other and to proposed city sidewalk.

# Development Permit 

## Permit Number: DP PL2022-9369

Owner Name
Owner Address

## Conditions of Permit

1. This permit is issued subject to compliance with all of the bylaws of the City, except as specifically varied or supplemented by this Permit.
2. This permit applies to:

Legal: Legal Description to be updated with consolidated lot information
Civic: Civic Address to be updated with consolidated lot information $\qquad$
PID: PID to be updated with consolidated lot information
3. This permit has been issued in accordance with Section 489 of the Local Government Act, to permit the construction of two rows of townhouse units, totalling 13 dwelling units as shown in the plans attached in Schedule ' $A$ '.
4. In accordance with Section 502 of the Local Government Act a deposit or irrevocable letter of credit, in the amount of \$ $\qquad$ must be deposited prior to, or in conjunction with, an application for a building permit for the development authorized by this permit. The City may apply all or part of the above-noted security in accordance with Section 502 of the Local Government Act, to undertake works or other activities required to:
a. correct an unsafe condition that has resulted from a contravention of this permit,
b. satisfy the landscaping requirements of this permit as shown in Schedule ' $A$ ' or otherwise required by this permit, or
c. repair damage to the natural environment that has resulted from a contravention of this permit.
5. The holder of this permit shall be eligible for a refund of the security described under Condition 4 only if:
a. The permit has lapsed as described under Condition 8, or
b. A completion certificate has been issued by the Building Inspection Department and the Director of Development Services is satisfied that the conditions of this permit have been met.
6. Upon completion of the development authorized by this permit, an application for release of securities (Landscape Inspection \& Refund Request) must be submitted to the Planning Department. Staff may carry out inspections of the development to ensure the conditions of this permit have been met. Inspection fees may be withheld from the security in accordance with the City of Penticton Fees and Charges Bylaw (as amended from time to time).

## General Conditions

7. In accordance with Section 501(2) of the Local Government Act, the lands subject to this permit shall be developed in general accordance with this permit and the plans attached as Schedule ' A '.
8. In accordance with Section 504 of the Local Government Act, if the holder of this permit does not commence the development authorized by this permit within 2 years of the date of this permit, this permit shall lapse.
9. This permit is not a building permit. In order to proceed with this development, the holder of this permit must hold a valid building permit issued by the Building Inspection Department.
10. This permit does not constitute any other municipal, provincial or federal approval. The holder of this permit is responsible to obtain any additional municipal, federal, or provincial approvals prior to commencing the development authorized by this permit.
11. This permit does not include off-site infrastructure costs that may be required at the building permit stage, such as Development Cost Charges (DCC's), road improvements and electrical servicing. There may be substantial infrastructure and servicing costs payable at a later date. For more information on servicing and infrastructure requirements please contact the Development Engineering Department at (250) 490-2501. For more information on electrical servicing costs, please contact the Electric Utility at (250) 490-2535.

Authorized by City Council, the $\qquad$ day of
 Issued this $\qquad$ day of $\qquad$ 2023.

Angela Collison
Corporate Officer
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Notes.

1. This is a preliminary opinion of probable costs based on development permit design plans, nota guaranteed cost figure.
2. This is apreliminary opilion of probable costs based on development permit design
3. Contractors are responsible for accurate quantity calculations and field measurements.
4. Cost estimate does not include hewest minten
 4. All costs include supply and ins
5. All costs are exclusive of GST.


## Development Variance Permit

Permit Number: DVP PL2022-9370
Owner Name
Owner Address

## Conditions of Permit

1. This permit is issued subject to compliance with all of the bylaws of the City, except as specifically varied or supplemented by this Permit.
2. This permit applies to:

Legal: Legal Description to be updated with consolidated lot information
Civic: Civic Address to be updated with consolidated lot information
PID: PID to be updated with consolidated lot information
3. This permit has been issued in accordance with Section 498 of the Local Government Act, to vary the following sections of Zoning Bylaw 2021-01 to allow for the construction of two rows of townhouse units, totalling 13 dwelling units, as shown in the plans attached in Schedule ' $A$ ':
a. Section 10.10.2.3: to increase maximum lot coverage from $50 \%$ to $56.5 \%$;
b. Section 10.10.2.7: to reduce the minimum interior side yard from 4.5 to 2.1 m ;
c. Section 10.10.2.9: to reduce the minimum rear yard from 6.0 m to 1.5 m ; and
d. Section 5.2, Table 5.1 to waive the requirement for landscaping buffers along the east and west property line.

## General Conditions

4. In accordance with Section 501 of the Local Government Act, the lands subject to this permit shall be developed in general accordance with this permit and the plans attached as Schedule ' A '.
5. In accordance with Section 504 of the Local Government Act, if the holder of this permit does not commence the development authorized by this permit within 2 years of the date of this permit, this permit shall lapse.
6. This permit is not a building permit. In order to proceed with this development, the holder of this permit must hold a valid building permit issued by the Building Inspection Department.
7. This permit does not constitute any other municipal, provincial or federal approval. The holder of this permit is responsible to obtain any additional municipal, federal, or provincial approvals prior to commencing the development authorized by this permit.
8. This permit does not include off-site infrastructure costs that may be required at the building permit stage, such as Development Cost Charges (DCC's), road improvements and electrical servicing. There may be substantial infrastructure and servicing costs payable at a later date. For more information on servicing and infrastructure requirements please contact the Development Engineering Department at (250) 490-2501. For more information on electrical servicing costs, please contact the Electric Utility at (250) 490-2535.

Authorized by City Council, the $\qquad$ day of $\qquad$ 2023.

Issued this $\qquad$ day of $\qquad$ 2023.

Angela Collison
Corporate Officer
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WHEREAS the Council of the City of Penticton has adopted a Zoning Bylaw pursuant the Local Government Act,
AND WHEREAS the Council of the City of Penticton wishes to amend Zoning Bylaw No. 2023-08;
NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Municipal Council of the City of Penticton, in open meeting assembled, hereby ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

1. Title:

This bylaw may be cited for all purposes as "Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 2023-19".

## 2. Amendment:

Zoning Bylaw No. 2023-08 is hereby amended as follows:
2.1 Rezone Lot B District Lot 3 Group 7 Similkameen Division Yale (Formerly Yale Lytton) District Plan EPP112534, located at 951 Dynes Avenue and Lot A District Lot 3 Group 7 Similkameen Division Yale (Formerly Yale Lytton) District Plan EPP112534, located at 963 Dynes Avenue from R2 (Small Lot Residential) to RM3 (Medium Density Multiple Housing) as shown on Schedule 'A'.
2.2 Add section 10.10.5.4: "In the case of Lot B District Lot 3 Group 7 Similkameen Division Yale (Formerly Yale Lytton) District Plan EPP112534, located at 951 Dynes Avenue and Lot A District Lot 3 Group 7 Similkameen Division Yale (Formerly Yale Lytton) District Plan EPP112534, located at 963 Dynes Avenue, apartments shall not be a permitted use."
2.3 Schedule ' $A$ ' attached hereto forms part of this bylaw.

| READ A FIRST time this | 6 | day of | June, 2023 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| A PUBLIC HEARING was held this | 20 | day of | June, 2023 |
| READ A SECOND time this | day of | , 2023 |  |
| READ A THIRD time this | day of | , 2023 |  |
| RECEIVED the approval of the <br> Ministry of Transportation on the | day of | , 2023 |  |
| ADOPTED this | day of | , 2023 |  |

Notice of intention to proceed with this bylaw was published on the $9^{\text {th }}$ day of June, 2023 and the $14^{\text {th }}$ day of June, 2023 in an online news source and the newspaper, pursuant to Section 94.2 of the Community Charter.

```
Approved pursuant to section 52(3)(a) of the Transportation Act
this
```

$\qquad$

``` day of
``` \(\qquad\)
``` 2023
```

Julius Bloomfield, Mayor

Angie Collison, Corporate Officer

Schedule A: Zoning Amendment Bylaw 2023-19
Date: Corporate Officer:
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