

Lower Princeton
Area Sector Plan (ASP)



Prepared by:
Protech Consultants Ltd.
Kim McKechnie, Planning Consultant
Mosaic Forest Management Ltd.
Makonis Consulting Ltd.
ARC Environmental Ltd.
I.R. Wilson Consultants Ltd.

June 2011

Table of Contents

1.0 Introduction	1
1.1 Purpose of Area Sector Plan.....	1
1.2 History of Plan Process.....	1
1.3 Plan Area and General Context	2
1.4 Topography	2
1.5 Zoning	2
2.0 Public Consultation	3
3.0 Planning Context.....	4
3.1 Limiting Factors – Constraints and Challenges	4
4.0 Overview of Plan	5
5.0 The Physical Environment	6
5.1 Background	6
5.2 Objectives.....	6
5.3 Policies	6
6.0 Heritage and Archaeological Considerations	7
6.1 Background	7
6.2 Objectives.....	7
6.3 Policy.....	7
7.0 Hillside Development	7
7.1 Background	7
7.2 Objectives.....	8
7.3 Policies	8
8.0 Sustainable Development	9
8.1 Background	9
8.2 Objectives.....	10
8.3 Policies	10
9.0 Housing	10
9.1 Background	10
9.2 Objectives.....	11
9.3 Policies	11
10.0 Transportation and Road Networks	12
10.1 Background	12
10.2 Objectives.....	12
10.3 Policies	13
10.4 Plan Area Access	14
11.0 Existing Boat Launch – Parcel A.....	14
11.1 Background	14
11.2 Objectives`	14
11.3 Policies	14
12.0 Parks, Trails, Recreation and Natural Areas	15
12.1 Background	15
12.2 Objectives.....	15
12.3 Policies	15

13.0	Emergency Service Access	15
13.1	Background	15
13.2	Objectives.....	15
13.3	Policies	16
14.0	Non-Residential Uses	16
14.1	Background	16
14.2	Objectives.....	16
14.3	Policies	16
15.0	Infrastructure and Servicing Strategy.....	16
15.1	Background	16
15.1.1	Policies	17
15.2	Objectives.....	17
15.2.1	Sanitary Servicing	17
15.2.2	Water Servicing.....	17
15.2.3	Storm Water Management Servicing	18
16.0	Overall Planning and Design Guidelines	18
16.1	Development Permit Area Guidelines.....	19
16.1.1	Buildings and Structures	19
16.1.2	Parking	19
16.1.3	Screening and Fencing	19
16.1.4	Access.....	20
16.1.5	Signage	20
17.0	Implementation.....	20
17.1	Introduction.....	20
17.2	The Official Community Plan (OCP)	20
17.3	Rezoning	20
17.4	Subdivision.....	20
17.5	Development Permits.....	21
17.6	Amenity Contributions	21
17.7	Development Cost Charges (DCC's)	21
17.8	Development Constructions Issues.....	21
17.9	Required Studies and Reports	21
17.10	Development Concepts.....	21

APPENDICES

Appendix A Terms of Reference

Appendix B Wildfire Mitigation Assessment

Appendix C Transportation and Road Networks

Appendix D Environmental Assessment

Appendix E Geotechnical Hazard Assessment

Appendix F Archaeological Overview Assessment

Appendix G Engineering Pre-Design/Service Report

Appendix H Landscaping Overview

List of Figures

Site Location	Figure 1
Existing Zoning	Figure 2
Boundary Plan	Figure 3
Topography and Orthophotos	Figure 4
Slope Analysis	Figure 5
Proposed Land Use Plan	Figure 6
Geotechnical Hazard Developable Areas	Figure 7
Geotechnical Hazard Seepage Areas	Figure 8
Environmentally Sensitive Areas	Figure 9
Proposed Road Network	Figure 10
Existing Water and Proposed Upgrades	Figure 11
Existing Sanitary Sewer	Figure 12
Existing Storm Culvert Crossings	Figure 13

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of Area Sector Plan

The Official Community Plan requires that Area Sector Plans (ASP's) are completed for designated areas within the District. The OCP states that,

“ Sector and Neighbourhood Plans will allow the District to refine land use designations and resolve development issues at the neighbourhood level. Design guidelines can also be prepared as part of this exercise.”

Generally Area Sector Plans (ASP's) are undertaken for large areas of land that are to be developed or redeveloped. This ASP is required for redevelopment of the Lower Princeton area because the area is going through a shift in general land uses from predominately single family to multi-family use as delineated within the OCP. In keeping with the OCP, these ASP's "should be ...prepared prior to intensive development occurring."

ASP's are concept plans that provide a level of assurance to residents, developers and Council about what is expected within an area. This allows for a more cohesive vision for an area or neighbourhood and discourages unorganized piece meal development from occurring. An ASP also allows for more comprehensive infrastructure planning taking place so that utility and road upgrades, as examples, are designed to a level acceptable for any proposed future use of the lands within the plan.

Concept Plans or ASP's are required to provide a general level of analysis regarding key challenges present within a specific area. More detailed level of analysis regarding challenges occurs at later stages of the development process such as at re-zoning or when consideration is given for development permits.

ASP's are diverse with the specific content within an ASP being dependent on the unique nature of the area being assessed.

1.2 History of the Plan Process

In 2005-2006, after receiving development enquiries and an application for a multiple dwelling unit project (100+ units - Hangingstone Properties Inc), a review was undertaken on behalf of the District. This review suggested that an ASP be completed for the Lower Princeton area. This was deemed necessary because of concerns regarding infrastructure in the Lower Princeton area which includes road network planning and access to Highway 97; uncertain capacity and distribution needs for water, sanitary sewer and storm water drainage are other challenges that the ASP will address.

The District of Peachland Council passed a motion in August 2006 as follows:

“That the Council direct staff that all development applications in this area be suspended until an Area Structure Plan has been completed; and,

That staff be authorized to approach current applicants in this area to cost share the development of an Area Structure Plan.”

A Terms of Reference (TOR) was prepared to guide preparation of the plan. The TOR was prepared in August 2006 (**See Appendix A**).

The **Lower Princeton Area Sector Plan (LPASP)** was prepared for the District of Peachland with assistance of lead consultant, Protech Consulting Ltd. and several sub-consultants including, Kim McKechnie Planning Consultant, Cascade Geotechnical Engineering, Makonis Environmental, ARC Environmental, Mosaic Forest Management and I.R. Wilson Consultants Ltd. The plan deals with issues relating to land use, wildfire protection, environmental, geotechnical, transportation and archaeological features. The plan was prepared in consultation with District of Peachland staff, other government

agencies including the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure (MoTI), the landowners and other stakeholders.

This plan is to be used as a guide for future rezoning, subdivision and development of the Lower Princeton area by providing a planning framework for rezoning amendments or approvals for subdivision. In order for proposed development in specific areas within the plan area to proceed, it is necessary for applications to be forwarded to the District of Peachland. Any approvals will need to conform to this LPASP and follow the statutory development approval process requirements in the Local Government Act.

1.3 Plan Area and General Context

The Lower Princeton area is a very large tract of land comprised of approximately 41 properties with various owners. The Lower Princeton lands are located on the west side of Okanagan Lake within the District of Peachland, with Princeton Ave. forming the north boundary and the south boundary located just north of Highway Lane. The total ASP area consists of approximately 23.99 hectares (**See Figures 1 and 3**).

The study area is currently a mix of single family residential, strata and large rural residential lots, as well as, large tracts of undeveloped vacant land. The surrounding land uses are as follows:

North: Princeton Ave. and large lot single family

South: Large lot single family

East: Highway 97 and Okanagan Lake

West: Predominately large lot single family

1.4 Topography

The project area is characterized by benched terrain with frequent bedrock outcrops on the lower and mid portions of the slope. The area generally drains toward Highway 97 (**See Figure 4**).

The geotechnical report identifies safe buildable areas for future development (**See Figure 7**). Information regarding slope analysis and developable areas are delineated, as well as those areas needing remedial work before development may occur.

The requirements for geotechnical assessment of the LPASP are outlined in Section 6.0.

1.5 Zoning

The plan area is comprised of 41 different properties with varied zoning and ownership. However, a majority of the plan area is zoned Residential with:

1. large areas zoned RR1 (Rural Residential – minimum site area 0.4 ha)
2. pockets of RR2 (Rural Residential – minimum site area 0.2 ha)
3. pockets of R-1 (Single Family Residential); R-2 (Two Family Residential)
4. pockets of R-3 (Multiple Family Residential – Low Density)
5. pockets of R-4 (Multiple Family Residential – Medium Density)
6. some C-3 (Highway Convenience Commercial)
7. some C-5 (Resort Commercial)

As delineated by Peachland Zoning Bylaw # 1375. The lands to the north, south and west are generally a mix of rural and residential (**See Figure 2**).

2.0 Public Consultation

There have been several Public Consultation Meetings regarding the LPASP.

March 9, 2007

A Public Information Meeting was held at the Peachland Community Centre. There were approximately 70 residents that attended from the surrounding area. The process of ASP development was explained and an overview of the planning framework was provided. This included an overview of the necessary studies needed at the ASP level to address the unique challenges of development within the area. An overview of some of the specific comments/concerns from those that attended the meeting is provided below:

- a) preservation of trees
- b) ensuring free movement for pedestrians
- c) ensuring that views are retained
- d) several exit questionnaire respondents stated that they would not like to see high rises in the Lower Princeton study area

January 31, 2009

a second Public Information Meeting was held at the Fifty Plus Centre in Peachland. It was attended by 62 people. An overview of the progress of plan development was presented and maps were displayed for people to review.

From the completed surveys received, a substantial comment was received from landowners in a nearby 10 unit strata development within the plan area. Their concern was with the potential that increased development/density may have on both traffic and noise in the area.

May 19, 2011

An open house was held and approximately 35 people attended. Two exit surveys were completed, and both were supportive of the concepts presented within the ASP presented.

An OCP amendment bylaw making the ASP an Appendix to the OCP will require Three Readings of Council and Final Adoption. Pursuant to Section 876 of the Local Government Act (LGA) Council must hold a Public Hearing after Second Reading and prior to Third Reading, where members of the public who deem their interest in property may be affected will be given the opportunity to be heard by Council.



3.0 Planning Context

3.1 Limiting Factors – Constraints and Challenges

In preparing an ASP, it is necessary to provide a planning context based on a vision for future development for a study area. The vision for the LPASP as expressed in the current OCP suggests the area is suitable for “Medium Density Residential” development. The following established components will be highlighted and analyzed as part of this LPASP document.

- **Development density** – densities need to be established to ensure that appropriate and acceptable development occurs in harmony with the District’s vision for future growth. The District vision is expressed on the OCP map which identifies the area as Medium Density Residential. OCP policies state the density is not to exceed 60 units per hectare (24 units per acre) and buildings are not to exceed the maximum height of three stories.
- **Affordable / Attainable housing** - affordable housing is an important issue within the District. Affordable housing is needed to ensure a diverse range of housing is available to a diverse range of residents with varying ages and income levels. The District of Peachland has been requiring of new developments that 10% of total new units be designated as affordable housing. Where this may not be appropriate cash in lieu of providing 10% of the units as affordable housing will be considered.
- **Bonusing for Increased Density** – Increased density may be given by the District to a prospective developer in exchange for amenity contributions, pursuant to Section 904 of the Local Government Act. Any density bonuses for amenity contributions would be specified within a Phased Development Agreement (PDA) between the two parties.
- **Transportation Impact Study (TIS)** - the provision of safe and efficiently moving traffic is essential to a community. Care and attention should be taken to ensure traffic patterns associated with new development can be safely provided and designed appropriately. Access and egress is a very important consideration of all development applications.
- **Environmental Assessment** – As part of the ASP an inventory of environmentally sensitive areas, riparian areas and sensitive terrestrial habitats will need to be provided and certain areas may need to be managed and protected when considering new developments with best management practises for the environment being followed.
- **Steep Slope Development Considerations** – development on steep slopes and hillsides may be unstable or unsafe. Hillside development may have adverse impacts on neighbouring properties and may also contribute to an unattractive hillside aesthetic. Geo-technical and Hydro-geological analysis needs to be undertaken and general requirements established as part of this ASP.
- **Design Brief (Servicing and Phasing of Utilities)** – infrastructure and servicing issues, particularly capacity for sanitary sewer and water need to be assured if higher density development is to occur. A general inventory and analysis of water, sanitary sewer, stormwater management, and other municipal infrastructure are provided in the ASP. Development within the LPASP plan area may take place in several phases. If that is the case it will be necessary for the developer to enter into a Phased Development Agreement (PDA) with the District.
- **Provision of Open Space, Trails and Parkland** - these are important liveability elements which define the quality of life in a neighbourhood. Either a dedication of 5% of land or cash-in-lieu for parkland is the legislated requirement under the Local Government Act. Useable parkland should be provided within the ASP area, along with strategically located trail connections where appropriate.

- **Development Permit Areas** - form and character design provisions often make the difference between new development being attractive and of good quality, or not. Development Permit Areas (DPA's) with provisions pertaining to form and character in Multi Family areas are established by the OCP. Form and character considerations ensure that the aesthetics of exterior materials and design is appealing. Other important considerations addressed by a development permit are siting, parking, screening and landscaping. The OCP also suggests that development should maintain the natural aesthetic of the hillside to the extent possible. New development should develop in a manner compatible with the natural slope and site preparation should maintain natural terrain to the extent possible. These issues should be considered in early design and will be determined at the Development Permit stage. A component of Development Permits is the provision of securities to be provided by new development, to ensure an appropriate standard of development takes place.

4.0 Overview of the Plan

The lands within the LPASP are strategically located for multiple family developments. There are a number of reasons for this:

- The lands are located close to the downtown core including the necessary services and amenities
- The lands are in close proximity to the waterfront and they provide high quality lake and mountain views
- Upgrades to water and sewer services can be provided for the intended use
- Lands are generally not suitable for single family use as they demand a higher level of privacy than higher density residential types.
- Multi-family development could be connected to the downtown through pedestrian/trail linkages.
- Although any new access from Highway 97 will not be permitted for any development, access can be achieved into the area from Princess St. down to Hawkes Rd.

The LPASP projects medium density residential development with density ranging from 37 units per hectare (15 units per acre) to 60 units per hectare (24 units per acre). Bonuses for higher density development may be considered by the District where affordable housing and/or green infrastructure can be provided. These parameters were adopted by Council in 2008 as part of the OCP review process. The numbers below represent more detailed calculations.

4.1 Total Maximum Density Calculation

<u>TOTAL MAXIMUM DENSITY CALCULATION – 24.0 HA (59.3 Acres)</u>	
TOTAL LPASP LAND AREA	
Roads or access (20%)	4.8 ha (11.80 acres)
Parkland (5%)	1.2 ha (3.00 acres)
MOTI road widening (20%)	4.8 ha (11.80 acres)
TOTAL land area not to be developed	10.8 ha (32.7 acres)

<u>CALCULATION</u>	
TOTAL land projected for development (24.0 has * 60 units per ha)	13.2 ha (32.7 acres)
Maximum projected dwelling units (13.2 ha * 60 units per ha)	792 units
10% affordable housing to be provided (792 * .10)	79 units

**the maximum density numbers established here are used to represent total development capacity benchmarks for the future development of the LPASP.*

These densities are being proposed without a specific development concept or pre-designed plan. The projected estimates are speculative and may not come to fruition due to fragmented land ownership and many landowners may not have development aspirations for their property (**See Figure 6**).

5.0 The Physical Environment

5.1 Background:

An environmental study is necessary to ensure best management practices for the environment are followed. Makonis Environmental has completed a study of the area in their report dated October 2008 which also includes a Riparian Area Report prepared by ARC Environmental Ltd. (**See Appendix D**). Other additional issues to be assessed include slope stability, erosion, drainage, protection of riparian areas, management of the foreshore and the management or protection of wildlife and natural vegetation.

Criterion for the terrestrial environmental assessment utilized a multi-disciplinary approach, using a threefold rating; ecosystem, wildlife and cumulative ESA rating (**See Figure 9**).

5.2 Objectives:

- Ensure best management practices for the environment and existing OCP policies are followed respecting all developments which take place within the LPASP.

5.3 Policies:

- ESA -1 are areas which contain significant ecosystem and/or wildlife characteristics representing a diverse range of sensitive habitat, no development should be permitted. Although development of ESA-1 is not encouraged it may only be considered for development where mitigation is undertaken as part of an accredited report from a Qualified Environmental Professional (QEP); such that no net loss of habitat occurs. In such instances, remediation will require a habitat area replacement of 3:1 of equivalent functioning habitat.
- Buffers between ESA-1 and other areas should be 30 metres. These areas may only be reduced where best management practices for the environment are followed and are supported by a report from a QEP which supports such a reduction.

- Development may be considered in ESA-2 to ESA-4 areas provided best management practices for the environment are followed. A report from a QEP shall ensure these areas are appropriately designed with consideration of buffering adjacent to ESA-1 areas, habitat connection and habitat mitigation. These considerations may include the extension of natural green spaces, trail systems and riparian area protection as appropriate.
- Protect all birds and mammals during nesting season.
- Developers of land must ensure at the Development Permit stage that there is consistency in assessment, implementation and monitoring. Monitoring of projects so that the best management practices for the environment are followed as delineated within any professional reports will be a condition of any Development Permit.
- Radon gas is present throughout the Okanagan Valley and the construction of all buildings and structures shall ensure standards for radon gas control under the BC Building Code are met.
- Development Permits will require Stormwater management plans which will address run-off from developments. Run-off control will be addressed in order to minimize impacts on any streams and Okanagan Lake.

Conservation covenants shall be registered on property titles for environmentally sensitive and environmentally hazardous areas, as appropriate.

6.0 Heritage and Archaeological Considerations

6.1 Background:

The LPASP is located within the traditional territory of the Westbank First Nation and Penticton Indian Band (both are members of the Okanagan Nation Alliance). Heritage sites and objects on private and Crown Land in British Columbia are protected under the Heritage Conservation Act. The detection of archaeological resources can have an impact on development. An Archeological Overview was undertaken by IR Wilson Consultants Ltd. (**See Appendix F**).

6.2 Objectives:

- To ensure that heritage and archaeological resources are respected and managed and/or protected.
- To ensure that appropriate development takes place in a manner sensitive to and in harmony with heritage and archaeological resources.

6.3 Policy:

- More detailed archaeological assessments shall be undertaken prior to development taking place on lands shown as having potential in the IR Wilson Consultants Ltd study.
- Best management practices and protocols shall be followed in the event of a “chance find”.

7.0 Hillside Development

7.1 Background:

The Lower Princeton area contains some flatter lands adjacent to steep slopes (benched terrain). The natural stability of slopes can be disturbed by development leading to problems including daylighting of seepage, erosion, slope failure and/or rock fall hazards. A recent study conducted by Golder & Associates

entitled Sustainable Hillside Development Study: Peachland, BC, was completed in March, 2009. The study has provided the District with assistance in assessing development on hillsides to help assure that development is undertaken safely and in an attractive manner compatible with the natural hillside aesthetic.

7.2 Objectives:

- To avoid development of buildings or structures on steep slopes, and generally discourage development on slopes greater than 30% (**See Figure 5**).
- To ensure professional Geotechnical / Hydro-geological reports are undertaken to define slope hazards to public or private property for all development applications.
- To ensure professional reports assess potential impacts on adjacent properties.
- To ensure detailed Geotechnical /Hydro-geological assessment is provided pertaining to any mitigation which may be considered, such as the walls of buildings or structures being utilized as retaining wall support built adjacent to slopes.
- Peer review of submitted hydro-geotechnical reports may be considered by the District, as deemed appropriate.

7.3 Policies:

Cascade Geotechnical Ltd. prepared a report which outlines parameters and requirements for how development should take place safely in the LPASP (**See Appendix E**). The Golder Study (2009) provides baseline requirements for Geotechnical and Hydro-geological investigations based on comprehensive mapping as provided within the final report. Some specific baseline requirements for Geotechnical and Hydro-geological studies are as follows:

Slope Investigation

- For any slopes above 20%, investigation reports shall include Geotechnical and Hydro-geological assessment.
- Where appropriate, the Basic Investigation Review Process for Hillsides (Golder: 2009) shall be utilized in Geotechnical reports.
- Reports shall provide an estimated annual probability of occurrence for each type and location of geotechnical hazard (shown on the plan) that may affect the proposed development site and the immediately adjacent properties. Lands deemed to be “safe” or “developable” should be identified on the plan.
- On-site flow variations related to seasonal flow should be assessed for potential negative off-site effects.
- Potential costs and regulatory limitations of hazard mitigation approaches should be discussed and evaluated.
- Professional monitoring during site preparation and construction shall ensure there is no conflicting information between applicable studies.

General Development Guidelines

- Subdivisions and buildings on properties with slopes in excess of 20% must be planned comprehensively, taking into consideration use, access, densities, servicing and design.

- Development must take place on lands containing less than 30% natural grade, with the exception of small pockets of land along with more gentle slopes (maximum of 10% of the building envelop) where the terrain may be altered.
- Subdivision and site design should respond to the unique circumstances of each site and disruption of the natural terrain should be minimized to the extent possible.
- Site preparation (Earthworks) and tree removal and retention plans shall be an integral part of the design process in order to minimize modification of the natural terrain. Site preparation shall not occur until a Development Permit, Earthworks Permit and Tree Removal Permit are applied for and approved.
- Grading Plans should be provided such that grading of key features are avoided (knolls, ridgelines, rock outcroppings, cliffs, ravines). A “manufactured appearance” of graded slopes should be avoided (sharp cuts, long or wide slopes with uniform cuts).
- Do not create deep scars or expose large areas of highly visible subsoil and material on the proposed development site.
- Avoid side casting of material along sloped edges.
- Excavations and the placement of fill that result in terrain forms that are not characteristic of the natural terrain should be avoided.
- Form and Character guidelines for development shall follow the guidelines Section 16.10 – Multiple Family Development Permit Area in the Official Community Plan.

Retaining Walls

- Retaining walls should respect the natural character of the site and not be dominating or fortress-like.
- Except where a wall of the building is utilized for slope retention, retaining wall height should be a maximum of 1.2 meters. Higher walls may only be considered for marginal increments (maximum 20%) where they are articulated, have a surface texture / pattern, or where sufficient sustainable landscaping is provided at its base.
- Smaller stepped retaining walls and not a uniform wall should be employed, and they should be consistent with the natural terrain or with the slope above and below the walls. For stepped retaining walls, sufficient sustainable landscaping should be provided at its base.

8.0 Sustainable Development

8.1 Background

The District of Peachland was a signatory to the BC Climate Action Charter in 2007. The District is committed to actions aimed at reducing greenhouse gas consumption and energy waste. Through an OCP amendment, the District has adopted Greenhouse Gas reduction targets consistent with Provincial requirements which are as follows:

- A 18% reduction in GHG's below 2007 levels by 2016
- A 33% reduction in GHG's below 2007 levels by 2020
- A 80% reduction in GHG's below 2007 levels by 2050

In 2008, an OCP amendment established a Sustainable Development Strategy. The vision of increased density for the LPASP is a fundamental principle relating to sustainable community development. New development in the LPASP also offers the opportunity to address sustainability through green building design and construction i.e. District Energy Systems, Geothermal, Solar etc. Any new development in the LPASP would be considered infill development meaning that urban sprawl is being avoided. Moreover, the distance of the area from the downtown core will only decrease vehicle kilometres travelled for recreation and shopping. Therefore, any new development within the LPASP could have the potential to minimize the effects of GHG increases associated with increased growth from development; while showcasing new building design parameters, energy systems and technologies.

8.2 Objectives:

- To encourage sustainable development features and alternative sources of energy in the design and construction of new developments or in redevelopment projects in the LPASP area.
- To encourage a minimum of LEEDS Silver, or equivalent sustainability rating for new buildings / structures being developed.
- To encourage higher density development in line with the benchmarks established in Section 4.0 of this plan.
- To ensure developers investigate all energy management (heating and cooling) options in development planning and design with detailed consideration of life cycle costing.

8.3 Policies:

- In an effort to meet GHG targets and conserve water the District requires that developers identify and quantify energy and water conservation measure during the application process.
- The following measures should be addressed in the design and construction of new developments:
 - Green Building Standards for Sustainability
 - Energy Conservation
 - Water Conservation
 - Landscaping plans with emphasis on xeriscaping
 - Green Roofs and Terraces
 - Indoor Environmental Quality
 - Universal Design and Accessibility
 - Alternative Energy and Energy Conservation
- A Solid Waste Management Strategy pertaining to construction waste, demolition materials and land clearing waste will be required to minimize the use of landfills to the extent possible.
- A LEEDS certified professional shall be included during the design stages of any proposed development.

9.0 Housing

9.1 Background:

Recent amendments to the Official Community Plan in 2008 provide an overall framework for developing housing in Peachland. A key consideration as per the OCP is that a 10% affordable housing contribution will be advocated for in new developments or cash in lieu of affordable housing is to be placed into a

Housing Reserve Fund. The objectives and policies of this LPASP will provide more detailed guidelines which reflect those as found within the OCP.

An integrated design model in development may be considered where hillside development clusters are incorporated that have less impact upon the natural environment than conventional lot design. Simply put, cluster housing as applied to the LPASP area is a form of planned residential development that concentrates the homes on a portion of the site to allow the remaining land to be used for common open space, recreation, or preservation of environmentally sensitive land.

9.2 Objectives:

- Provide a range of housing opportunities in the plan area for a diverse range of incomes, age and household composition. Ensure new development occurs such that it can be efficiently serviced and linked to the existing infrastructure without additional financial burdens put on the taxpayer.
- Develop the area in a manner which is sensitive to the hillside and the waterfront aesthetic, with care and attention paid to the form and character of design.
- Encourage affordable housing in all new developments
- Encourage innovative housing approaches such as integrated cluster housing design, where appropriate
- Encourage a sustainable, green approach in all housing developments as described in Section 7.0 Sustainable Development Features.

9.3 Policies:

- Multi-family housing types shall be developed in a manner which is compatible with the District's utility servicing capabilities and development will not proceed if servicing capabilities within the plan area cannot be achieved.
- All new developments shall provide 10% of the units in a development as affordable housing as provided in a housing agreement or cash in lieu to be placed in a Housing Reserve Fund.
- If the target of 10% target cannot be achieved, cash in lieu may be considered in agreement with the District of Peachland.
- Where affordable housing units are provided, bonus densities may be provided at a ratio of 1:1 (affordable units: market units).
- Affordable housing may be achieved through partnering with an accredited Non-profit Housing Corporation or by providing ceilings on rental units or sale of dwelling units, now and in the future, through Housing Agreements to be implemented through covenants on title.
- Consideration may be given to using CD Comprehensive Development Zoning as a tool to accomplish appropriate flexibility in the design process and to accomplish innovative approaches to housing, as deemed appropriate.

10.0 Transportation and Road Networks

10.1 Background:

In 2004 Peachland undertook a Road Network Plan which provided road system classifications, road design guidelines, cross-sections appropriate for hillside development and outlined potential improvement for road networks as well as pedestrian and cyclist routes (**See Figure 10**).

The four roads that front the ASP have been classified as follows:

- Highway 97 is a Provincial highway and is to provide mobility for commuters as well as foster the safe and efficient flow of goods and services up and down the valley (Hwy 97 is a major trucking route between Canada and the United States). Therefore, direct access from the highways is generally not desirable and in the long term MOTI seeks to minimize or eliminate access where possible. If Highway 97 is 4-laned in the future, those properties that access directly to Highway 97 will be provided access via a frontage road or an access via a Princess St. extension. Any development in the LPASP will have to address access issues prior to zoning approval (MOTI approval is required prior to zoning as well). Currently, any traffic increases associated with development will eventually access Hwy 97 via Princeton Ave.
- Princeton Ave. has been designated as an arterial road. Direct access to those properties fronting Princeton Ave. is not permitted. The ASP envisions 2 interior access roads that will connect to Princeton Ave. thereby eliminating a direct access to Princeton Ave. These access roads to Princeton Ave. will be required to intersect with Princeton in a location that will coincide with the future upgrading of the Sommerset /Princeton Ave. intersection.
- Lipsett Ave. is classified as a collector road. The primary function of a collector road is to provide a primary route for traffic travelling into and out of an area. Due to topographic constraints and the depth of existing parcels along Lipsett Ave. it is anticipated that an internal access road may be constructed to service the lots fronting Highway 97 and the lower areas of the lots fronting Lipsett Ave. The Lipsett/Princeton Ave. intersection is located where there are limited sight line distances. Additionally, there is a sharp Eastbound to Southbound right turn which is difficult for larger vehicles to negotiate. It is anticipated that intersection improvements will be a requirement as traffic increases due to densification occur.
- Renfrew Rd. is classified as a collector road intersecting Highway 97 and providing access to the southern area of Peachland. Heighway Lane connects Lipsett Ave. to Renfrew Rd., which provides alternate access to the south of the LPASP.

A Traffic Impact Study was completed as part of this ASP (**See Appendix C**). Consultation with the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure (MOTI) has taken place and their comments and issues of concern have been reflected in the report. An important consideration is that MOTI has a mandate to reduce and eliminate access points to Highway 97. The study considered traffic projections for the LPASP at full build-out (20 year timeline – 2030 completion). Key elements in the analysis include the estimation of the capacity of the main roads and intersections to accommodate traffic.

10.2 Objectives:

- To protect rights of way for future roadway development and upgrading.
- To ensure traffic impact analysis is undertaken prior to development approval.
- To minimize conflict between vehicle traffic and pedestrians.

10.3 Policies:

- Rights of way of major roads throughout the plan area should be protected.
- Residential lots fronting major roads shall be discouraged.
- The overall road network in the area shall include:
 - Hwy 97 - Provincial Highway Network
 - Princeton Ave. – Arterial Road
 - Renfrew Rd. and Lipsett Ave. – Collector Roads
 - Princess St. – Local Access Road
- Achieving a connected road network through the site is a significant challenge due to the steep slope topographic conditions of the site. As such, roadway standards that respect the existing topography and environment will be considered in order to minimize impact to the natural environment.
- Given the topography, it may not be possible to have a proposed road fronting every property (i.e. it may require lot consolidation). Any proposed road alignments identified as part of the Lower Princeton Neighborhood Plan, under preparation by private developers in the area, will need to coordinate with the concept design proposed in the USL memos dated October 17, 2007 and March 30, 2006 (See Addendum to Appendix C).
- All proposed transportation and road network infrastructure shall be constructed to the criteria of the District's Subdivision and Development Services Bylaw. Proposed developments will be required to submit road profiles that are beneficial in understanding utility servicing and where additional right-of-ways are required for the gravity utilities.
- The Princess Avenue / Princeton Avenue intersection will require a re-design as part of this Area Structure Plan.
- A sensitivity analysis will be completed to access the trigger point. The Report for the Ponderosa-Pincushion Ridge Traffic Impact Study 2010 may be a source of background information for future base traffic volumes.
- All properties being proposed for development which are adjacent to Highway 97 shall be required to dedicate land for the widening of Hwy 97 in keeping with MOTI's policy to accommodate the projected four-laning into the future.
- A future roadway shall be designed to connect Princess St. to Hawkes Rd. Upon completion of this connection the roadway access to Highway 97 could be discontinued.
- Upon completion of 4-laning of Highway 97, access to the Doggy Beach Boat Launch shall be discontinued. A future access to the Doggy Beach Boat Launch shall be established via Beach Ave.
- Future four-laning of Highway 97 may result in intersection upgrades at Princeton Ave. and Renfrew Rd. with future upgrades to Princeton Ave, Lipsett Ave., Renfrew Rd. and Princess St. also anticipated. These upgrades will include the provision of sidewalks that should be integrated with District-wide bicycle and pedestrian trail systems.
- Traffic Impact Studies are required for new multi-family development projects and single family developments containing greater than 6 units.

- A possible future overhead pedestrian walkway should be investigated over Highways 97 and to the Doggy Beach area. This would prevent vehicle pedestrian conflicts and promote pedestrian safety.

10.4 Plan Access Area

Highway 97 extends North – South throughout the study area and it is a major part of the provincial highway network. Provincial policies under the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure (MOTI) suggest that new private accesses to the highway will not be permitted and that intersections will be upgraded. Current Provincial policy suggests that in the long-term, Highway 97 will be developed to four lanes. However, consideration is being given to an alternate four-lane highway route along the upper, western edge of Peachland; if that future direction proceeds, the provincial direction to four-lane the existing Highway 97 passage through Peachland may change.

The District's Traffic Network Plan indicates Princess St. as a local road, Renfrew Rd. and Lipsett Ave. as collector roads and Princeton Ave. as an arterial road serving the area.

There are several parcels of land south of the Princess/Hawkes intersection that do not have any access opportunities other than their current access from Highway 97. Until frontage roads are constructed to MOTI standards in the future, these established private accesses will continue. Proposed frontage roads are shown (**See Figure 10**).

11.0 Existing Boat Launch – Parcel A

11.1 Background:

The existing boat launch, known as Parcel A is under the ownership of the Province of British Columbia. Current access to the boat launch can be maintained for the time being. However, when four-laning of Highway 97 occurs or the Province of British Columbia through MOTI has indicated that they wish the access closed. An alternative public access to the boat launch along with adequate parking in the area will need to be explored.

11.2 Objectives:

- To ensure future planning takes regarding access and parking issues at Doggy Beach.
- To take into account transitional areas and their use as part of planning for future development occurring in the LPASP.

11.3 Policies:

- Future transportation and land use planning in the area shall take into account the anticipated future closure of the Doggy Beach Boat launch and the MOTI preference for four laning Highway 97.
- The District intends on maintaining the Doggy Beach.
- Future transportation issues shall be coordinated with MOTI.

12.0 Parks, Trails, Recreation and Natural Areas

12.1 Background:

Parks, trails, recreation and natural areas are an important aspect of the quality of life in Peachland. Lands along Highway 97 contain slopes greater than 30% and as per the OCP and Golder Study 2009 are not to be developed. Therefore, these areas are best to be left in their natural state. Since the plan recommends medium density development strategic locations for the provision of parkland that is central and accessible to developed areas is desirable. Trail systems are important for providing pedestrian access to parks, the downtown core and other areas. Active transportation networks (trails, sidewalks and bike paths) promote a healthy lifestyle and offer an alternative to the automobile.

12.2 Objectives:

- To develop parks for the benefit of Peachland residents that are easily accessible to new development within the LPASP.
- Parkland will be strategically planned to be centrally located.
- To develop trail systems to connect new development in the LPASP to parks and the downtown.
- To protect wetlands, steep slopes and natural areas within the LPASP for parks and where necessary for environmental conservation.

12.3 Policies:

- Five percent of the land to be subdivided or developed must be dedicated to the District as land for parks. The District may consider cash in lieu for parks where suitable park land cannot be provided.
- Parkland shall be located on properties with less than 10% slopes over at least 75% of the site.
- Wetlands and areas containing natural springs should be retained in their natural state. An environmental assessment report shall be provided by a QEP before any modification or mitigation of ESA's occurs (best management practices for the environment to be followed). These ESA's shall either be dedicated as park or protected by using a Section 219 Restricted Covenant on Title.

13.0 Emergency Service Access

13.1 Background:

All new development must have access for fire and other emergency vehicles. All development within the LPASP will be required to make sure that access to emergency vehicles is provided. The ambulance detachment and the Fire Hall are approximately 7 to 10 minutes from the LPASP.

13.2 Objectives:

- To ensure that road design and traffic access can accommodate the requirements of emergency services.
- To ensure adequate fire protection is provided in new developments.

13.3 Policies:

- All development proposals will be required to provide all necessary requirements for emergency access to the site.
- All new developments will be required to meet fire protection standards as set out within the BC Building Code. Where projects are developed which are greater than 4 stories all structures shall meet the standards of the British Columbia Building Code for fire protection.
- Amenity Contributions from new development will be required by the District to be put into a Fire Protection Reserve Fund.

14.0 Non-Residential Uses

14.1 Background:

While future develop in the LPASP area is generally contemplated to be residential, smart growth / sustainable development practices suggest that mixed use development is more advantageous in building a sustainable community and reducing the carbon footprint. Therefore, future development may provide local neighbourhood services in some cases.

14.2 Objectives:

- To consider mixed use development where appropriate within the LPASP.
- To ensure mixed use developments are designed in such a manner as to avoid land use conflicts.

14.3 Policies:

- Non residential development which may include limited local neighbourhood commercial or institutional uses may be considered as part of a mixed use development project.
- Where mixed use developments are proposed Comprehensive Development (CD) Zoning may be used.

15.0 Infrastructure and Servicing Strategy

15.1 Background

The Lower Princeton Area has been identified in Peachland Official Community Plan, Section 2.3 Physical Planning; Considerations; specifically, existing land use pattern as having infill opportunities for residential through densification.

The existing land use pattern defines the direction of new development and sewage requirements.

A specific reference has been made to the Lower Princeton Area as having large undeveloped lots on steep slopes and includes the fact that the overall density is very low. With the amendment to the OCP in April 2008, and in completing a slope analysis of the plan area the theoretical density ranges from 750 to 830 multi-family units.

This draft Pre-design/Servicing report is intended to build upon the servicing policies in the OCP and to identify any servicing issues affecting the Lower Princeton Area (**See Appendix G**).

The Lower Princeton Area is comprised of 41 separate parcels and an area of 24 ha. Highway 97 forms the easterly boundary, the north boundary is Princeton Ave, the westerly boundary is Lipsett Avenue and the southern boundary is adjacent to the Lipsett/Heighway Lane intersection.

15.1.1 Policies

- Promote the orderly, economic growth and the logical extension of utilities and services.
- Require developers to pay for the costs that are attributed to servicing their development. More detailed costs will be made available subsequent to further study.
- Require all urban residential and commercial developments and subdivisions to provide full urban services including water, sewers, drainage, roads and underground wiring.

Only support extensions of roads and utilities which form a natural progression of existing developments might be a consideration for District payment of infrastructure.

15.2 Objectives

Given the large number of properties and challenging topography, a detailed and comprehensive approach to servicing is required. The approach should tie together infrastructure issues, especially roads and drainage, sanitary sewer and water, both within the context of the ASP site area and the District as a whole (**See Figures 11, 12 and 13**). Any servicing of a particular development will be subject to the District's Subdivision Development Servicing (SDS) Bylaw and approval.

15.2.1 Sanitary Servicing

- Based on the District's 2003 Sanitary Sewer Servicing and Phasing Plan, the assumed population for the service areas covered within the ASP was approximately 775 persons. The highway sanitary trunk appears to have the capacity to support the newly projected population within the ASP, but will need to be examined and approved as development takes place.
- The sanitary sewer collection DCC's collected will continue to go toward trunk capacity improvements and the future equalization tank planned for the Renfrew lift station, with sanitary treatment DCC's being collected to fund future expansion of the RDCO treatment plant.
- Any new development should show detailed sanitary sewer alignments (in conjunction with proposed road rights-of-way) showing direction of flow. The entire site should be able to be serviced by gravity, and therefore sanitary lift stations should be discouraged. Site layout should include potential easements that will allow for servicing all of the properties by gravity to the highway sanitary trunk.

15.2.2 Water Servicing

- The 2007 Water Master Plan modeled a population of 861 persons for the area representing the Lower Princeton ASP neighborhood and it encourages Smart Growth as highlighted in Section 3.3.4:

"...the District of Peachland should strongly consider policies which direct development in a more compact, sustainable form in accordance with Smart Growth principles."

- Each proposed development will need to be modeled to determine if upgrades to the water system are necessary to provide adequate water quantity and pressure for peak demand and fire flow. All upgrades will be at the cost of the Developer.

- The District would encourage developers to reduce water demand through implementation of aggressive water efficiency technology and conservation, including universal water metering, high-efficiency fixtures,
- Pressure Reducing Valves (PRV's) may be required in both of the zones. Including the PRV's within the District's water system for the Lower Princeton area neighborhood would be preferable to a series of privately owned PRV's. As these PRV's are not in the current DCC program, they will have to be funded by the Lower Princeton developers.
- The Deep Creek reservoir (proposed reservoir at the future treatment plant) will need to be built prior to any multi-family development within the ASP, in order to provide storage for MDD and Fire Flow. Although the reservoir is currently planned for 2011, the District may not have sufficient funding to front-end the construction of the reservoir in 2011. Thus, the Lower Princeton ASP developers may need to front-end these costs or provide a significant portion thereof.

15.2.3 Storm Water Management Servicing

- The District of Peachland Subdivision, Development and Servicing Bylaw No. 1956 outlines the requirements for Storm water Management, which states:

“Stormwater management involves the planning and design necessary to mitigate the hydrological impacts of land development or land use changes. Adverse hydrological impacts include such things as increased peak storm water flows, erosion, sedimentation, flooding, reduced surface infiltration, reduced minimum groundwater levels and stream flows, water quality deterioration and degradation of aquatic and wildlife habitats.”
- A Storm water Management Plan must be completed before any development is approved to outline a comprehensive and sustainable approach to storm water management given the large number of properties, and inconsistency of infiltration rates across the various properties of the Lower Princeton area. The detailed storm water management plan must ensure that all properties have access to the discharge points (culverts) which cross the highway, and should be protected through an easement or restrictive covenant. Treatment of storm water that has direct discharge into Okanagan Lake will require treatment. Treatment levels will be determined through consultation with the Ministry of Environment.
- The design of the storm water system should refer to the District's SDS Bylaw. Given its proximity to Lake Okanagan and the steep hillside conditions, discharge to existing culverts may be preferable over ground infiltration as long as storm water quality has been addressed.
- Any infiltration that is to take place close to the highway will require approval by MOTI to ensure that it will not affect the road structure.
- A hydrogeological report is required for any proposed development area, as it is necessary to be reviewed in conjunction with stormwater management.

16.0 Overall Planning and Design Guidelines

General planning and design principles are important elements to ensure development is constructed to an acceptable community standard. Key elements include:

- Form and Character of buildings should complement the surrounding natural landscape and character of the area.
- Colour is a powerful design elements used to establish character and appearance. An overall colour scheme should unify various elements of individual development façades.

- Building materials shall consist of aesthetically pleasing materials that are appropriate for the development style.
- Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles shall be followed so that crime is discouraged by reducing concealed areas, providing lighting to minimize dark spaces, placing windows in order to maximize informal surveillance and affixing addressing in obvious locations so that units can be easily identified in the case of an emergency.

16.1 Development Permit Area Guidelines

The Development Permit Area guidelines are provided in the OCP. Multifamily developments shall be constructed in accordance with the following criteria:

16.1.1 Buildings and Structures

- The scale and shape of buildings should relate positively to adjacent development.
- The perception of monolithic structures and long expanses of straight walls should be avoided through design aspects such as building jogs and irregular faces that create the impression of smaller units and less bulk.
- The shape, siting, rooflines, architectural features and exterior finish should be significantly varied to create interest and avoid a monotonous appearance.
- Sloped roofs are preferred. If roofs are not sloped they should be designed to have the appearance of being sloped.
- Green, eco-friendly roofs are encouraged where possible as well as other sustainable development features.
- Signs, canopies and awnings, if provided, should be carefully located with consideration of building design, architectural features and surrounding buildings signage. Provisions of the District's Sign Bylaw shall apply.
- Canopies or awnings should be used to provide weather protection at doorway entrances.

16.1.2 Parking

- Large parking areas should be given the appearance of smaller parking areas through the use of landscaping as screening.
- Parking areas will provide safe access and egress and efficient traffic flow.

16.1.3 Screening and Fencing

- Screening should adhere to regulations as found within Zoning Bylaw #1375. In addition sites should include supplementary screening in the form of walls, fencing and/or landscaping in the following areas:
 - along the property edge next to roadways.
 - between buildings and parking areas
 - along on-site access roads
 - along all sides of buildings
 - in other open space areas not required for parking, access roads or walkways.

- Xeriscaping and the use of indigenous species to the area should be used for landscaping.
- Site landscaping should be designed as part of a comprehensive landscaping plan that complements the building and the surrounding area.

16.1.4 Access

- Safe and efficient vehicle entrances, exits on-site traffic flow shall be provided.

16.1.5 Signage

- Proposed developments may have to provide a Sign Plan to the District outlining when, for how long and what kind of signage will be placed on site during phases of construction. Additionally, any signage for a proposed development will be permitted through the development permit process.
- Free standing signage should be low, front lit with a landscaped base.
- Signage should positively relate to the surrounding area and character of buildings.

17.0 Implementation

17.1 Introduction

The LPASP is a long term planning document which is prepared to reflect a 20 year timeline. New development will have to adhere to the provisions as outlined within this document.

There are a number of steps which will need to occur in order for individual development projects to be constructed. These steps as part of the development process provide for additional public consultation and consultation with government and private service providers through referrals that are sent out for comment. This information represents an integral part of the land-use decision-making process.

17.2 The Official Community Plan (OCP)

An OCP amendment bylaw making this LPASP an Appendix to the OCP will require Three Readings of Council and Final Adoption. Pursuant to Section 876 of the Local Government Act (LGA) Council must hold a Public Hearing after Second Reading and prior to Third Reading, where members of the public who deem their interest in property may be affected will be given the opportunity to be heard by Council.

17.3 Rezoning

Applications for rezoning will be required in order for development to occur. Some areas can be regulated through the use of existing zones as found within Zoning Bylaw No. 1375. In some cases it may be more appropriate to use a site-specific Comprehensive Development Zone that will allow more flexibility to accommodate innovative and mixed use development. All required site specific studies must be completed prior to adoption of any zoning by Council.

17.4 Subdivision

In some cases, Subdivision applications will be required as the owners proceed with their development plans. The subdivision process requires that all requirements as set out within the Subdivision and Development Services Bylaw are followed and that all applicable site specific studies are required before the Approving Officer can approve a Subdivision.

17.5 Development Permits

The OCP sets out areas that are subject to a Development Permit (DP Maps found as Figures 1 to 9 of the OCP). Development Permits may be required including, but not limited to, Steep Slope Areas, Waterfront Areas, Multiple Family, Highway Corridor Areas and Environmentally Sensitive Areas. Development Permits allow the District to apply specific guidelines as set out within the OCP for a Development Permit Area. This allows the District to maintain a standard or level of satisfaction that a development is of a high quality and takes in to account the specific needs of a given area.

17.6 Amenity Contributions

New development and the associated population growth place pressures on existing public facilities and services that the District of Peachland provides to its population. In many cases, the increase in development is substantial enough that it exceeds the District's capacity to provide those amenities into the future. An amenity contribution is an amount of money given to a municipality by a developer(s) that will aid in the upgrading / development of existing or proposed facilities and services such as recreation facilities, fire halls (fire protection equipment) and museums. Providing amenities is a challenge that many municipalities face in an environment that requires municipalities to minimize tax increases through fiscally responsible budgeting.

Development Cost Charges can fund sewer and water systems, roads and transportation but they cannot be used to fund amenities. Upon the granting of higher zoning, developers receive a substantial land lift, or increase in land value. The District has adopted an Amenity Contribution policy per Section 905 of the Local Government Act, where a rational connection between needed community amenities and anticipated new development has been established and a fair contribution formula is implemented.

To help the District to achieve its goals for providing needed amenities, voluntary amenity contributions placed in an Amenity Reserve Fund and are used as a valuable source of funding.

17.7 Development Cost Charges (DCC's)

DCC's are necessary to raise funds to pay for construction, replacement and expansion of infrastructure including water treatment and storage facilities, sewerage treatment and disposal facilities, water and sewer trunk mains, major drainage works and major collector and arterial highways and for community parks, as appropriate. The District has had DCC's in place since 2004.

More localized infrastructure components may be required through off-site works and services agreements.

To help the District to achieve its goals for providing necessary infrastructure and services, DCC's are applied to new development as a valuable source of infrastructure funding.

17.8 Development Construction Issues

At the Development Permit approval stage, construction activity including exposure to noise, dust, traffic issues, hours of operation and site preparation will be considered. The District prefers to approve Development Permits in conjunction with final adoption of the zoning bylaw. The District will request information pertaining to the method of site preparation to be undertaken, at the rezoning stage. Monitoring and review of compliance shall be on-going at regularly established intervals, during the development process. There should be coordination between disciplines (i.e. Forestry Professional and Qualified Environmental Professional – QEP) to ensure that there are no inconsistencies or conflicts in requirements.

17.9 Required Studies and Reports

Council will not adopt any zoning bylaws to implement the plan until appropriate studies or reports are undertaken.

17.10 Development Concepts

Development concepts and estimates described in the ASP shall be clarified within Phased Development Agreements (PDA's) and amendments to the zoning bylaw.