Landscape Buffer Notes:



Buffer Definition

verb

verb: buffer; 3rd person present: buffers; past tense: buffered; past participle: buffered; gerund or present participle: buffering

1. lessen or moderate the impact of (something).

"the massage helped to buffer the strain"

synonyms: shield, protect, defend, cushion, insulate, screen, guard "she tried to buffer the children from the troubles"

noun

noun: **buffer**; plural noun: **buffers**; noun: **buffer solution**; plural noun: **buffer solutions**

- a person or thing that prevents incompatible or antagonistic people or things from coming into contact with or harming each other."family and friends can provide a buffer against stress"
 - 1. *synonyms:* cushion, bulwark, shield, barrier, guard, safeguard "a buffer against market fluctuations"
- 2.

Our building purposely has minimal glazing on the side facing ALR at grade and only to be effective in making aware trespassers on the buffer area. The floors above have no openings windows and only 10% of the facade is glazing.

ALC Landscaped Buffer Specifications (PDF 1993)

?Section 07 - Landscaping and Screening.pdf (2017-09-15)?

City of Kelowna Level 5 Landscape Buffer Design



MINIMUM LANDSCAPE BUFFER TREATMENT ALR - LEVEL 5 Diagram 7.6

ALC Minimum Landscape Buffer Design



Excerpts from the ALC Buffering

2.5 Edge Strategy - Shared Responsibility

The success of edge planning relies on shared responsibility.. This philosophy requires that both agricultural and urban land users and decision makers seek opportunities and adopt approaches to ensure compatibility.. More specifically, successful agricultural – urban edge planning relies on:

- recognition that it is reasonable for landowners along both sides of the agriculture--urban boundary to share the benefits and impacts from edge planning and implementation;
- public education that increases agricultural awareness and promotes neighbourhood--friendly land use; and

- ability of landowners to realize optimum land use which increases long term certainty and security for agricultural and urban land uses.

3.9 Enhacing Agricultural Awareness

Communication tools can be used to enhance compatibility between farming and non—farm uses. Whenever possible, they should be used in conjunction with the other compatibility mechanisms listed in this Guide. These tools can increase the awareness of urban residents living near the farm edge about impacts from normal farm practices that they may experience.. The awareness tools can be used even where existing urban development makes it impractical to address subdivision and housing design, or buffering.

3.9a Disclosure Statements

A disclosure statement,, in the form of a restrictive covenant under section 219 of the *Land Title Act* can be a very effective tool.. It can inform the prospective land buyer that the property is close to an agricultural area where acceptable farm practices may result in noise,, dust, odour &/or other impacts during certain times of the year. To be accepted by the Registrar of Land Titles,, the covenant must have a "rrestrictive"" aspect.. Such "rrestriction"" could include other urban-side tools discussed above – e..gg.., no building in the yards adjacent to the ALR;; If new development occurs in the Edge Planning Area,, within 300 metres of the ALR boundary,, a covenant could be placed on land titles disclosing the proximity of the agricultural area and the potential implications..

WE are prepared and suggest this is appropriate for our Proposal

3.9b Signage

Local governments should consider using signs along the agriculture--urban boundary that inform residents and prospective purchasers of the proximity of farm operations within the immediate area and the possible activities associated with farm operations.. Here is a sample buffer sign.

WE are prepared and suggest this is appropriate for our Proposal





Interesting other Facts from the ALC Buffering:

Farm Side Setback Distances

The following setback distances apply to buildings and structures located with designated EPAs. Setback distances are measured from ALR/Urban boundary on the Farm side.

15M for:

- Greenhouses
- Crop Storage

30M for;

- Mushroom Barns
- Sent Compst Storage
- 50 M for;
 - Boilers
 - Open Loading Areas

- Refrigeration Units

ALR Soil Information Finder

ALR Soils Capability

CLASS 4 LAND IN THIS CLASS HAS LIMITATIONS THAT REQUIRE SPECIAL MANAGEMENT PRACTISES OR SEVERELY RESTRICT THE RANGE OF CROPS, OR BOTH.

Land in Class 4 has limitations which make it suitable for only a few crops, or the yield for a wide range of crops is low, or the risk of crop failure is high, or soil conditions are such that special development and management practises are required. The limitations may seriously affect one or more of the following practises: timing and ease of tillage, planting and harvesting, and methods of soil conservation.

CLASS 6 LAND IN THIS CLASS IS NON-ARABLE BUT IS CAPABLE OF PRODUCING NATIVE AND OR UNCULTIVATED PERENNIAL FORAGE CROPS.

Land in Class 6 provides sustained natural grazing for domestic livestock and is not arable in its present condition. Land is placed in this class because of severe climate, or the terrain is unsuitable for cultivation or use of farm machinery, or the soils do not respond to intensive improvement practises. Some unimproved Class 6 lands can be improved by draining and/or diking.



ArcGIS Web Map



August 28, 2017 BC_Soil_Map_SIFT_AG - AgCapability Leading Class 4 5 5 7 1:1,128 0 0.01 0.02 0.04 mi 0 0.01 0.02 0.04 km

Exit, HERE, DeLarme, Asprovincia, di OpenStreatMap contributore, and the GIS user community. Source: Exit, Dipta/Globa, Geolya, Earthear Geographics, CNESAInova DS, USDA, USDA, AsroGHID, IGN, and the GIS User Community

IBC Soil Information Finder Tool C. Okanagan, Kelowna, DigitalGlobe | Earl, HERE, Garmin, IPC, NRCan |



To:	Jason Monteleone, RM	Kelowna, BC	TR 0721
From:	Lynn Lashuk, P.Ag Manager, Agriculture	Kelowna, BC	TR 0721
Date:	August 29, 2017		SCHEDULE A
COM	MENTARY: STEVE NICHOLS(4638 Lakeshore Roa	DN BUILD SITE ad, Kelowna, BC	# Z17-0077 City of Planner Initials AC

This Agriculture Manager Commentary has been prepared in response to a request by CAM Jason Monteleone on Thursday, August 24, 2017 for client support for a commercial building project adjacent to ALR land in Kelowna, BC. There may be a perceived conflict of interest with a BMO Agrologist opinion, so this commentary is to serve as a guideline only to the developer for future discussions with a 3rd party Agrologist and/or City of Kelowna Staff and Council.

The Ag Manager visited the subject property on Tuesday, August 29, 2017 with the client. The owner, Mr. Steve Nichol, explained the development and provided background on the site and the neighbourhood. The Ag Manager walked the property and viewed the neighbouring agricultural land over the fence.

The subject property and the neighbouring ALR property are shown in the GoogleMap below.



The larger parcel, shown below the subject property is 4647 Bellevue Road, a 2.822 acre property which is included the Agricultural Land Reserve. The land is currently assessed at \$4,740 which indicates that BC Assessment Authority has concluded that the revenue from the farm for agricultural products grown on site meets or exceeds the current criteria for farm land (\$2,500 per year). It is unclear to me at this time how this parcel meets the farm status criteria.

The developer reported that the City of Kelowna has requested a setback from the neighbouring ALR land to provide a buffer that will allow for agricultural activities and mitigate conflict between the development and any agricultural uses, now or in the future.

I contacted Mr. Carl Withler, BC Ministry of Agriculture Tree Fruit and Grape Specialist, former Resource Agrologist with the BC Ministry of Agriculture to enquire about recent changes to bylaws and/or pending changes for development on lands adjacent to farmland within the City boundaries. Carl did not know of any bylaw changes but did state that the City of Kelowna staff has been working on protecting farmland and that there may be new requirements for developers. The current Resource Agrologist has been seconded to work at the Provincial Emergency Response Centres.

I also spoke with Councillor Mohini Singh, a strong advocate for Agriculture, and Ms. Singh also stated that there had been no recent bylaw changes to her knowledge, that would dictate buffer zone set back distances for developers.

The developer is challenged with explaining how the project will not incur negative impact to the neighbouring farm's activities.

In my opinion, at this point in time, from an agronomic perspective with consideration for air, soil and water quality, and the economics of farming the neighbouring parcel, given the type of farm, there will be no negative impacts to the neighbour farm's activities, regardless of buffer zone size.

As for the future, there are too many variables and unknowns to allow for a meaningful opinion on the impact of neighbouring properties on farmland. The concepts/buzz words of "food security" and "grow local" are great taglines, seemingly replacing "sustainability" and "environmentally" in the popular lexicon. The meaning of the buzz words and the impact of their interpretation need to be clearly defined and communicated before public policy and land use decisions are based these concepts.

• The depth of the water table and potential for contamination from agricultural uses due to run-off and irrigation.



- The proximity of neighbours and contamination from chemical drift using normal farm practises (for example, with air blast sprayers) for high value horticultural production.
- The smells from agricultural activities (for example, manures, vegetative waste products or growth room exhaust).
- The sounds from agricultural activities (equipment, animals, pest deterrents for starlings and crows)
- The light from potential greenhouse operations.
- The farm access requirements for shipping and receiving on agricultural land.
- The overall economics of farming on a small parcel of land.

Please feel free to call/email me to discuss.

Respectfully submitted by,

Lynn Lashuk

29-August-2017 Lynn Lashuk, P.Ag Manager, Agriculture, BC Division



LONDONPLAIN TREE

Nov 23

 Initiated conversation with Real Estate to arrange for Londonplain Tree to be relocated to the Roundabout as a centre piece at my expense. Explored with all appropriate Departments and ultimately given the short timeline was not possible. Had we more time it could have been engineered correctly but the Roundabout Construction would have been delayed another year.

May 15

• Met in person with Mike Geddes to suggest relocating the Londonplain Tree to his parcel approximately 120M to the south. He agreed with enthusiasm

Sept 15

• Confirmation from Mike Geddes of his Support for our proposal as well as his willingness to have the Londonplain Tree relocated to his property at our expense

SCHEDULE	Α
This forms part of applic # Z17-0077	cation
Planner Initials AC	City of Kelowna

From: Ben Walker BWalker@kelowna.ca

Subject: FW: 4638 Lakeshore Rd the Round About and the Tree



- To: Blair Stewart@kelowna.ca, Andrew Hunsberger AHunsberger@kelowna.ca, Rafael Villarreal Pacheco RVillarreal@kelowna.ca, Brian Beach BBeach@kelowna.ca
- Cc: Steve Nicholson steven@strandhaus.ca, John Saufferer JSaufferer@kelowna.ca

Gentlemen,

Steve Nicholson, whom has recently acquired the Minstrel Café, is looking to redevelop the site which will go a long way to re-energizing the existing commercial node. As part of this redevelopment, Steve would like try and save the existing London Plane tree and would like to engage in conversation with the City about incorporating the tree into the proposed roundabout. Obviously there are challenges in moving a tree of this size but Steve has been working with Mike Gates of Okanagan Tree Sales and Mike believes it is achievable. Before we move this any further I would ask that you please provide some comments and thoughts on if this is something you would believe worth exploring. Some comments I have are as follows:

- One of the goals of the roundabout is to slow down north bound traffic as it moves down the hill. If people are moving through the roundabout at 25km/hr does this proposal allow for proper sightlines (if the canopy is trimmed accordingly). To me it wouldn't be much different than the running man installed in the Queensway roundabout (similar diameter "trunk")
- The diameter of the tree is roughly 30m, which is the same diameter as the roundabout (centre out to the edge of asphalt). Is it possible to:
 - Trim the canopy so that it meets traffic needs (i.e. not interfere with the truck route)
 - Raise the centre of the roundabout to give move height? Or other options?
- What is the risk for the City should the tree not survive?

I look forward to exploring this creative and unique plan in saving this tree. If you can please provide me with your feedback by Tuesday, November 30, 2016 it would be greatly appreciated.

Cheers,

Ben

Benjamin Walker, B.L.Arch, BCSLA Property Officer II 250-469-8472 | bwalker@kelowna.ca



-----Original Message-----From: Steve Nicholson [mailto:steven@strandhaus.ca] Sent: Wednesday, November 23, 2016 12:56 PM To: Ben Walker <BWalker@kelowna.ca>; John Saufferer <JSaufferer@kelowna.ca>; Blair Stewart <bstewart@kelowna.ca>; Adam Cseke <ACseke@kelowna.ca> Subject: 4638 Lakeshore Rd the Round About and the Tree

Hi Ben et al,

I've been working more with Mike Gates on a viable option to relocate the existing "Minstrel

Tree".

He has done considerable research on large tree moving and is confident he can move it successfully. We've approached the immediate neighbour on ALR land along Lakeshore Rd and he's not terribly interested in having the tree on his property as it would in his opinion reduce the value of his land.

I was having a discussion with an acquaintance and it was suggested we relocate the Tree to the centre of the proposed roundabout. Thinking further on the subject it does have considerable merit...

Who would we need to include in this conversation to move forward?

The costs and risks associated with moving the tree would ideal be shared by the parties.

Thoughts?

Steve



SCHEDU	JLE A	
This forms part of application		
# <u>Z17-0077</u>	🕺 💥	
	City of 💖	
Planner Initials AC	Kelowna community planning	

From: Mike Geddes <<u>mike.geddes@naiokanagan.ca</u>> Subject: RE: Request Date: September 15, 2017 at 1:21:59 PM PDT To: Steve Nicholson <<u>steven@strandhaus.ca</u>>

Attention:

City of Kelowna - Mayor, Council and whom it may concern,

I have reviewed and would like to hereby express support for the proposed development by Steve Nicholson and Strandhaus Developments at 4638 Lakeshore Rd.

I own and live at the 4.5acre ALR farm parcel at 4676 Bellevue Rd., one property (~100m) directly south of the subject property of 4638 Lakeshore Rd. Steve Nicholson and I have met regarding the proposed development on numerous occasions and I have agreed to accept into my property at the developers request and expense the relocation of the large London Plane shade tree currently at 4638 Lakeshore Rd. I have a horse pasture area into which the tree would most likely transplant and adapt given soils & hydrology similarities.

Should there be any questions or to discuss further please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Mike Geddes, B.Comm.

Personal Real Estate Corporation Principal CELL 250-878-6687 FAX 888-877-4805 <u>mike.geddes@naiokanagan.ca</u> 1980 Cooper Rd, Suite 219 Kelowna, BC V1Y 8K5









D'ARCY JONES ARCHITECTURE INC.
304-175 Broadway East Vancouver BC VST 1W2
T 604 669 2235 F 604 669 2231 mai@darsyonia.com
SCALE: 1/16" = 110"
DATE: 2017-07-25
DRAWN: BR
CHECKED: DJ
REVESION:
ISSUE:
CONSULTANT
Copyright reserved. All parts of this drawing are the exclusive property of DXRCY JONES ARCHITECTURE INC and shall not be used willnest permission, in part or in whole.
DO NOT SCALE THESE DRAWINGS
All dimensions to be verified by contractor, trades or suppliers. Any discrepancies shall be brought to the attantion of the Architect.
Any errors or omissions on this drawing shall be reported to D'ARCY JONES ARCHITECTURE INC for clarification and revision
LAKESHORE KELOWNA 4638 LAKESHORE ROAD KELOWNA BC
A0.3

AERIAL CONTEXT

ISSUES: A ISSUED FOR REZONING 2017-07-25







COLLETT STREETSCAPE

D'ARCY JONES ARCHITECTURE INC.

304 - 175 Broadway East Vancouver BC V6T 11V2 T 604 669 2235 F 604 669 2231 mei®darcyjonie com

> 9CALE: 1/16" = 110" DATE: 2017-06-22 DRAWN: BR CHECKED: DJ REVISION:

> > and shall in whole.

URE INC for

LAKESHORE KELOWNA 4638 LAKESHORE ROAD KELOWNA BC

STREETSCAPE

A0.4b





SOUTH EAST CORNER JUNE 21, 9:00AM

WEST FACING BALCONIES JUNE 21, 3:00PM

D'ARCY JONES ARCHITECTURE INC. 304 -175 Broadway East Vancouver BC V5T 1W2

T 604 669 2235 F 604 669 2231 Nidarcyjones.com SCALE: DATE: 2017-07-25 DRAWN: BR CHECKED EVENON ISSUE

Copyright reserved. All parts of this drawing are the exclusive property of D/ARCY JONES ARCHITECTURE INC and shall not be used without permission. In part or in whole. DO NOT SCALE THESE DRAWINGS

awing shall be TURE INC for LAKESHORE KELOWNA 4638 LAKESHORE ROAD KELOWNA BC

A0.5 RENDERINGS







A CARACY JONES ARCHITECTURE INC. BARRY JONES ARCHITECTURE INC. BARRY JONES PROBABILITY PROBA

NORTH WEST CORNER JUNE 21, 7:30PM

RENDERINGS

A0.6



BUILDING SECTION (FACING NORTH)



D'ARCY JONES ARCHITECTURE INC.

A due to show the first of the show the

or supplies. Any discrepancies shall be becaught to the abanton of the Architect. Any errors or onissions on this drawing shall be reported to DARCY JONES ARCHITECTURE for for clarification and revision

LAKESHORE KELOWNA 4638 LAKESHORE ROAD KELOWNA BC

A6.1









Enns Gauthier landscape architects

Kelowna, BC June 2017



A REISSUE FOR REZONING 17-12-13

llex crenata 'Convexa

Convex-Leaf Japanese holly

UNILOCK PAVER

4638 LAKESHORE ROAD Landscape Design 4638 Lakeshore Road Kelowna, BC

4638 LAKESHORE RD LTD. 17090 Rezoning June 2017

PLANT LIST AND PRECEDENT IMAGES

Pinus nigra

Oxalis

Wood Sorrel

Austrian pine





Common Name

Paperbark Maple

Swiss Stone Pine

Moonglow Juniper

Bearberry, Kinnikinick

Blue Danube Azalea

Japanese Holly

Rewood Sorrel

5. INSTALL TREE PROTECTION FENCING AROUND ALL EXISTING TREES TO CITY STANDARDS, INSTALL TREE PROTECTION FENCING ON NEW PLANTING IF PHASED INSTALLATION IS REQUIRED.

Western Sword Fern

Blue Chip Juniper

Salal

3. FINAL SOFTSCAPE AND GRADING LAYOUTS AS WELL AS LOCATION AND SPACING TO BE APPROVED BY LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT IN THE FIELD PRIOR TO INSTALLATION

1. ALL PLANT MATERIAL AND LANDSCPING PRACTICES SHALL BE COMPLIANT WITH THE LATEST EDITION OF THE BCLNA NURSERY STANDARD 2. IN CASE OF DESCREPANCY BETWEEN PLANT INFORMATION ON THE LIST AND ON THE PLAN, THE LATTER SHALL PREVAIL

4. ALL PLANT MATERIAL TO BE MANUALLY WATERED FROM START OF INSTALLATION THROUGH THE END OF THE WARRANTY PERIOD

Acer circinatum

Arctostaphylos uva-urs

Akebono Yoshino Cherry

Rockspray or Rock Cotoneaster

Vine Maple



Juniperus horizontalis 'Blue Chip'

Creeping Juniper



Cotoneaster horizontalis

Rock Cotoneaster









CONCRETE BENCH WITH WOOD TOP

5cm cal. 2m. ht.

1'6"o.c.

2'0"o.c.

1'6"o.c.

2'0"o.c.

1'8"o.c.

Notes

Scheduled Size Spacing

5cm cal.

#5 Pot

#1 Pot

#3 Pot

#1 Pot

#1 Pot

#3 Pot

#2 Pot

#1 Pot

#3 Pot

B&B Specimen, Twisted shape **SCHEDULE** 1'0"o.c. 2'0"o.c.

AC

Z17-0077

Planner

Initials

B&B Specimen, Multistem.

City of

B&B Specimen, Multistem. С 1'0"o.c. This forms part of application

MATERIAL PRECEDENTS



PLANT LIST Quantity Latin Name

19 Acer griseum

4 Acer circinatum

49 Juniperus scopulorum 'Moonglow'

264 Arctostaphylos uva-ursi

955 Azalea x 'Blue Danube'

1151 Cotoneaster horizontalis

73 Ilex crenata 'Convexa'

47 Polystichum munitium

356 Juniperus horizontalis 'Blue Chip'

51 Gaultheria shallon

402 Oxalis oregana

5 Pinus cembra

TREES: R

R

۲

0

3

۲

\$

0

۰

NOTES:

GROUNDCOVERS / FERNS:

PLANT PRECEDENTS

SHRUBS:

CONIFERS:

ATTACHMENT A



Subject: 4673 Lakeshore Road

1.1 Agricultural Land Commission – Schedule 'A' Buffer types (1993) – A1: Minimum Vegetative Screen (Evergreen Hedge)

Minimum visual screening and protection of farmland from trespass and vandalism.



1.2 Agricultural Land Commission – Schedule 'A' Buffer types (1993) – A2: Minimum Vegetative Screen (Medium Height Trees)

Inhibits trespass and vandalism while providing protection to non-farm developments from the movement of dust and pesticide spray from adjacent agriculture operations.



Agricultural Land Commission – Schedule 'A' Buffer types (1993) –
 A3: Airborne Particle and Visual Screen (a. Yearly Screen / b. Summer Screen)





Agricultural Land Commission – Schedule 'A' Buffer types (1993) –
 A4: Noise, Airborne Particle & Visual Screen (a. Yearly Screen / b. Summer Screen)

To Buffer agricultural land from trespass and vandalism, visually screen incompatible uses, reduce the exchange of particulate matter between adjacent land uses and reduce the transmission of noise. (Note: Coniferous trees should be used in the buffer in situations where visual and particulate screening is required on a year round basis. Solution A.4a)



3.8 Urban-side buffer design specifications

Below are the setback distances for principal buildings and design criteria for installing an urban-side buffer along the agriculture-urban boundary. Four examples of design specifications and layouts follow.

Urban-Side Setback & Buffer Design Criteria for Urban-Agriculture EPAs				
	Setback Distance and Buffer Size	Buffer Height	Buffer Design Features	
Level I Urban-side Residential Setback & Buffer*	Setback_ 30 m from agricultural area boundary	6 m ** (finished height)	 Mixed planting of fast growing tree and shrub species with foliage from base to crown – long thin foliage desirable. Include at least 60% evergreen conifers to collect dust & spray drift. 	
	Buffer Width I5 m – buffer is lo-		 No gaps in buffer and no tightly packed hedges; crown density of 50-75%. Design as wedge shaped if odour dilution desired. 	
	Cated within the 30 m setback ATTACHMENT B This forms part of application # Z17-0077 City of Kelowna		 Design specifications and layout will be as per urban- side Buffer A or B (p.24); or existing vegetation may be retained as part of buffer (Buffer C, p.26). 	
ATTACHN			 Leave 2 m of low growing or no vegetation from agri- cultural areaboundary. 	
This forms part of # Z17-0077 Planner			 If paths and passive recreational uses (e.g. picnic areas) are part of the landscaped buffer, the recreational fea- tures will not take up more than 1/3 the width of the buffer and they will be located away from the agricul- tural area boundary. 	
Initials AC	COMMUNITY PLANNI	NG	• If community forest/gardens are an included use of the buffer then the uses should be located away from the agricultural area boundary and protected with vegetation.	
Level 2	Setback	6 m**	Either a double row of mixed deciduous/coniferous	
Urban-side Non- Residential Setback & Buffer	15 m from agricultural area boundary	(finished height) **See Note 2 below	 (with at least 60% evergreen conifers) or just coniferous, and hedging/screening shrub species with foliage from base to crown. Design specifications and layout will be as per urban- 	
(e.g. passive recreation, industrial, or commer-	Buffer Width		side Buffer D (p.27); or retain existing vegetation (Buf-	
cial)	8 m – buffer is lo- cated within the 15 m setback		 Leave 2 m of low growing or no vegetation from ALR boundary. 	

* Exception to Level 1 Residential Urban-side Buffer requirements:

Residential parcels that are separated from the agricultural area by a road allowance can reduce the size of the Level 1 buffer, provided new driveway accesses from these parcels onto the subject road allowance are avoided. The siting of the residence should still be 30 m but the vegetative buffer can be reduced to 7.5 metre width and located as near and parallel to the agricultural area boundary as possible.

** If spray drift is a concern, tree height should be 1.5 times the spray release height or target height, whichever is higher.

3.8.a Urban-Side Buffer A (no berm) – Design Specifications & Layout

The Urban-side **Buffer A** includes:

- > double row deciduous/coniferous trees (see Appendix B for plant list)
- > triple row trespass inhibiting shrubs (see Appendix B for plant list)
- > double row screening shrubs (see Appendix B for plant list)
- solid wood fence or chain link fence with a height of 6 feet (1.8 metres) and built as per Appendix C or as per the local government's fencing specifications.



3.8.b Urban-Side Buffer B (with berm) – Design Specifications & Layout

Urban-side **Buffer B** includes all elements of **Buffer A**, as well as a berm with a minimum height of 2 metres above the adjacent grades. There are two alternatives for locating a fence, either at the lowest or highest points of the berm. This choice should be made according to design and use of adjacent properties. The main intent of the berm in this example is to provide increased storm water retention capabilities of the buffer, although a berm may provide more effective noise reduction and visual screening as well.



3.8.c Urban-Side Buffer C (Existing Vegetation) - Design Specifications & Layout

Urban-side **Buffer C** should retain existing vegetation and use either a solid wood or chain-link fence with a height of 6 feet (1.8 metres), built as per Appendix C or as per the local government's fencing specifications.



ATTACHMENT B				
This forms part of application				
# Z17-0077	🕅 🚿			
	City of 🔇			
Planner Initials AC	Kelowna community planning			

3.8.d Urban-Side Buffer D - Design specifications, layout & spacing

Urban-side Buffer D includes:

- > single row deciduous or coniferous or just coniferous trees (see Appendix B for plant list)
- > triple row trespass inhibiting shrubs (see Appendix B for plant list)
- > single row screening shrubs (see Appendix B for plant list)
- > solid wood fence or chain link fence with a height of 6 feet (1.8 metres) and built as per Appendix C or as per the local government's fencing specifications.



3.8.e Urban-Side Buffer Spacing (Buffers A, B or D)



Double row deciduous/coniferous trees

Double row screening shrubs



Triple row trespass inhibiting shrubs

3.9 Enhancing Agricultural Awareness

Communication tools can be used to enhance compatibility between farming and non-farm uses. Whenever possible, they should be used in conjunction with the other compatibility mechanisms listed in this Guide. These tools can increase the awareness of urban residents living near the farm edge about impacts from normal farm practices that they may experience. The awareness tools can be used even where existing urban development makes it impractical to address subdivision and housing design, or buffering.

Please refer to Appendix A for an example of how the agriculture awareness tools in this section can be applied within Development Permit Area guidelines.

3.9.a Disclosure statements

A disclosure statement, in the form of a restrictive covenant under section 219 of the *Land Title Act* can be a very effective tool. It can inform the prospective land buyer that the property is close to an agricultural area where acceptable farm practices may result in noise, dust, odour &/or other impacts during certain times of the year.

To be accepted by the Registrar of Land Titles, the covenant must have a "restrictive" aspect. Such "restriction" could include other urban-side tools discussed above – e.g., no building in the yards adjacent to the ALR; houses or other habitable buildings must have extra sound-proofing.

If new development occurs in the Edge Planning Area, within 300 metres of the ALR boundary, a covenant could be placed on land titles disclosing the proximity of the agricultural area and the potential implications.

3.9.b Signage

Local governments should consider using signs along the agriculture-urban boundary that inform residents and prospective purchasers of the proximity of farm operations within the immediate area and the possible activities associated with farm operations. Here are two sample buffer signs.



Farmers in this area sometimes:

- Make noises to keep wildlife away from crops
- Plough fields on dry, dusty days
- Spread manure to fertilize fields
- Spray crops to eliminate weeds or plant disease
- Drive big, slow machines between fields
- Harvest crops day or night when ripe

