
City of Kelowna

MEMORANDUM

DATE: August 16, 2006
FILE: 5080-01

TO: City Manager

FROM: Community Planning Manager

RE: Review of Community Planning Function Within the Community Development
and Real Estate Division of Corporate Services

REPORT PREPARED BY: Theresa Eichler

RECOMMENDATIONS:

THAT Council take the recommendations of the consultant entitled *Defining the City of Kelowna's Role in Social Planning* dated August 2, 2006, under advisement and support the recommendations below, based on the findings of the consultant's report:

AND THAT Council refer the hiring of a Community Development Officer, subject to the parameters defined in this report, to the 2007 budget review process. The community development officer would:

- a. Possess a post-secondary social work or community development diploma or degree;
- b. Report to the Community Planning Manager;
- c. Be required to work with non-profit and social serving agencies and committees operating both within and external to the City structure;
- d. Be pro-active in determining appropriate means of providing community development service to the non-profit and government social-serving sectors.

AND THAT Council defer any consideration of changing budget allocations to the grant programs administered under Community Planning until a report is received from the contracted grants administration agency (Central Okanagan Foundation);

AND THAT Council direct the Terms of Reference for the Social Planning & Housing Committee be amended in accordance with recommendations No. 1, 2, 4 and 5 of the August 2, 2006 SPARC Report presented to the City, to incorporate the points below, as shown by the changes in the attached revised terms of reference;

- e. Formal appointment of Committee members to represent the City on external community-based committees;
- f. Holding annual community consultations with stakeholders to identify current community priorities;
- g. Preparing annual work plans for projects to be conducted at the committee level, based on community consultation and policy direction;

- h. Providing an annual status report to Council that will include the results of community consultations, corresponding recommended actions and the annual work plans, along with any items that need to be referred to the annual budget review process.

AND THAT an environmental scan process, included as Recommendation 6 in the August 2, 2006 SPARC Report presented to the City, be coordinated with the community consultation to be conducted annually by the Social Planning & Housing Committee;

AND FURTHER THAT Council authorize staff to bring forward the necessary amendments to the Official Community Plan and Zoning By-law to introduce amenity bonusing to achieve community amenities as part of the development process, in response to Recommendations 9 and 11 of the August 2, 2006 SPARC Report presented to the City.

PURPOSE:

In 2005, Council approved the hiring of a consultant to review the Community Planning function at the City and make recommendations for change to improve the delivery of this service. Interviews with internal and external stakeholders in provision of community and social services were conducted and a workshop was held. The approach was to determine familiarity with the current policies and service delivery, identify and prioritize current social issues for Kelowna and recommend changes to the City. It is important to note that a deliberate approach was to determine perceptions; and that the findings of the research are in the context of perceptions of the stakeholders who participated in the process. As such, they may not necessarily reflect the priorities of the broad community and they may not be consistent with the approved direction of City Council in some circumstances.

The Social Planning & Research Council of B.C. (SPARC) was hired to conduct the research and produce a report with recommendations to City Council. This was following a comprehensive Request for Proposals process that determined the best submission, based on the Terms of Reference for the project.

REPORT:

HISTORY:

The Community Planning function was last examined in 1994, when the focus was to move away from the social service-based approach to determining the City's role in quality of life issues, to a more planning-based approach. Findings of research to that point led to a prevention-oriented manner of determining the appropriate municipal role of addressing the well-being of its citizens. The City made use of definitions of prevention from Social Work theory identifying primary, secondary and tertiary prevention to help distinguish its role. These are as follows:

Primary Prevention is oriented towards groups, and attempts to reduce the incidence of social breakdown by strengthening and supporting the individual, family and community.

Secondary and Tertiary prevention initiatives are often more focused on individuals, and attempt to address problems that are already established from a

rehabilitative or crisis-oriented perspective. Examples include support to those suffering health problems, crisis centres and rehabilitation programs.

Any service to address a social or health problem, falling under secondary or tertiary prevention, was seen as a senior government, rather than municipal, responsibility. The City's social policy structure was then developed with primary prevention as the underlying theme, based on considerable research & community consultation undertaken by the City at that time. A workshop with about 100 people in attendance in February 1996 helped finalize the structure and content of the Social Plan document that was approved by City Council in March of 1996. Since then, social policies have been incorporated in the OCP and work programs have been developed based on this policy direction. Updates to policy have happened in many ways since 1996, through specific projects, such as the Housing Study in 1999/2000, secondary suites research, the zoning by-law review and the review of the issue of sexual exploitation of youth. Two updates of the OCP itself included the social component of the policies, at one point re-organizing them such that they are found throughout the document, instead of in one chapter that could be overlooked.

A major barrier in trying to keep social policy framework up to date and in trying to achieve objectives of work programs developed to implement this policy direction has been the continual side-tracking of time from this area to the most current social issues identified by other levels of government or social stakeholders in the community. Examples include: sexual exploitation of youth; poverty, the needs of young children (0-5), homelessness and addictions. Each of these issues has been attached to limited federal or provincial funding that demands a "community-based" approach. This involves the creation of a stakeholder group normally consisting of representatives of agencies that would be in competition for limited funding dollars, as well as government representatives and with a demand for City participation in some form. In some instances, resources in the form of research produced by the City have been sufficient to help initiatives move forward. In many cases, there is an expectation that the City be represented at every meeting of the groups that are responding to the latest social issues in the community.

The City has continually formulated its policy direction and work programs with many forms of community consultation with its residents. It also conscientiously operates within the legal framework set out for municipalities. It is clear that there is an expectation that work in the area of community or "social" planning should also cater to the community of social service providing stakeholders in a more direct way. The current structure of one manager in charge of moving community planning initiatives forward does not allow for this level of interaction or service delivery. The demand, however, continues to be evident.

The work of SPARC was to more clearly determine the expectations of the stakeholders who are involved in the delivery of social services to the community. The City also wanted to conduct a time sensitive reading of the social issues that were considered priorities at the time of the research. Some of the themes identified are familiar and consistent with historical interactions with the non-profit sector. Provision of buildings and space by the City and increasing grant funding are examples of these.

SUMMARY OF SPARC REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS:

The recommendations from the consultant's report will be repeated in this section of the report, with staff comments provided:

Recommendation 1: Structure the SPHC to be a point of communication for community concerns by having members participate on the various social issue committees, task forces, and community tables as representatives of the City of Kelowna, relieving the CPM from attending as the City representative, while utilizing the skills and expertise of Committee members. [This recommendation does not have a financial cost, but could require a redirection of human resources to facilitate changes in Committee structure.]

Staff is supportive of this recommendation and has taken the approach of assigning members of the Social Planning & Housing Committee (SPHC) to the various community-based committees that exist outside of City Council's structure over the years. This has happened on a relatively informal level, usually with a motion of the committee to support a member's participation on the particular committee and an expectation that the individual would report back to the SPHC. Although this approach has been beneficial in some instances, it has also resulted in difficulty on the part of committee members in representing the City. This is due to the need for some members to prioritize representation of their employer over the City, an inadequate comfort level with the City's role in some areas and a desire to act as an individual, to provide a few of the reasons. A more structured way of soliciting the Committee's assistance in this area is needed.

Recommendation 2: Create regularized structures to facilitate the sharing of information on social issues between Committee members and between Committee and Council. [This recommendation does not have a financial cost, but could require a redirection of human resources.]

The Terms of Reference for the SPHC name staff as the resource for presenting reports to City Council, although the Committee Chair often also presents some material on behalf of the Committee. Again this process could be more specifically defined, enabling a more active role on the part of Committee members.

Recommendation 3: Review the effectiveness of the current Committee structure to ensure that a variety of social issues are addressed either through the re-division into two separate committees or by ensuring that key social issues are addressed in the Committee's annual workplans. [This recommendation will have a financial cost if the determination is to support a second committee.]

The present SPHC was amalgamated from the former Social Planning Board and Community Housing Needs Committee. The consultant's report suggests re-creating this division. The recommendation was made based on the consultation that took place prior to the last municipal election. Several Task Forces and Committees have been created since 2005 to deal with more specific issues (e.g. Advisory Committee on Community and Women's issues, Advisory Committee for People with Disabilities, Youth Task Force, Affordable and Special Needs Housing Task Force). The administrative of the former two committees was demanding and the blending of the two was beneficial from this perspective. Staff is now providing administrative support to the Advisory Committee for People with Disabilities, research support to the Affordable and Special Needs Task Force and assisting with the Youth Task Force. Other City staff are also involved in supporting these new committees / task forces reporting to City Council.

It may be wise to defer any consideration of re-structuring committees within community planning until the new committee structures have been in place for more than a year.

Recommendation 4: *Formalize the development of an SPHC annual work plan to ensure that its strategic direction fits within the strategic and operational plans of the City and that social priorities are addressed. [This recommendation does not have a financial cost.]*

The work of the SPHC has been loosely defined each year in terms of what events it would like to support and what initiatives it would like to take forward to Council. A more formalized work plan specifically for the Committee is a positive idea. It should be separate and distinct from the overall community planning work plan as part of budget considerations. Support from the Committee for the work within community planning is still needed, but duplication of work plans need not occur.

Recommendation 5: *Include a public engagement process, such as a stakeholder consultation, within the development of SPHC annual work plans. [There are financial costs associated with this recommendation.]*

In order to effectively include a public engagement process that would help determine work plans for the SPHC staff would need to properly organize this process. If it was combined with other activities of the SPHC, resulting calls for action from the City would be good feedback from the work of the Committee.

Recommendation 6: *Develop an environmental scan process through which residents and institutional stakeholders can have a voice in planning around social issues. [There are financial costs associated with this recommendation.]*

This recommendation could be combined with Recommendation 5 such that with the assistance of the SPHC, the City hosts or conducts an annual exercise, generally involving public events, that would enable the community stakeholders at all levels to communicate their priorities to the City. The Committee and staff could then examine how the City can address these priorities in the following year.

Recommendation 7: *Coordinate with other City departments to streamline internal planning processes in order to develop a comprehensive framework that addresses quality of life issues. [This recommendation does not have a financial cost, but is a resource issue for staff.]*

This recommendation is consistent with the City's Corporate Plan and other policy documents including the Strategic Plan and the Official Community Plan. The Corporate Plan also noted the difficulties in achieving this. Due to the general heavy workload of most City departments, it is a challenge to effectively communicate and coordinate between departments and this leads to "silo" behaviour where many departments may be working towards the same goals on parallel projects but do not get together frequently enough as a team for a more cohesive result. It will continue to be an area that City administration will work towards enhancing. Kelowna is a high growth community with many complex external and internal pressures for delivering service to its residents and economic base. This is acknowledged and the City will always strive to improve its service delivery.

Experience with the delivery of the community planning function over the last decade has confirmed that working with the other departments at the management level is a

highly effective way of ensuring that the City's priorities in these areas are met.

Examples include:

- working jointly with the RCMP, Parks and Planning Department to review effective ways of reducing crime at beach access parks;
- developing community indicators in cooperation with the RCMP to help determine areas of the city where crime prevention programs might be most effective;
- working with Parks, Airport Management, Public Works (Transportation) and Civic Properties to resolve issues of accessibility for people with disabilities.

Recommendation 8: *Develop information sharing relationships with other levels of government and their institutions to increase opportunities for coordination, collaboration, and partnership. [This recommendation does not have a financial cost, but is a resource issue for staff.]*

Community planning has devoted considerable energy towards building information sharing relationships with other levels of government and their institutions as cited above. This has happened in many ways, through external committee work and through deliberate work towards networking with other organizations to determine the best course of action for the City. The latter is the approach used in trying to complete policy directed work projects, as no undertaking is done in a vacuum without seeking input from other agencies that will have influence or may have conducted similar work themselves. Examples of the latter include improving the City's regulatory approach, primarily through zoning, to land uses that relate directly to quality of life for the community, including secondary suites, child care services, various forms of residential development and residential facilities that provide services, including health care, to residents.

A very clear example of committee-based coordination, collaboration and partnerships was the City's experience with the Premier's Task Force on Homelessness, Mental Illness and Addictions (PTF). This work and the projects developed as a result, have forged close partnerships with provincial agencies, including, but not limited to the Ministry of Employment and Income Assistance, Interior Health and BC Housing. A partnership award was given by the Premier for this work in Kelowna and other BC communities. Collaboration, coordination and partnerships that extend the level of the Task Force are also very time-consuming. PTF work in 2005 accounted for about 350 hours, or 10 full weeks / 50 days of staff time for the Community Planning Manager alone. Other staff in the City within Planning & Corporate Services, Communication and Finance, were also part of this work in 2005 and 2006, devoting many hours that were not initially part of internal budget and work programs defined by the City. This is the area within Community Planning that is so hard to define due to the external origin of the time requirements, and where additional assistance is needed.

Recommendation 9: *Look for opportunities to be innovative in using City assets to support the space needs of community service providers either through property or through the negotiation of public space in the development process. [There are potential financial costs associated with this recommendation.]*

This recommendation is consistent with the historical experiences of the City in working with the non-profit sector. Most agencies look to the City to provide building space and/or land at little or no cost. In some examples over the years, there has been a clear fit with the services of an agency and the services the City has a mandate to provide. In other situations, the fit has been less clear but consistent with objectives that the City wanted to achieve. This form of using City assets will probably continue and has been

innovative, if not well-defined, in the past. A new direction that staff would like to achieve is to look at amenity bonusing (similar to the Vancouver approach) as a way to secure community services through the development process as the city continues to grow. Council support for this initiative will be sought. Other new endeavours will arise as a result of pro-active work to bring City-owned land into the equation for achieving community goals, both external ones and those that are part of the City-led priorities.

Recommendation 10: *Increase the funds available to community groups through the Community Social Development Grants and Grants to Address the Sexual Exploitation of Youth. [There are financial costs associated with this recommendation.]*

This recommendation is also consistent with the City's communications with the non-profit sector. However, the grants programs, since they were initiated with the Community Social Development Grants in 1992, have very infrequently spent the annual budget allocation. Either the applications were inconsistent with the grants programs or individual grant recipients were unable to conduct the intended work. Staff administered these programs until 2004. In 2005, grants administration was contracted to the Central Okanagan Foundation. 2006 marks the second year grants were administered externally, but overseen by the City. One consistent difficulty with the grants programs centres around the understanding of primary prevention as a priority in allocating funds. Primary prevention, as defined earlier in this report, is consistent with City mandates and policies, while secondary and tertiary prevention programs, where health or social services are provided to those that are disenfranchised or have health-related conditions, are frequently the source of grant requests. The City generally considers the latter as senior government responsibilities.

It is recommended that Council hold off on considering any increases to the grants program allocations until a report from the Foundation or other contracted agency is brought forward. This report should provide a detailed account of how the money was spent and how well the City's policy direction is matched with grant allocations.

Recommendation 11: *Should any central urban policies be created in Kelowna, ensure that they have a strong social element, that the City brings community to the table and that it enhances social services in Kelowna. [This recommendation does not have a financial cost.]*

The Kelowna Downtown Plan included social issues when it was prepared. This could have included greater participation of the social and non-profit stakeholders, although these groups were invited and involved in the consultation processes at the time. The consultant was of the impression, in preparing this report on Social Planning, that the City would pursue an Urban Development Agreement, and this was the context of Recommendation 11. The latter is on hold until federal funding priorities in this area are clearer. Funding priorities provincially and federally for initiatives affecting city centres are limited and are more focused on program delivery, usually conducted by non-profit agencies, than with capital or physical improvements or changes to these areas. Municipal interest is necessarily more focused on the latter, due to its mandated role in overseeing development. Any planning initiatives affecting urban centres can and will include the involvement of the social and non-profit sectors into the future.

Recommendation 12: *Consider hiring additional administrative support to provide assistance to community development staff. [There are financial costs associated with this recommendation.]*

This recommendation was made prior to the restructuring of committees of Council, following the last election. The latter, in itself, has resulted in significant increases in administrative work. Details are outlined in the next section of this report with the amount of time for the various new committees outlined in the table on page 10. Administrative support is provided on a City department or division level. The administrative support needs for community planning only form part of the consideration of this need for the Community Development and Real Estate Division. The workload of the Division, now with the added committee support work, is presenting significant difficulties for administrative staff to deliver all of the work initiatives needed in a timely manner. More full-time administrative staff is definitely needed, and this will be brought forward as part of the budget review process. Recording support for Council Committee work is currently a separate issue under review by the Clerk's Department. It affects many departments, including the needs of community planning.

Recommendation 13: Consider hiring at least one additional full-time employee to assist the City with collaboration, partnerships and consultation. [There are financial costs associated with this recommendation.]

This recommendation is the primary recommendation resulting from the stakeholder consultations conducted by the Social Planning and Research Council. The City did pursue a very similar option in 2002 by hiring a temporary position. There has been other project-based contracted work, practicum student placements from the Okanagan College, and summer students hired over the years to augment the ability to deliver the community planning function. Recommendation 13 advises that the City pursue a full-time, permanent position.

The position needs to be clearly defined. There will also be challenges with the seasonal and issue-based fluctuations in demand for City involvement in "community-level" work, often created out of senior government funding priorities. Typically, new initiatives are created on short notice or behind schedule, (e.g. National Homelessness Initiative, Premier's Task Force on Homelessness, Mental Illness and Addictions), generating significant time demands on limited notice, outside of City-initiated and budgeted priorities. Another fluctuation is the decrease in activity during summer months, where much of the external committee-based work generally gets put on hold due to the difficulty of assembling large groups of people in the summer months. The person placed in the position of primarily working at this level should possess the initiative to find more pro-active ways of effectively initiating and committing to community development work, instead of only being able to react to outside demands.

Qualifications would need to be in the area of social work at a college or university level and proven experience in the area of community development would be mandatory.

ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS AND DISCUSSION:

The last year presented many challenges in moving forward with the findings of the SPARC research in the area of Community Planning. These included the unforeseen and considerable demands on staff time in CDRE, as well as other City Departments, for the work of the Premier's Task Force on Homelessness, Mental Illness and Addictions; significant change happening within City administrative structure¹; a municipal election

¹ Including, but not limited to: promotion of the CDRE Manager to a new position of Director of Corporate Services; appointment of a new CDRE Manager, promotion of the Director of Planning

with notable change on City Council; corresponding change to Council Committee structures; and personal events affecting staff.

At the time the consultant report was sought, many of the changes that have since happened weren't anticipated, and a time-sensitive reading of social priorities in the community was thought to provide the most value in helping to direct Council on the appropriate and most effective way of moving forward with the community planning function. Consideration of the SPARC recommendations must now be done in the context of the present City structure. An illustration of how stakeholder priorities within the community can affect the delivery of services was initially an objective that was viewed internally as desirable, but that had the added effect of interviewed stakeholders misinterpreting the exercise and questioning the methodology. This created difficulty for the consultant and staff in delivering effective recommendations to Council. Additional recommendations from the administrative level are therefore provided.

One point that was raised in the consultant's report, but not clearly tied to the recommendations was the dichotomy between the delivery of a community planning function and the expectations on the part of social service stakeholders for delivery of a more social service focused role. Even the title of the report *Defining the City of Kelowna's Role in Social Planning* demonstrates this expectation. Following the departure of the City's first social planner in the early nineties, the City re-examined the role of including social priorities within its planning function. The concept of primary prevention was central to this, with the objective of creating positive quality of life for the City's residents so as to prevent social issues from developing or worsening. Providing social service delivery was the approach the City chose not to pursue, although knowledge of the social service sector in the community was still considered necessary. In rehiring a position to incorporate the social aspect to planning for the future, the City renamed the function "community planning" and hired a "Community Planning Manager" with a required planning-related education and background. Avoiding the downloading of social services to the municipal level was always a key concern for the City's administrative and political priorities.

The last decade has been telling in terms of the city's growth to exceed the 100,000 population level and with it see some of the social woes of larger cities become more visible. The urgency of the homelessness situation and its related complexities draws attention on all government levels. Kelowna became part of the efforts of cities across Canada in demanding senior government action to address the problem of homelessness, which was identified as a crisis in 1999/2000. With the initiation of action by the federal government (the National Homelessness Initiative) and the provincial government (Premier's Task Force on Homelessness, Mental Illness and Addictions) came the expectation that the municipalities would play a lead role and contribute resources to address the problem in their communities. With the homelessness issue being so obvious, municipalities have become involved at a much greater level than would have been expected a decade ago. Kelowna is no exception. A recent example is the move by Surrey to reprioritize spending of its housing reserve fund, even renaming the fund, to give homelessness initiatives the highest spending priority. As stated elsewhere in this report, the PTF work alone considerably altered the community planning work program for the City in the last 2 years. City councils,

& Corporate Services to City Manager; resignation of Current Planning Manager and hiring of these positions.

including Kelowna, have also changed their approach to be more inclusive of social issues at the problem stage, as opposed to the primary prevention niche that was a clearer fit.

With the recent restructuring of Council Committees, there have been several social focused activities that have accounted for staff time that was not pre-determined by work programs developed by City administration for budget purposes. Estimated time break-downs over a one year period for these additional initiatives are provided in the following table:

Committee or Task Force	Focus of Committee	Community Planning Manager Time	Other Staff Time	Total Person Days
Site Review Task Force	Site identification for 30 unit supportive housing building	470 hours	628 hours (planning, finance, communications & CDRE)	157 days
Advisory Committee for People with Disabilities	Coordination of needs for people with disabilities.	100 hours	80 (recording minutes; clerical assistance)	26 days
Task Force on Special Needs & Affordable Housing	Planning a workshop & recommendations for action to create affordable housing.	200 hours	300 hours – meetings, clerical, CDRE staff	71 days
Youth Advisory Committee	Planning youth events	30 hours	250 hours plus consultant costs	40 days
Advisory Committee on Community & Women's Issues	Broad terms of reference but present focus on family violence (has only been in place part of the year)	10 hours	160 hours – CDRE staff & clerical assistance	24 days

This change in approach and the more pressing issues the City has been facing calls on the City structure to re-examine its resources for dealing with social issues as they arise, while still planning with a conscious focus on quality of life for our communities. The table above shows that the Council is already committing additional resources in terms of staff time, both for the Community Planning Manager and staff in other areas for committees which are clearly social in their focus.

PLANNING FOR QUALITY OF LIFE:

Appropriate planning approaches to quality of life that have been undertaken by the City include:

- Zoning that provides a wide range of housing options, including housing with health care and other supports;
- Continual review of secondary suites to more adequately meet housing needs;

- Zoning to allow child care facilities on a very broad level while including adults in the definitions of day care to reflect the needs of an aging population and maximum opportunities for the delivery of child care services;
- Design guidelines for crime prevention (CPTED), and accessibility for people with disabilities;
- Use of adaptable design principles;
- Affordable housing definitions and policy direction;
- The creation of an affordable housing reserve fund;
- Mixed uses in commercial areas to increase safety and liveability.
- Creation of community indicators to provide a measure of change and well-being in the community, as well as define areas that have greater challenges related to income levels;

Future directions for community planning supported and addressed in the OCP and/or Strategic Plan include:

- Additional proactive initiatives to require and achieve more affordable housing for the city;
- Incorporation of socially-related design guidelines into policy or regulatory (e.g. zoning) structures to increase implementation;
- Development of child friendly design guidelines;
- Pursuit of amenity bonusing, based on the Vancouver model, to enable the city to achieve greater provision of community services in its neighbourhoods and core areas;
- Better and clearer ways of integrating social priorities as part of the development review process;
- An examination of the needs of an aging population so that we can more effectively plan for the future needs of our community;

Social issues that have demanded city staff time allocations that would have otherwise been devoted to activities such as those mentioned above include *homelessness*, *addictions* and *poverty*. Social priorities defined in the consultant's report are as follows:

- | | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| • Affordable housing | • Childcare and early childhood development |
| • Homelessness | • Family & elder abuse |
| • Substance misuse and addictions | • Sexual exploitation & the sex trade |
| • Poverty | • Diversity and ethno-cultural sensitivity |
| • Food security | • Transportation |
| • Crime | • The social impacts of pollution and the loss of green space |
| • Accessibility | |
| • Mental health | |
| • Youth suicide and youth services | |

The issues above are listed in order of frequency identified by the stakeholder consultation. Some are clearly planning-related (e.g. affordable housing, accessibility, transportation, loss of green space), while others are delving into the social service delivery realm (e.g. mental health, family and elder abuse, substance misuse). It has always been a challenge for the City to clearly define where it can fit in the area of social service delivery. An example is the new Advisory Committee on Community and Women's Issues. Early indications of this committee's priorities include working on the issue of family abuse. While trying to accommodate these social issues at the municipal level, it is still important to plan and develop the city effectively for quality of life. The

recent Sustainability Forum consultation process confirmed that this is has meaning for the broad community as well; as briefly described below:

Public Consultation on Sustainability:

The most recent comprehensive community consultation exercise conducted by the City was the 'FUTUREOK' regional sustainability initiative held over a 4 week period in early summer of 2006. The consultant's final report from this exercise was provided in July. A summary report of the results of the initiative are available on the website created for the sustainability consultations (www.FUTUREOK.ca) and a report to Council is to be presented in September.

Input from the community came in the form of 1,900 responses to an online survey and an all-day Citizen's Forum on Sustainability with about 120 participants. Although this report is not directly tied to the community planning function, nor to the work conducted by the SPARC in 2005, some of the findings related to community priorities are very consistent with City policy direction and work programs in this area, suggesting that these programs are in line with community desires, based on current and previous community consultation. Examples that are consistent with City community planning initiatives are as follows:

- More affordable housing opportunities;
- Create 'complete communities' which co-locate different uses and provide a variety of housing types
- Create more inclusive communities (a mix of ethnicity, age and incomes)
- Encourage community gardens & rooftop gardens;
- Foster clean / local / green business;
- Higher standards for development that is energy-efficient, environmentally sound and designed to promote a sense of community
- More and meaningful public engagement in planning for the future;
- More local government accountability by showing the link between citizen input and actions.

FIT FOR THE COMMUNITY PLANNING FUNCTION:

The City first identified a desire for a social planning function in the early 1990s and a social planner with a social work background was hired. With the departure of the social planner in 1992, this City function was re-defined as a planning function and much of the work has been conducted in the area of developing policy and regulatory (e.g. zoning, design guidelines) procedures. In the last decade, the growth of the City and the change in the urgency of social issues for Kelowna, and for cities across Canada, has created a shift in focus at the municipal level to be more inclusive of social issues at the problem stage, as opposed to tackling quality of life strictly from a prevention standpoint.

While the community planning role is still relevant and adds value to planning for the future by ensuring quality of life issues are incorporated, it is now time for the City to acknowledge the demand for a service that focuses more closely on the social service sector by working closely with stakeholders in the community. The consultant's report provides the external perspective that confirms this need.

Theresa Eichler
Community Planning Manager

Approved for Inclusion

David Shipclark
Director of Corporate Services

TE

Attachment: (electronic)

Revised Terms of Reference for the Social Planning & Housing Committee

Report by the Social Planning & Research Council of B.C. – “Defining the City of Kelowna’s Role in Social Planning”, August 2, 2006

**CITY OF KELOWNA
TERMS OF REFERENCE
SOCIAL PLANNING AND HOUSING COMMITTEE**

INTRODUCTION

Council of the City of Kelowna recognizes the value and benefit of community and social services, which enhance the quality of life for Kelowna residents. Council established the Social Planning Board in 1995, as a method of providing effective community input to Council regarding social planning and service issues. In 1996, the Community Housing Needs Committee was established by Council to provide community input on housing issues. In 2002 the two committees were amalgamated under the Social Planning and Housing Committee.

OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the Committee are:

- To advise Council on matters of social relevance from a community-based, prevention standpoint.
- To ensure a policy and decision-making framework which aims to improve quality of life for residents of the City.
- To work toward ensuring that all citizens of Kelowna have access to adequate and suitable housing.

SCOPE OF WORK

To achieve these objectives, the Social Planning and Housing Committee will undertake the following activities:

- Appoint members, as needed, to represent the City on groups or committees that form outside the City government structure to address social issues or needs within the city;
- Appoint 2 members annually to serve on the Grants Committee of the grants consultant contracted by the City to administer the grants programs, including forwarding funding recommendations to Council, for the following grants programs, in accordance with the City's approved Council Policies governing these programs :
 - Community Social Development Grants;
 - Grants to Address the Sexual Exploitation of Youth; and
 - Emergency Grants.
- Advise Council regarding implementation of social and affordable housing policies contained within the City's Official Community Plan, and ensure that these policies remain current.
- Inform council and members of the community of the City's social policies, which are provided for the following topic areas, as approved in the 1996 Social Plan, and incorporated and updated within the Official Community Plan:

Accessibility	Education
Arts and Culture	Employment
Child Care	Health
Community Development	Housing
Crime Prevention	Human Rights
- Advise Council on affordable and special housing needs within the City and search for possible solutions to such needs.

- Advise Council on the effectiveness and value of existing or proposed policies and bylaws designed to promote and develop affordable and special needs housing.
- Determine means of recognizing existing community or social service organizations that embody the policy direction of the City.
- Advise Council on all areas of social and community needs and problems within the city, recommending possible solutions to such needs and problems.
 - In order to accomplish this the Committee will hold annual community consultations to identify current community priorities;
 - Based on these consultations and on the City's policy direction, the Committee will prepare annual work plans for projects to be conducted by the Committee with the support of staff.
- Advise Council on formal agreements between the City and community and social service organizations.
- Act as a liaison between Council and community organizations concerned with the provision of social service programs.
- Work at raising awareness within the community of City policy direction and initiatives on social and housing issues.
- Hear and consider representations by any individual organization or delegation of citizens with respect to social and housing programs and make recommendations to Council that the Committee deems to be in the general interest of all citizens.

MEMBERSHIP

In order to provide representation from the community, the membership of the Committee is as follows:

- Twelve individuals committed to a healthy communities approach to planning for the city of Kelowna, representing a broad cross-section of interest and background, ranging from the social to the business perspective.
- Up to two members of Council as non-voting liaison members only.

APPOINTMENT AND TERM

Members shall be appointed by Council for a three-year term, to run concurrent with the Council term. Council may, at any time, remove any member of the Committee, and any member of the Committee may resign at any time upon sending written notice to the Chairperson of the Committee.

Committee members who are absent for three consecutive meetings shall forfeit their appointment, unless such absence is authorized by resolution of the Committee.

Committee members may stand for re-appointment at the conclusion of their term. Members of the Committee shall serve without remuneration.

In the event of a vacancy occurring during a regular term of office, the vacancy may be filled for the remainder of that term upon resolution of Council.

The Committee may appoint sub-committees to deal with any special matters coming within the scope and jurisdiction of the Committee.

CHAIR

The Committee shall elect a Chairperson and a Vice-Chairperson at their first meeting each year. The Chairperson and Vice Chairperson shall be the executive of the Committee.

Councillors shall not serve on the executive of the Committee.

MEETINGS

The Committee shall meet once monthly.

A special meeting may be called by the Chairperson or at the request of any three members of the Committee. Notice of the day, hour, and place of special meeting shall be given at least three days prior to the meeting, by leaving a copy of the notice for each member of the Committee at the place to which the member has directed such notices be sent, and by delivering a copy of the notice to the City Clerk for posting.

Unless otherwise authorized by Section 242.2 of the *Local Government Act* or City of Kelowna Council Bylaw No. 7906 all meetings will be held in open session and in a location accessible to the public.

Unless otherwise authorized by the Committee, the public shall only address the Committee when they are a scheduled delegation on the Committee meeting agenda.

A majority of the Committee shall represent a quorum.

The order of business is to be as set out in an agenda package to be provided to the Committee members in advance of the meeting date. A copy of the agenda will be forwarded electronically to the City Clerks Department at least three complete working days prior to the meeting date.

Minutes of the meetings will be prepared by the clerical staff provided by the Clerk's Office and then signed by the Chairperson. Originals of the minutes will be forwarded to the City Clerk for safekeeping.

Committee members have a responsibility to make recommendations based on the best interests of the City-at-large. Committee members must abide by the conflict of interest provisions of the *Local Government Act* and City of Kelowna Council Bylaw 7906. Members who have a direct or indirect pecuniary interest in a matter under discussion are not permitted to participate in the discussion of the matter or to vote on a question in respect of the matter. They must declare their conflict and state the general nature of their conflict, and then leave the meeting or that part of the meeting where the matter is under discussion. The member's declaration must be recorded in the minutes, and the Committee member must not attempt in any way, whether before, during or after the meeting to influence the voting on any question in

respect of the matter.

Voting:

- All members of a committee, including the chair, vote on every question unless they have declared a conflict and left the meeting
- Any member who does not indicate how they vote, or has left the meeting without declaring a conflict, is counted as having voted for the question
- If the votes are equal for and against, the question is defeated.
- At committee meetings the Council member is NOT to participate in discussion on issues pertaining to the disbursement of Community Social Development Grants or Grants to Address the Sexual Exploitation of Youth.
- When speaking in public or to the media on an issue, Committee members must distinguish whether they are speaking as a member, or as a representative of another agency or community group, or as an individual. Committee members need to convey the public interest and remember that they represent the City of Kelowna. This means they must be consistent with the City's position on specific issues.

REPORTING TO COUNCIL

- Recommendations of the Committee must be adopted by Committee resolution prior to presentation to Council.
- The Committee will provide a status report to Council annually.
 - The status report will identify community consultations conducted in the given year and identify issues, including any corresponding recommended actions, resulting from these consultations;
- The Committee will also report to Council its intended annual work plan as part of the annual budget review process.
- The staff liaison, and, if and when the Committee determines the need, a Committee member appointed by the Committee, will report to Council on behalf of the Committee.

BUDGET

The routine operations and any special initiatives of the Committee will be funded by allocations within the Community Development & Real Estate- Community Planning Budget. The Community Social Development Grants and the Grants to Address the Sexual Exploitation of Youth shall be funded from the Community Development and Real Estate - Community Planning budget and guided by approved Council policies.

STAFF SUPPORT

- The Community Planning Manager shall serve as administrative liaison to the Committee. The Community Development and Real Estate Department shall provide administrative and technical support for the Committee. Typical support functions include the following:
- organizing and preparing the agenda, in conjunction with the Committee chairperson & staff liaison;
- distributing the agenda packages to Committee members;
- forwarding the agenda to the City Clerk for posting as a public notice;
- mailing or delivering all meeting notices and agendas;

- receiving all correspondence, and preparing correspondence and reports on behalf of the Committee;
- editing the draft minutes and providing the final minutes to the City Clerk and Committee members;
- managing the files of the Committee, as necessary;
- maintaining a list of outstanding issues for Committee action.

Endorsed by Council: November 18, 2002