

Memo



Date: March 23, 2011
File: 1200-31
To: City Manager
From: Policy & Planning Department
Subject: 2030 Official Community Plan - 2011 Public Consultation
Report prepared by: Long Range Planning Manager

Recommendation:

THAT Council receives, for information, the Policy and Planning Department dated March 23, 2011 with respect to the 2030 Official Community Plan;

AND THAT Council directs staff to bring forward Official Community Plan (OCP) 2030 - Bylaw No. 10500 for initial consideration and referral to the Agricultural Land Commission.

Purpose:

To bring Council up to date with the results of recent public consultation and move OCP Bylaw 10500 forward to initial consideration.

Background:

The latest and final round of public, stakeholder and agency consultation has now been completed. As part of the most recent public consultation, staff hosted four open houses: February 17th (Glenmore); February 19th (Downtown); February 21st (Rutland) and February 23rd (Pandosy). A total of approximately 460 people attended the open houses.

The draft OCP was posted to the kelowna2030.ca website, along with all of the material that was displayed at the open houses. The public and stakeholders (e.g. Resident's Associations, Urban Development Institute, Chamber of Commerce, Economic Development Commission, Downtown Kelowna Association, Uptown Rutland Business Association, Agricultural Land Commission, School District 23, Interior Health, First Nations, other provincial ministries and service agencies including utilities and water purveyors) were invited through traditional media, electronic and social media, as well as mass email to review that material, attend an open house and provide feedback.

A handwritten signature in black ink, located in the bottom right corner of the page.

The opportunity for feedback closed on Friday, March 18th with a total of 628 responses. Early survey results were slow in coming and indicated a predominantly 60+ age group had responded. In response, staff developed a shorter version of the feedback form in the hopes that this would increase responses from those under 40. This approach appeared successful. By the time the feedback deadline arrived, 28% of respondents were under the age of 40 (according to the 2006 census, 31% of Kelowna's adult population is under the age of 40). A summary of the survey results is included in Attachment 1. A compilation of comments is also available but at over 100 pages it was felt to be most appropriate to post this material on-line at kelowna2030.ca rather than attaching it to this report.

As part of the consultation process, staff have also met with and presented relevant portions of the draft OCP to various Council Committees. All of the committees consulted have endorsed or agreed with the policy content or where there was specific feedback provided staff have, where appropriate, adjusted the wording to reflect that feedback.

External Agency/Public Comments:

The feedback received indicated generally strong support for proposed policies and land uses. There is majority support for all the cited policies. In cases where there was more than 20% disagreement with the proposed policy direction, staff reviewed each of the comments relating to disagreement to identify whether wording and land use changes should be considered prior to advancing the OCP for initial consideration. The material below provides details on the items on which disagreement was greatest.

Building Height

The review indicated that on the matter of building height, those disagreeing with the proposed policy direction were virtually evenly split between those who felt that buildings should be higher than proposed and those who felt they should be lower. Specifically:

- 66% agreed with the proposed height limits for downtown buildings. 31% disagreed. Among those disagreeing, 49% felt that building heights should be higher than proposed, whereas, 51% felt they should be lower;
- 64% agreed with the proposed height limits for buildings in the South Pandosy area. 29% disagreed. Among those disagreeing, 48% felt that building heights should be higher than proposed, whereas 52% felt they should be lower;
- 68% agreed with the proposed height limits for buildings in the Rutland area. 22% disagreed. Among those disagreeing, 51% felt that building heights should be higher than proposed, whereas 49% felt they should be lower;
- There were quite a few comments expressing concern that the proposed policy wording relating to building heights being kept low adjacent to the waterfront was too general and that the potential for the policy to be disregarded was too great.

Given that disagreement with building heights in Downtown, South Pandosy and Rutland was evenly split between those who feel that building heights should be lower and those who feel that building heights should be higher, staff suggest that the overall agreement with proposed building heights seems to have struck a balance. Staff have incorporated revisions to proposed Policy 5.5.1 Building Height to reflect concerns related to the language not being specific enough with respect to building height near the waterfront. The revised wording will be included in the draft document that is forwarded for initial consideration.

Roadway Modifications

The proposed policy pertaining to the conditions which would influence roadway modifications to increase capacity for automobiles on non-commercial routes was another policy that, although it garnered majority support, had more than 20% of respondents disagreeing.

- 67% agreed with the proposed policy direction
 - Those aged under 29 were most likely to agree with the proposed policy direction (75% agreed)
 - Those living in the central part of the city (downtown and South Pansy) were most likely to agree with the proposed policy (71% agreed)
- 27% disagreed with the proposed policy direction
 - Those who disagreed cited a wide range of reasons for their disagreement. Some of the most commonly cited reasons included:
 - references to currently inadequate infrastructure;
 - the thought that proactively increasing the width/number of roads would be more appropriate;
 - concerns about the impact of congestion on the economy/tourism; and
 - feelings that cars were the best/most desirable or in some cases only option.
 - Those aged 40-49 were most likely to disagree with the proposed policy (37% disagreed)
 - Those living in Glenmore/Dilworth were most likely to disagree with the proposed policy (33% disagreed)

Given the overall support (83%) for the proposed 2030 road program which reflects the above noted policy and given the corporate direction toward sustainability, staff are recommending that the policy remain as currently worded.

New Growth Areas (North Glenmore)

Additional growth areas are proposed for North Clifton, Eagle Ridge and Tonn Mountain, proposed to be designated as areas requiring preparation of an Area Structure Plan to determine future land use, housing mix and servicing needs.

- 65% indicated support for additional single family housing in the North Glenmore area. Those who disagreed (24%) cited a number of reasons for their disagreement, including:
 - Concern that growth in this area represents further sprawl
 - Desire for growth to be directed to the urban core
 - Desire for more growth to be oriented toward multi-family housing rather than single detached housing
 - Concern about loss of green space
 - Concern about insufficient supporting infrastructure (schools, commercial, roads etc.)
- Those aged 18-29 were more likely to disagree (35%), than other age groups, with the most commonly cited reason for objecting to the policy, being a concern that the proposed direction further perpetuates urban sprawl.

In order to satisfy long term city-wide projections for single detached housing it became necessary to add new growth areas and it was felt that growth in North Glenmore in proximity to

and in support of a variety of housing nearer to UBC Okanagan was more appropriate than elsewhere. It should also be noted that proposed new growth areas in North Glenmore would not be exclusively single detached homes as there is some provision for higher density housing. Given the reasonably strong support for additional growth in North Glenmore staff are not recommending a change in the draft Future Land Use designations.

Internal Circulation:

General Manager of Community Sustainability

Legal / Statutory Authority:

Local Government Act Part 26: Division 2 - Official Community Plans, Sections 875 - 882.

Legal/Statutory Procedural Requirements:

Local Government Act Section 882(3) specifies that after first reading (and prior to Public Hearing) of an Official Community Plan bylaw the local government must consider the plan in conjunction with its financial plan and any waste management plan applicable. In addition, the local government must refer the plan to the Agricultural Land Commission for comment.

Considerations not applicable to this report:

Existing Policy:

Community & Media Relations Considerations:

Financial/Budgetary Considerations:

Personnel Implications:

Alternate Recommendation:

Submitted by:



Gary Stephen, Long Range Planning Manager
Policy and Planning

Approved for inclusion:



Signe Bagh, Director of Policy & Planning

cc:

General Manager, Community Sustainability

Attach:

Attachment 1

OCP Feedback Form (#6) Summary March 23, 2011

This tabulation reflects responses received from feedback forms distributed at OCP Open Houses held on February 17, 19, 21, and 23, 2011 as well as responses received on-line between February 17 and March 18, 2011. In total, 628 people completed the feedback form.

Q1. Steep Slopes Policy

<u>Total</u>	<u># Responses</u>	<u>% of Responses</u>
Strongly Agree	326	54%
Somewhat Agree	168	28%
No Opinion	29	5%
Somewhat Disagree	54	9%
Strongly Disagree	32	5%
Total Responses	609	100%

Q2. Permanent Growth Boundary

<u>Total</u>	<u># Responses</u>	<u>% of Responses</u>
Strongly Agree	258	44%
Somewhat Agree	191	33%
No Opinion	38	6%
Somewhat Disagree	56	10%
Strongly Disagree	42	7%
Total Responses	585	100%

Q3. Directing roughly half of new urban growth to the Urban Core

<u>Total</u>	<u># Responses</u>	<u>% of Responses</u>
Strongly Agree	307	53%
Somewhat Agree	181	31%
No Opinion	17	3%
Somewhat Disagree	45	8%
Strongly Disagree	30	5%
Total Responses	580	100%

Q4. Building Height – Downtown

<u>Total</u>	<u># Responses</u>	<u>% of Responses</u>
Strongly Agree	181	32%
Somewhat Agree	191	34%
No Opinion	21	4%
Somewhat Disagree	75	13%
Strongly Disagree	102	18%
Total Responses	570	100%

Q5. Building Height - South Pandosy

<u>Total</u>	<u># Responses</u>	<u>% of Responses</u>
Strongly Agree	168	29%
Somewhat Agree	199	35%
No Opinion	40	7%
Somewhat Disagree	81	14%
Strongly Disagree	83	15%
Total Responses	571	100%

Q6. Building Height - Rutland

<u>Total</u>	<u># Responses</u>	<u>% of Responses</u>
Strongly Agree	198	35%
Somewhat Agree	189	33%
No Opinion	53	9%
Somewhat Disagree	72	13%
Strongly Disagree	53	9%
Total Responses	565	100%

Q7. Building Height - Midtown (Orchard Park)

<u>Total</u>	<u># Responses</u>	<u>% of Responses</u>
Strongly Agree	215	38%
Somewhat Agree	211	38%
No Opinion	42	7%
Somewhat Disagree	51	9%
Strongly Disagree	43	8%
Total Responses	562	100%

Q8. Building Height - Capri/Landmark

<u>Total</u>	<u># Responses</u>	<u>% of Responses</u>
Strongly Agree	190	34%
Somewhat Agree	226	40%
No Opinion	44	8%
Somewhat Disagree	55	10%
Strongly Disagree	48	9%
Total Responses	563	100%

Q9. Building Height - Elsewhere

<u>Total</u>	<u># Responses</u>	<u>% of Responses</u>
Strongly Agree	161	30%
Somewhat Agree	202	37%
No Opinion	75	14%
Somewhat Disagree	56	10%
Strongly Disagree	45	8%
Total Responses	539	100%

Q10. Recognize and accept that a greater level of congestion may result from an increased focus on active transportation modes

<u>Total</u>	<u># Responses</u>	<u>% of Responses</u>
Strongly Agree	196	39%
Somewhat Agree	175	34%
No Opinion	41	8%
Somewhat Disagree	44	9%
Strongly Disagree	52	10%
Total Responses	508	100%

Q11. Except where there are safety issues, refrain from implementing major roadway modifications intended to increase capacity and/or efficiency for automobiles on non-commercial routes

<u>Total</u>	<u># Responses</u>	<u>% of Responses</u>
Strongly Agree	195	38%
Somewhat Agree	146	29%
No Opinion	36	7%
Somewhat Disagree	70	14%
Strongly Disagree	64	13%
Total Responses	511	100%

Q12. Transportation infrastructure will be funded, designed, constructed and maintained to meet the needs of identified on Panel 20 users and according to funding priority

<u>Total</u>	<u># Responses</u>	<u>% of Responses</u>
Strongly Agree	246	47%
Somewhat Agree	156	30%
No Opinion	37	7%
Somewhat Disagree	46	9%
Strongly Disagree	40	8%
Total Responses	525	100%

Q13. Transit Priority Policy

<u>Total</u>	<u># Responses</u>	<u>% of Responses</u>
Strongly Agree	298	57%
Somewhat Agree	140	27%
No Opinion	30	6%
Somewhat Disagree	32	6%
Strongly Disagree	27	5%
Total Responses	527	100%

Q14. Transit Service Policy

<u>Total</u>	<u># Responses</u>	<u>% of Responses</u>
Strongly Agree	324	62%
Somewhat Agree	124	24%
No Opinion	38	7%
Somewhat Disagree	20	4%
Strongly Disagree	15	3%
Total Responses	521	100%

Q15. Additional Growth Areas for Single Family Housing in North Glenmore

<u>Total</u>	<u># Responses</u>	<u>% of Responses</u>
Strongly Agree	104	30%
Somewhat Agree	121	35%
No Opinion	39	11%
Somewhat Disagree	45	13%
Strongly Disagree	39	11%
Total Responses	348	100%

Q16. Glenmore Recreation Park

<u>Total</u>	<u># Responses</u>	<u>% of Responses</u>
Strongly Agree	199	57%
Somewhat Agree	99	28%
No Opinion	30	9%
Somewhat Disagree	7	2%
Strongly Disagree	17	5%
Total Responses	352	100%

Q17. Requiring Special Zoning for Residential Land Located on 20-30% Slopes

<u>Total</u>	<u># Responses</u>	<u>% of Responses</u>
Strongly Agree	185	53%
Somewhat Agree	90	26%
No Opinion	36	10%
Somewhat Disagree	26	7%
Strongly Disagree	15	4%
Total Responses	352	100%

Q18. Capri/Landmark designated as an Urban Centre (in addition to Downtown, Rutland, South Pandosy and Midtown)

<u>Total</u>	<u># Responses</u>	<u>% of Responses</u>
Strongly Agree	202	57%
Somewhat Agree	108	30%
No Opinion	23	6%
Somewhat Disagree	12	3%
Strongly Disagree	11	3%
Total Responses	356	100%

Q19. Health District designation for area between Pandosy and Richter Street (across from Hospital)

<u>Total</u>	<u># Responses</u>	<u>% of Responses</u>
Strongly Agree	230	64%
Somewhat Agree	94	26%
No Opinion	14	4%
Somewhat Disagree	11	3%
Strongly Disagree	9	3%
Total Responses	358	100%

Q20. Mixed Use Tourism and Multiple Residential Medium Density and Multiple Residential Low Density designations for Hiawatha Mobile Home Park site on Lakeshore Road and north of Cook Road

<u>Total</u>	<u># Responses</u>	<u>% of Responses</u>
Strongly Agree	109	31%
Somewhat Agree	131	37%
No Opinion	55	16%
Somewhat Disagree	31	9%
Strongly Disagree	28	8%
Total Responses	354	100%

Q21. Industrial Limited designation for Arab/Appaloosa/Pinto Road Area

<u>Total</u>	<u># Responses</u>	<u>% of Responses</u>
Strongly Agree	141	40%
Somewhat Agree	124	35%
No Opinion	75	21%
Somewhat Disagree	11	3%
Strongly Disagree	2	1%
Total Responses	353	100%

Q22. Expanding protection for terrestrial ecosystems

<u>Total</u>	<u># Responses</u>	<u>% of Responses</u>
Strongly Agree	240	67%
Somewhat Agree	78	22%
No Opinion	16	4%
Somewhat Disagree	17	5%
Strongly Disagree	6	2%
Total Responses	357	100%

Q23. Adding biodiversity as a consideration in review of development applications

<u>Total</u>	<u># Responses</u>	<u>% of Responses</u>
Strongly Agree	220	62%
Somewhat Agree	81	23%
No Opinion	24	7%
Somewhat Disagree	16	5%
Strongly Disagree	13	4%
Total Responses	354	100%

Q24. Adding design guidelines for Character Neighbourhoods

<u>Total</u>	<u># Responses</u>	<u>% of Responses</u>
Strongly Agree	190	54%
Somewhat Agree	107	31%
No Opinion	21	6%
Somewhat Disagree	19	5%
Strongly Disagree	13	4%
Total Responses	350	100%

Q25. Adding water conservation / landscape irrigation guidelines

<u>Total</u>	<u># Responses</u>	<u>% of Responses</u>
Strongly Agree	236	67%
Somewhat Agree	85	24%
No Opinion	14	4%
Somewhat Disagree	7	2%
Strongly Disagree	8	2%
Total Responses	350	100%

Q26. Adding hillside guidelines (visual)

<u>Total</u>	<u># Responses</u>	<u>% of Responses</u>
Strongly Agree	218	63%
Somewhat Agree	101	29%
No Opinion	17	5%
Somewhat Disagree	5	1%
Strongly Disagree	4	1%
Total Responses	345	100%

Q27. Adding guidelines for farm protection

<u>Total</u>	<u># Responses</u>	<u>% of Responses</u>
Strongly Agree	223	63%
Somewhat Agree	75	21%
No Opinion	22	6%
Somewhat Disagree	16	5%
Strongly Disagree	18	5%
Total Responses	354	100%

Q28. Parkland Acquisitions

<u>Total</u>	<u># Responses</u>	<u>% of Responses</u>
Strongly Agree	259	54%
Somewhat Agree	152	32%
No Opinion	37	8%
Somewhat Disagree	19	4%
Strongly Disagree	12	3%
Total Responses	479	100%

Q29. Water priorities

<u>Total</u>	<u># Responses</u>	<u>% of Responses</u>
Strongly Agree	223	47%
Somewhat Agree	158	33%
No Opinion	69	15%
Somewhat Disagree	14	3%
Strongly Disagree	9	2%
Total Responses	473	100%

Q30. Sewer Priorities

<u>Total</u>	<u># Responses</u>	<u>% of Responses</u>
Strongly Agree	204	43%
Somewhat Agree	170	36%
No Opinion	78	17%
Somewhat Disagree	13	3%
Strongly Disagree	5	1%
Total Responses	470	100%

Q31. Transportation Networks

<u>Total</u>	<u># Responses</u>	<u>% of Responses</u>
Strongly Agree	193	42%
Somewhat Agree	191	41%
No Opinion	43	9%
Somewhat Disagree	23	5%
Strongly Disagree	15	3%
Total Responses	465	100%

Q32. How did you hear about this public involvement opportunity?

<u>Total</u>	<u># Responses</u>	<u>% of Responses</u>
Word of Mouth	119	16%
Email	231	31%
City of Kel. Webpage	76	10%
YouTube	15	2%
Facebook	1	0%
Twitter	5	1%
Castanet	74	10%
Other online media	3	0%
Capital News	80	11%
Daily Courier	64	9%
CHBC	20	3%
Shaw	3	0%
Radio	21	3%
Electronic Msg Board	33	4%
total	745	100%

Q33. Age

<u>Total</u>	<u># Responses</u>	<u>% of Responses</u>
18-29	58	12%
30-39	82	16%
40-49	96	19%
50-59	120	24%
60-69	90	18%
70+	55	11%
Total	501	100%

Q34. Postal code of Kelowna Respondents

(data on this response only is based on submissions received by March 15)

<u>Total</u>	<u># Responses</u>	<u>% of Responses</u>
V1W (Mission/SE Kelowna)	124	31%
V1X (Rutland/Black Mountain)	58	14%
V1Y (Downtown/South Pandosy)	136	34%
V1V (Glenmore/Dilworth)	87	21%
Response Count	405	100%