



**URBAN DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE- OKANAGAN CHAPTER**

210 – 1460 Pandosy Street  
Kelowna, BC V1Y 1P3 Canada  
T. 778.478.9649 F. 778.478.0393

[udiokanagan@udi.org](mailto:udiokanagan@udi.org)

[www.udiokanagan.ca](http://www.udiokanagan.ca)

November 25, 2021

City of Kelowna  
1435 Water Street  
Kelowna, BC, V1Y 1J4

**Attention: Zoning Bylaw Project Team, City of Kelowna**

**Subject: Draft Zoning Bylaw – Request for Comprehensive UDI Feedback**

Thank you for providing UDI Okanagan with the opportunity to provide input on the City's draft Zoning Bylaw. A large number of UDI members have spent many hours reviewing this document in detail and attending information sessions with City staff. Even in the limited number of weeks that the consultation period has been active, we have a significant amount of feedback to provide.

That being said, the Zoning Bylaw is being replaced for the first time in over twenty years. As the key regulatory document governing land use and development rights, we do not believe the consultation process should be rushed. Given the extent of the changes and the significant importance of this document to our members, we would like to stress that we do not feel that the current window of opportunity to provide feedback has been adequate to allow the development community the time necessary to properly review and consult with staff on a document of this magnitude. We believe there is months of work ahead in order to bring this document to the point where it is ready for approval and adoption. We implore the City to provide us with the opportunity to have additional in-depth workshops and engagement with the City on this Bylaw before it is adopted so that we can all work together to have it become the best document that it can be for our community.

As stated by UDI Okanagan during the OCP 2040 consultation process, the new Zoning Bylaw will be a key implementation tool for the OCP. Without adequate review, the Zoning Bylaw could have a number of negative unintended consequences, including a higher number of variance applications, while limiting the development potential as envisioned in the OCP. UDI Okanagan is committed to providing the resources to ensure that an in-depth consultation process, including section-by-section working sessions, are worthwhile, and help to create a practical, progressive Zoning Bylaw that works for all stakeholders.

We would also like to emphasize the importance of establishing a generous transition period when ultimately moving to a new Zoning Bylaw. Our membership is concerned about potential project delays due to forced application "blackout" periods, or negative impacts on in-stream applications. The transitioning and grandfathering period must allow for all instream applications the fair and reasonable opportunity to complete their projects under the Zoning Bylaw they were originally considered under. This transition period should only be contemplated after an adequate consultation period has been

completed and all feedback has been collected. The City of Kelowna should consider having both the former and new Zoning Bylaws to operate in parallel for a period of time to ease the transition period. UDI Okanagan would also propose that the grandfathering provisions be tied to Rezoning and Development Permit applications rather than Building Permit applications.

We should also note that many of our members had difficulty understanding this new bylaw as a comprehensive document and we are concerned that many members of the public will have the same issue. The document can be difficult to navigate and we believe that staff time will be impacted due to industry and the public's lack of comprehension. For this reason, we suggest the City undergo a significant simplification of the Zoning Bylaw to make it much easier to understand and navigate. Alternatively, this could involve creating a second, more simplified version of the bylaw that contains the full listing of everything that a property owner needs to know about each zone, zone by zone.

Attached is an appendix with specific comments on the draft Zoning Bylaw regulations. Several of our members may have already submitted some of these comments to you in advance but we have done our best to compile them all into one document. Although there are many comments included in this appendix, we would like to emphasize that this is in no way an exhaustive list due to the time limitations discussed above. We also note that the individual comments collected from our members may not represent the final position of UDI Okanagan. However, without the necessary time to work with staff on a shared understanding of the intent and impact of each section of the draft bylaw, we have prepared this list as a starting point for collaborating with staff on future working sessions.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of our feedback as well as our request for more time to review and engage with the City on this important bylaw before it moves forward to its next stages.

Sincerely,

**URBAN DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE OKANAGAN CHAPTER**

Per:

Jennifer Dixon, Executive Director of UDI Okanagan

Luke Turri, Chair of UDI Okanagan

cc. Ryan Smith, Divisional Director

Doug Gilchrist, CAO

## APPENDIX A

### Zoning Bylaw Comments (Organized by Section)

#### Section 1

- Section 1.7.1: Does this mean that a project is considered in stream only if it is at Building Permit?

#### Section 2 - Definitions

- For Basement and Walkout, how do you determine internal floor area, at grade or less than .6 m below?
- Carriage House - are they all secondary in nature? Please clarify why that cannot be stratified. Will the City be Charging Res 3 a DCC?
- Curb Elevation – We would like to discuss this item further.
- Gas Bar – Please clarify why siting requirements are in the use definition. Does that mean they cannot be varied?
- Grade, Finished – This does not account for average of each building face. Also, why has the City included measurement of 1.5 m away from the building?
- Impermeable Surface – The six different measurements for lawn seems excessive and would be difficult to enforce.
- Natural Resource Extraction – This should exempt listed activities that are required for development in-site.
- Offices vs Professional Services – Please clarify why there is a distinction between these two and what that distinction is.
- Park – This should include some form of public tenure.
- Second Storey Floor Area - Is there any relevance to the 70% shown?
- Secondary Suite - Size limitations are gone from the definition. Why has this been changed?
- Health Service – It appears as though major and minor have been removed. Has this adjustment occurred in the associated zones as well?
- Many definitions of Use have been removed and there is the potential for this to create issues.
- Lock off unit removed – Please clarify if this means that it is not allowed anymore.
- Lot Line, Front - Commercial & industrial – This is not defined. We recommend that the City provide a definition for this otherwise it will be at the discretion of the Director of Planning.
- Nuisance definition – Why has this been removed?
- Offices no longer includes any wording around construction and development industry. Where do they fit now?
- Private open space definition has been removed. Please clarify why this has been removed and does this mean that there isn't this requirement in the new bylaw?
- Retail stores – This is defined as convenience, general, health products, etc. Please clarify why it has been defined this way and how does this affect the warehouse sales definition?
- Why has the Service commercial definition been removed?

- The Secondary suite definition no longer carries size restriction. Does that show up somewhere else?
- Short term rental no longer includes B & B's. Please explain where they would fall now.
- Supportive Housing – This now includes apartments and townhomes but with this inclusion would seem to limit it from single family dwellings. Please clarify if this is in fact the case.
- Two and three storey dwelling housing has been removed from definitions. Please explain the rationale for this.
- Visual Example of max floor height for ground oriented - from diagram looks like 1.2 m - storey allows for up to 2.0 out of ground. Shouldn't these be the same? Also, at 1.2 it will eliminate lower floors (which add to affordability) in many of the flat neighbours such as mission, downtown and south Pandosy due to water table. If it is 2.0 meters it may work in those areas.
- Visual example of min net floor area for ground oriented – We strongly disagree with a 11 m<sup>2</sup> minimum. Why has this been changed?
- There are several items alphabetized under "V" for Visual Example. We recommend having them under what they are examples of instead.
- Warehouse sales has been removed. Please explain why.

## Section 6

- Section 6.3.5: Lighting not to shine beyond the boundaries of a lot. Does this need to be this stringent?
- Section 6.6.4: Riparian protection setback from water courses for building and facilities in farming areas. – Please clarify what this means.
- Section Table 6.9: How is linear frontage measured? What about corner/double fronting lots? How were the figures developed?
- Section 6.9: Density bonus program leaves no flexibility/opportunity for other types of bonusing. Rental housing, affordable housing, energy efficiency, daycares, etc.
- Section 6.9: Density and Height bonusing. We have concerns surrounding density and height bonusing and would like the chance for further conversations with the City around this important issue to help work through various implications associated with this.
- Section 6.9.1: Density Bonus does not seem to have a ratio (either pay the entire amount or none at all, no matter how much extra density/height).
- Section 6.9.2: Payment at Building Permit is good but how is this dealt with at Development Permit?
- Section 6.9 Table: How is a per linear frontage used to calculate density bonus? A narrow lot is cheaper than a wider one, but could produce more density. Is this per meter of frontage or cm?
- Section 6 - General: There are no longer any Okanagan Lake sight setback lines, daylighting standards, accessory development regulations, height and grade regulations, rooftop screening, or utility cabinets. Please clarify where these regulations have gone as we believe many of them were important.

## Section 7

- Section 7: In general, this section appears to be excessive and might be difficult to enforce.
- Section 7.2 Table: 1 tree for 55 m<sup>2</sup> for apartments but commercial requires more at 1 per 30 m<sup>2</sup> seems like it should be the other way around, since commercial includes industrial. If the setback is 0, then no trees are required?
- Section 7.2 Table: Need to discuss tree planting requirement for single detached housing. Will it be a requirement of subdivision? Best to plant trees after house construction is complete, irrigation is available and coordinated with the homeowner's landscaping.
- Section Table 7.2: The tree requirements are extremely specific. Such detailed requirements will mean unexpected variances - these should only be considered once staff has the ability to deal with minor variances, or add language that says (or to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning). 75% soil-based growing medium is very restrictive. Minimum tree amounts: what about zero lot line developments?
- Section 7.2.3: We believe that all of the setback areas other than driveways and pathways are excessive and would like to discuss this with the City further, including the rationale behind this change.
- Section 7.4.1: These breaks/recesses in the streetwall could lead to CPTED & security concerns through the creation of 'blind corners'.
- Section 7.4.2: The urban plaza dimensions are very specific and could lead to minor variances.
- Section 7.4.3: The urban plaza dimensions are very specific and could lead to minor variances.
- Section 7.4.3: Requirement for min of one tree seems like it may not suit all plazas and should be removed or revised from required to 'recommended'.
- Section 7.2: Please clarify how this compares to the buffers listed in table 7.1 of the existing bylaw. Does this mean that there are no longer any minimum buffer requirements?
- Section 7.2.11: We believe that changing from a threshold of 50 stalls to 8 stalls is much too small of a minimum to have and suggest that the City reconsider this decision.
- Section 7.3: Please clarify why there is no mention of Molok containers in place of enclosures.
- Section 7.5.10(a): If the wall is over 1.2 m in height, it will need geogrid which extends behind the wall - setback?

## Section 8 - Parking

- Section 8.1.12(c): We have some questions surrounding this grade limitation that we would like to discuss further.
- Section 8.2.3: Does this mean that a driveway counts as long as it is 1.5 m back from property line?
- Section Table 8.2.7 (b): Please clarify why there are no small car stalls for commercial.
- Section Table 8.2.18: Electric Vehicle Charging Requirements should advocate for EV ready, not Level 2 charging to each stall. Use categories are not clear - what about commercial spaces inside a residential building?
- General Comment: We struggle with 100% electrification especially since the City is relying on only one technology to achieve this. UDI recommends that the City look into possibilities surrounding emission free vehicles and some of the advances in car technology that are being made in this area.

- Section 8.2.18: Please clarify what "capable of providing" means. Does this refer to conduit or an actual charging station?
- Section 8.2.18: This needs clarity on whether or not this means conduit, all wiring pulled, or complete with charger. Also, please explain why we would need to have EV ready visitor stalls.
- Section Table 8.6: End of Trip Facilities – This is similar to the existing bylaw, but still seems excessive.

## Section 9

- Section 9.4.1: Increase on inbound from 3 to 5. Why?
- Section 9.4.2: Does this mean that the City only wants them where traffic is the busiest? Please clarify.
- Section 9.11: Min. CRU Depth – 6m depth seems arbitrary and punitive as considering new back of curb setback. Market should decide what is commercially viable for CRU dimensions.
- Section Table 9.11: The Tall building requirements should not apply to mid-rise buildings. This is currently worded as every building above 6 storeys.
- Section Table 9.11: How is the Minimum first floor height of 4.5m measured? For the entire floor, or just retail? What is the rationale? This is difficult to achieve for many buildings, adds costs, and makes it difficult to have the rest of the podium meet the maximum height requirements.
- Section Table 9.11: This podium height is noted at 15.0m Max and is inconsistent with UC1, etc. where 16.0m is permitted. 16.0m should be used. Also, the City should remove reference to number of storeys since the dimensional height is the important measurement and not how many storeys happen to sit behind the facade. This allows more flexibility in above-ground parkades.
- Section Table 9.11: Building separation. If this is to apply across property lines (rather than to multiple towers on one property) this is extremely problematic. It means that the "first-in" developer can sterilize neighbouring parcels. Is this fair or reasonable? At what height would this apply to? Would a mid-rise building get in the way of a tower next door? Lots of existing buildings that have been built in urban centres would effectively stop any towers from being built on their neighbouring parcels.
- Section Table 9.11: Why are balconies included in the calculation? This punishes the creation of outdoor space. Typically, balconies do not read as part of the primary massing of the building.
- Section Table 9.11: Minimum floor plates should be considered in the context of recent projects that would require a variance in order to meet these. With the prescriptive height maps being applied, there will be smaller projects (~15-20 stories) that will be penalized more by this regulation than others.

## Section 10

- Section 10.1: Does this mean that the City is rezoning all non ALR A1 to A2? What about when ALR is only partially on the lot?
- Section 10.2 – Sub-Zones: There used to be an A1t – Agriculture with Agri-tourist Accommodation included in the A1 Zone. UDI recommends that this should be added back into

the A1 Zone as a Sub-Zone. We also recommend that Agri-tourism accommodation Units should be added as a definition and as a Secondary Use 'S' in the zoning table/matrix for A1. This Secondary Use is supported under ALC and is also promoted by other municipalities. Other municipalities typically include a table for the number of Agri-Tourism Accommodation Units based on size of the A1 parcel. This is critical to the success of agriculture in our community, feasibility of wineries, promotes tourism and economic development, and provides much needed access to unique tourist accommodation for visitors. All these key principles are supported under the OCP. These units could be restricted to non-farmable areas, as determined under the Farm Protection DP application process. Any Agri-tourism Accommodation Units would be regulated through the rezoning process for A1t and Farm Protection DP.

- Section 10.3: We believe that A2 should allow alcohol production, cannabis cultivation, farm retail sales, and forestry.
- Section 10.4: A2 min lot size 30 ha? RR1 4 ha? Please clarify when the City is excluding covenant areas at this scale.
- Section 10.6: Please clarify why the height appears to be so restrictive for rural lots. We are also struggling to understand why curb height is relevant, where there are third storey limitations as well as second storey carriage houses. Also, footnote 25 limits carriage houses outside of the core to one storey, and footnote 29 appears to be a new policy direction on footprint limitation beyond lot coverage allowance.

## Section 11

- Section 11.1: The condensed zone names are welcome.
- Section 11.2: Please explain some of the rationale for the sub zones for child care. It appears as though they may be unnecessary. Also, please explain why the HC designation is only available for duplexes.
- Section 11.3: RU4 (duplex) will allow secondary suites as well for four units? Footnote 7 appears to be short sighted by requiring C zone for carriage house outside Core Area. It should be automatic for any lots that have lane access. Footnote 8 restricts RU5 below what is currently allowed in RU7. Why?
- Section 11.4: We generally support the reduction in lot sizes except that 4000 sq. m for RU5 seems large. Why not go for a multi family zone? Footnote 10 does not work. If the City wants a minimum footprint then this should be specified instead and it should be about 200 sq m or less. Also Strata lots are different than bareland strata lots as strata lots typically follow the outline of a building. Strata Lots probably do not need size regulations.
- Section 11.4: Would like to see RU4 allow for duplex units to be on separate lots (2 fee simple lots per duplex building) with a party wall agreement and allow legal suites.
- Section 11.4: Footnote 10. Removing the no-build and no-disturb covenant areas from the min lot area could be problematic, even with a reduced min lot area. No-build covenant areas are often within the rear yard setback, which already excludes the house but is included in the min lot area. Would likely reduce yield by restricting viable lots in hillside development.
- Section 11.5: Will the 2nd floor garage area be included in the 70% max floor area for the 3rd floor? Please clarify if / how this applies to walkup homes. It is important to ensure this does

not restrict some good 1.5 storey plans where a large portion of the upper floor is over the garage, which is often the case.

- Section 11.5: Front yard setback increased from 3.0 to 4.5m (RU1 & 2) and side yard increased from 2.0 to 2.1m (RU1). Why?

### Section 13

- Section 13.3: We support the idea of some mixed use with MF3/4 but Food Primary is possibly one of the more impactful uses to live above. Why is there no Secondary suites in town housing (MF1/2)? Footnote 3 - and why is 2017 the grandfather date?
- Section 13.3: MF2 zone no longer permits apartment or stacked townhome/row housing option. This would be considered downzoning from RM3.
- Section 13.4: Footnote 6 would seem to allow for "brownstone" type fee simple lots. You could apply the same to MF1 far adjacent lots with zero lot line setbacks.
- Section 13.5: Site coverage is always challenging for townhouses. Having the reference to curb level assumes you will never get this use in an area with slopes. Ground orientated units have zero setback? This is contradicted lower down with a 3.0 m flanking side yard setback. Minimum lot area and frontage is repeated and contradictory. In fact most of page 154 is confusing. Footnote 14 is a bit confusing - and why should townhouses need a common amenity space (over 19 units)?
- Section 13.6: MF1 - Why two different height allowances with or without a lane? Is 8 m realistic? Is 10 m realistic for 3 storeys? This will force flat roofs. We have some concerns about the FAR for MF1 as well as why there is a difference with or without a lane.
- Section 13.6: Footnote 16 - MF2 – Why is the deck being mentioned here? How is the height measured from 'finished grade' and 'curb level' on multi-unit projects with large grade differential?
- Section 13.6: MF2 – If measurement is restricted to 10.0 m from maximum vertical distance on building, some design repercussions would occur. These would include being restricted to low slope roofs or flat roofs, lower ceiling heights, less roof top development and more retaining. In order to promote desired design for 3 storey townhome developments, we have the following recommendations for height and ways to measure:
  - Raise maximum height to 11.00 m as this will permit higher roof slopes, higher ceilings/large windows, and roof top development.
  - For hillside developments of sloping grade allow for ways of measure for walkout grading similar to Section 11.5 Development Regulations for single family walkouts.
  - Ensure multi-unit buildings measured in a similar manner and equitable to single family.
  - Suggested ways to measure include:
    - The Development Officer shall determine Grade by selecting from a variety of methods ensuring the best compatibility with surrounding developments:
      - For flat sites with less than 1.00 m in grade change, use an average between high and low.



- The Development Officer may determine Grade by calculating the average of the elevation at the corners of the Site prior to construction as shown on the applicant's grading plan.
- The Development Officer may determine Grade by calculating the average elevation of the corners of the buildings on all properties abutting the Site or separated from the Site by a lane, effective for infill.
- For multi-unit dwellings such as row housing, townhomes, etc. Grade to be measured either per unit or per building. Whichever is less punitive while promoting consistent theme or architectural style.
  - The Development Officer may use their discretion up to .5 m due to grade differential or other hardship to determine grade by a method other than the ones described. The applicant shall submit all information the Development Officer requires to determine Grade by the method the Development Officer chooses.
- Section 13.7: We are concerned with this and believe these should be base densities if that is what the City wants. With regards to MF1, why is this only for corner lots?
- General comment: Will there be anything to address short-term rentals?
- General Comment: Recommendation to update map references to OCP. Draft map references don't always match current 2040 draft OCP. Ideally, get rid of the references to the OCP altogether.
- Section 13.5: What is the rationale behind the significant amenity spaces? This is a significant change. These are costly, add to strata fees, and make it difficult to design buildings around. Are there many developments built in the past that could meet these requirements? The outdoor amenity space amounts appear to be excessive. Separating indoor and outdoor amenity space forces developers to construct both. In many developments, this is not desirable, or achievable. Many buyers would prefer larger private balconies and terraces instead of common spaces. This adds costs with little value. Footnote 14 mentioned townhomes with projects that have their own yards and terraces. Building a separate amenity space seems unnecessary.
- Section 13.6: Footnote 17 and 20 - limiting height of projects because of neighbouring zoning is punitive. It should be neighbouring OCP FLU designation.
- Section 13.6: MF3 - how was the 1.3 FAR determined as the appropriate base density? What about the 1.75 for 5 stories plus?

#### Section 14

- Section 14.11: For minimum setback to back of curb face in UC zones of 6.0m, this may have significant implications for the development potential of certain sites, where 6.0m is not practical.
- Section 14.11: Why is UC3 the only zone with a 3.0m side and rear yard setback requirement?
- Section 14.11: Same comment as 13.5 related to amenity space requirements. Has this been tested on typical projects?
- Section 14.11: Footnote 22 - What is the rationale for 10m building setback above 6 stories?

- Section 14.11: Back of Curb Setback – seems likely to cause confusion and trigger variances. How is this to be determined on a site undergoing a dramatic streetfront improvement/alteration? As the front yard setback plays a significant role in the design of any project, is the development team expected to wait until City/Engineering finalizes curb location before commencing project design? Is this setback applicable to all storeys or just the ground floor? Setbacks to property lines historically have always worked since lot lines rarely move whereas curb lines do.
- Section 14.11: Mixed Street Use Above Grade - stipulating only residential allowed above ground floor seems restrictive to mixed-use development potential. For example, a supportive housing rental apartment building on a mixed street with CRUs at grade and Society offices on level 2 is now prohibited.
- Section 14.14: For areas identified as PARK - limiting the height and density in the zoning bylaw for these lots may have unintended consequences. Typically, if the City purchases a site for park purposes, the value should be based on the prevailing development potential for neighbouring properties - this density/height restriction may mean that property valuations would be significantly reduced, penalizing the land owner.
- Section 14.14: Base FAR - any existing C7 zone has an existing density of 9.0 FAR. Reducing the base density of this zone is down zoning. While it has been said that "9.0 FAR" was never thought to be achievable, it has been in place for ~20 years. What is the rationale for reducing this density and down zoning properties in the primary urban centre? Having density and then having to "buy it back" because of a new zoning bylaw is punitive.
- Section 14.14: Tourist Commercial - no additional density has been added to the former C9 zone. Should this be reconsidered if max height has been increased to 15 storeys (from 6 today)?
- Section 14.14: UC5 FAR - many projects had been using existing density bonusing provisions in the zone to achieve higher base densities than the new ZBL allows. This may point to the notion that the base density should be higher.
- Section 14.15: This is where the new height maps in the OCP and Zoning Bylaw become very restrictive. For example, in UC1, for a property that is identified as 12 stories on the height map, total FAR achievable is 3.0 (base) + 0.5 (bonus, at a cost). Depending on the location, the site could be right across the street or adjacent to a site with a max FAR of 9.0 and max height of 40 stories. There is no ability to vary density, so the only way for these sites to achieve more density would be through CD Zone or site specific amendments (which creates its own set of problems). All this because a site happens to be on one side of the height map boundary. What is supposed to be in the OCP as a "guideline" quickly becomes a restrictive regulation.
- Section 14.15: UC1 - the arena properties' FAR has been maintained from the current bylaw at 5.0 FAR - what was the rationale for not including this site in the density bonus program?
- Section 14 Height Maps: Maps in the OCP are supposed to be a guideline but are noted as "the legend indicates maximum permissible heights. This height will not always be achievable." This is philosophically different than our on-going discussions with staff.
- Section 14 Height Maps: We would like to understand the rationale for the height limitations in the Midtown and Rutland urban centres. In these locations, it is unlikely that mid-rise buildings

will be economically feasible (particularly for rental housing). For this reason the areas identified for height above 6 stories but capped at 12 stories would be difficult to develop to their fullest potential. For transit orientated development in areas where there has been limited multi-family density built historically, such as Midtown, Rutland and Capri-Landmark, we should be further incentivizing density and height to help create complete communities in these areas. The heights seem too restrictive when viewed in a longer-term outlook, and per other comments, the height maps are now directly correlated to density, which further complicates matters.

- Section 14.4 – Industrial Zones and Elimination of I4 Zone (consolidated into I2 zone): Concerns that removing I4 zone, including the entire North End industrial area will result in fewer land uses, less density, less height and impact the overall developability of sites within the North End. This is short sighted and does a disservice to a very unique and emerging area of the City. Changing the North End to the I2 zone will stifle many of the interesting projects that have happened or are planned for the area. The timing of that change also seems inappropriate considering that the City is about to undertake a major planning process for the North End and we believe that planning exercise will see more interesting uses and flexible zoning regulations brought to the area, versus a more restrictive approach like the I2 zone. Simply removing the I4 zone as it exists today and applying the I2 zone to the North End would have a very negative impact on projects and businesses, owners, developers, and residents in the area.
- Section P3 Zone and Definition: P3 currently allows Utility Service, Minor Impact as a secondary use. The new P3 does not. Not all P3 land has to be publicly owned.
- General comments surrounding Agriculture Zone:
  - The regulations under the ALC for Secondary Residences are changing within the next month or so. These changes should be incorporated into the Zoning Bylaw or at least referred to within the Zoning Bylaw to ensure alignment.
  - With regards to Riparian Management Area, there is a conflict between what is stated in the Sustainability Water Act and the Right to Farm Act regarding treatment and classification of drainage corridors, ditches, draws, ravines, and what is noted as a 'stream'. Streams are considered to be protected under the RAR.

Additional feedback summarized from our November 10<sup>th</sup> meeting:

- UDI suggested changing C2 to C3 along Harvey corridor, west of Hwy. 33.
- UDI suggested changing C2 to C3 on Gordon and Spall.
- UDI recommended maximum density on C3 above 2.1 to align with current C4 density of 2.35.
- UDI provided comments regarding the balcony requirement and associated challenges with the Step Code.
- Industrial comments – Potential to keep 3.0 FAR density in I2 zone for north end.
- EV Charging requirements. Consider rough-in requirement, rather than complete Level 2 units.
- UDI provided comments on end of trip facilities.
- UDI suggested including Non-Accessory Parking and Offices as Principle Uses under C1 use matrix.

- UDI suggested the City look at removing the impermeable area restrictions noted in the industrial zones.

Additional feedback summarized from our November 18 and 19<sup>th</sup> meetings:

- Baseline densities and heights in multi-family and urban centre zones should aim to be higher than currently allowable in Zoning Bylaw 8000, in order to help successfully achieve the vision of OCP 2040. Any bonusing provisions should be over-and-above what is expected in OCP 2040.