

Memorandum

December 13, 2019

To: James Kay

From: UDI Technical Issues Committee

Subject: Upcoming Review of Transportation Requirements in the Subdivision and Development Services Bylaw

As per your request at the recent UDI/Kelowna Liaison Committee, please find the following issues/topics as top of mind from our group in terms of the upcoming bylaw review. They are in no particular order nor should they be deemed a complete list. We look forward to engaging with City staff to review this critically important section of the bylaw.

General

- Transportation issues should be classified as either new/greenfield or infill. We don't think the successful hillside standards should be limited to hillside applications but rather any new road development. Similarly, infill projects will face different needs and challenges than new or greenfield projects and will be more likely to face coordination with specialized networks for transit, cycling, pedestrian or multi-modal use.
- The goal of the review should be to have a bylaw and plan that allows industry to plan and design with confidence. Too often, design and plans get revised on the fly by specific concerns from Transportation or Operations divisions that fall outside bylaw and policy parameters. The bylaw should also be as comprehensive as possible in terms of not requiring both a bylaw and a policy manual on how to interpret the bylaw. The legal requirement of any bylaw is that it can be read and interpreted by a "layman" or an ordinary citizen. A good bylaw will allow the development industry to give the City what it needs without time consuming and costly design revisions.
- There should be a "late hits" provision in the bylaw. If there are design changes identified after IFC drawings are approved, the City should have a mechanism to contribute to additional design and construction costs or abandon the late changes requested.

Specific Topics/Issues

1. Cul-de-sac lengths. We have made a lot of progress on this topic but we still feel that the two units per lot is an overly conservative position on the City's behalf. We understand BCBC changes may influence this discussion.
2. Road Standards for specific equipment. There are several examples where efficient design is prevented by the limitation on Operations' equipment available. It would be great to discuss some alternative equipment that would allow design efficiencies.

3. Boulevard Design. This area of design seems to be disjointed with several different standards and policies on street trees, irrigation, shallow utilities, etc. Streamlining boulevards would be a benefit.
4. Cross Sections in General. We look forward to reviewing sidewalks, bike lanes, shared asphalt, cycle networks, multi-modal networks, street trees, transformers, overhead utilities etc. There have been a number of new designs and a review of a few of them could be beneficial in looking at the good, bad and ugly.
5. Driveways. Review limit of one per property, shared driveways, design and criteria.
6. Road Grades/ K Values. Some flexibility for areas where minor increases in road grade will significantly minimize grading impacts and allow for more sensitive design.
7. Bus Stop. Design standards seem to be all over the map.
8. Pedestrian Crossings. What is the trigger or demand/warrant information? There are also a few different designs in place. Some cost benefit between different design standards?
9. Review of Sensor technology and requirements. Camera sensor vs pressure plates, emergency vehicle transponders, transit transponders, wireless tech etc.
10. TIA's. What will be the trigger? VC ration should be 1.0. How do 23,000 infill units in core areas impact the need for TIA's?
11. Parking and Care Share. Reduced on street parking, infill development road designs, future trends?
12. School Site requirements. Poorly planned drop off/parking for schools impact peak demand significantly. Should have standard design elements to reduce friction from school sites/zones.

We will also have members involved in the Transportation Planning exercises underway and the cross over between the two subjects will be significant. In general, UDI members are interested in:

- Arterial/Collector network planning
- Transit/cycling/pedestrian/multi-modal network planning and the impact to existing roads/networks
- Push for more coordination with MOTI in urban settings.