

## Schedule D: Engagement Summary

### Agriculture Plan Policy Implementation Package 2

#### 1. Summary of Engagement Points of Contact

Date	Contact	Notes
Dec. 19, 2017	Glen Lucas / BCFGA	Meeting to discuss draft policies
Dec. 20, 2017	Glen Lucas / BCFGA	Provided email comments to draft policies
Jan. 22, 2018	Glen Lucas / BCFGA	Emailed Glen providing links and background information to the AAC report. Also, provided details on how his comments had been incorporated into the recommendations.
Jan. 31, 2018	Glen Lucas / BCFGA	Phone call – left message requesting table at BCFGA conference
Jan. 31, 2018	Glen Lucas / BCFGA	Email – left message requesting table at BCFGA conference
Feb. 5, 2018	Glen Lucas / BCFGA	Voicemail – left on office phone
Feb. 21, 2018	Agriculture Rate Design Open House	Table at the open house to gather input on proposed changes
Feb. 22, 2018	Glen Lucas / BCFGA	Email, informing him of speaking to some members at Open House and online engagement coming in the next week.
Feb. 28 – March 31, 2018	getinvolved.kelowna.ca	Online engagement on house size, buffers and splitting A1 secondary uses.  Note: sent out to 94 people / organizations from Agriculture Plan contact list
Feb. 28	Glen Lucas / BCFGA	Responded to request for meeting to discuss implementation of Agriculture Plan. Advised that online engagement will be open until March 31 and provided possible meeting dates.
March 1	File Referral of both package 1 and package 2	Sent package of proposed amendments with request for input by Friday, April 6. File referred to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ministry of Agriculture</li> <li>• Agriculture Land Commission</li> <li>• Central Okanagan Food Policy Council</li> <li>• BC Fruit Growers Association</li> <li>• Interior Health</li> <li>• Ministry of Transportation</li> <li>• UDI</li> <li>• RDCO</li> <li>• Lake Country</li> <li>• SEKID</li> <li>• BMID</li> <li>• GEID</li> <li>• SOMID</li> </ul>
March 9, 2018	Myrna Stark Leader 306-536-5691 – email online engagement	Ag consultant at Invest Kelowna, the regional economic development commission.
March 15, 2018	Agriculture Industry Group Breakfast Meeting	Meeting to review House Size, Buffers (and SEKID Water Rate Design)
March 27, 2018	Trent Kitsch (Kitsch Corp.) and Andrew Gaucher (G Group)	Meeting to review package 2

<b>April 3, 2018</b>	BCFGA (Glen Lucas, Pinder Dhaliwal, Sukhdev Goraya)	Meeting to discuss house size, buffers and separation of secondary uses for ALR / non ALR land. (Letter received from BCFGA)
<b>April 6, 2018</b>	John Hopkins, City of Richmond Senior Planner	Meeting to hear City of Richmond's experience with house size policy on farm land.
<b>April 6, 2018</b>	Regional District of Central Okanagan and Central Okanagan Development Commission	Email outlining comments on referral Package 1 and Package 2.
<b>April 6, 2018</b>	Central Okanagan Food Policy Council	Letter outlining comments on referral Package 1 and Package 2
<b>April 6, 2018</b>	Ministry of Agriculture	Letter outlining comments on referral Package 1 and Package 2
<b>April 6, 2018</b>	Interior Health	Letter outlining comments on referral Package 1 and Package 2
<b>April 16, 2018</b>	Ministry of Agriculture	Call to discuss potential options for house size regulations in a farm bylaw community.
<b>April 18, 2018</b>	Glen Lucas, BCFGA	Reminder to provide input on the entire referral package.
<b>April 23, 2018</b>	Glen Lucas, BCFGA	Follow up phone call on input on referral package and advise that staff would not proceed with house size amendments at this time, pending outcome of the ALR Revite process
<b>April 23, 2018</b>	Glen Lucas, BCFGA	Email response stating will have input by the end of the week. Follow up with information on revisions to definition for "on-farm processing definition"
<b>April 23, 2018</b>	Ministry of Agriculture	Clarification regarding Ministry of Agriculture comments on "silos" and "grain bins"
<b>April 25, 2018</b>	Ministry of Agriculture	Direction from Ministry of Agriculture that they would support amendments using maximum height for agriculture structure and not introducing definitions and requirements for "silos" and "grain bins"
<b>April 30, 2018</b>	Glen Lucas, BCFGA	Follow up phone call regarding last chance for BCFGA comments on entire referral package.

## 2. Agriculture Rate Design Open House

On February 22, 218 participated in an Agriculture Water Rate Design Open House at Reid Hall at Benvoulin Heritage Church to gather input on proposed policy changes for urban side buffers adjacent to ALR lands, home size on ALR lands and separating secondary uses for ALR and non-ALR agricultural properties.

The event was advertised in the February 2 and 7 Kelowna Daily Courier as well as January 30 News Release and February 13 PSA Reminder. The open house was promoted through social media (Facebook (791 reach) and Twitter (596 impressions). Further, information about the open house was direct mailed to approximately 500 SEKID agriculture customers, 16 City agriculture customers, 10 SOMID customers. Finally, e-subscribe channels promoted it through Engagement Opportunities (668 subscribers), News Releases (1,742 subscribers), Kelowna Integrated Water Phase 1 (819 subscribers).

In total 25 people attended the Open House. While some attendees engaged staff with questions on the proposed policy, several others had questions about other agricultural policies such as Temporary Farm Worker Housing and residential footprint size and siting. It was of interest to note that several of the attendees thought that the policy being proposed was already adopted, indicating the success of engagement during the Agriculture Plan's development.

Only five exit surveys were completed. Of these, 40 per cent either agreed or had no response on the proposed policy to limit house size on agricultural lands. 80 per cent of respondents agreed or had no response with the proposed policy to increase buffers for new urban developments to address conflicts between farmers and urban neighbours. 60 per cent of respondents either agreed or had no response about the proposal to distinguish secondary uses on ALR and non-ALR lots.

One general concern that was heard was increasing limitations for farmers by various levels of regulation (local and provincial).

### **3. Agriculture Industry Group Breakfast Meeting**

On March 15, 2018 attended the Agriculture Industry Group Breakfast Meeting to gather their input on proposed farm home size policy, separation of secondary uses for ALR and non ALR lots, and buffers.

Six members of the group participated in the session representing the following organizations:

- Farmer
- BC Tree Fruits
- Okanagan Sterile Insect Release Program
- Federal Pesticide Program
- University of British Columbia

Discussion points from the session included:

- Clarification of group home minor and major as a secondary use
- Clarification on how a road between a residential property and ALR property impacts setbacks and buffers
- Clarification on whose responsibility it is for installing and maintaining buffer as well as how the buffer is planted.
- Inquiries on how buffers can be established for existing homes.
- Inquiries on noise complaints.

### **4. [Getinvolved.kelowna.ca](http://getinvolved.kelowna.ca)**

From February 28 until March 31 the public could provide online input on agriculture house size, buffers and splitting A1 secondary uses through [getinvolved.kelowna.ca](http://getinvolved.kelowna.ca). The online engagement was promoted through e-scribe and those who were already registered with [getinvolved.kelowna.ca](http://getinvolved.kelowna.ca). Further, invitations to participate were sent to 94 organizations/people from a contact list established through the Agriculture Plan engagement.

In total 580 people visited the site of which 152 people were informed and 36 people were engaged. Most of the people engaged on the site provided feedback on proposed home size on agricultural land. This feedback is not included in this summary as maximum home size is not being included in this amendment package.

#### **Proposed buffer policy feedback**

While only a few comments were received on this topic, most agreed with the proposed buffer policy. Comments are summarized in the tables below:

### Agree with proposed buffer policy

Agree with proposed buffer policy 6	Agree 4	Disagree 0
Shelter belts are a great idea.	1	0
Yes, I think the proposed policy will help with conflict while improving the ecosystem.	1	0
Vegetative buffers especially a shelter belt are an excellent start to mitigating city folk vs farm folk. A quick look into farming practises / wind drift will support this idea. More education to city folk moving into agricultural areas is necessary. Agricultural land is private, fences are not to be cut, climbed or gates opened. The fruit on the trees is not free for all to pick. Dogs are not to run free and kill chickens, calves or leave feces in fields where food is harvested. It sounds like common sense but as each house is resold the conflict is renewed.	2	0
I think that 20 m is more than enough vegetative buffer for new development such as multi family and new subdivisions. The previous requirement was 15 m. There should be no onerous restrictions such as trees that block the view be placed on new developments, it should be left to individual owners to decide whether to plant large trees or not.	0	0
Yes. Especially in the ALR land on the flats where we have MRM/MRL developments neighbouring agricultural lands. The ALR land in the urban fire is under immense pressure and will continue to be subject to tension between the farming/non-farming community. An extensive buffer can go a long way in alleviating tensions.	0	0
I think the buffer will help. However, people living in agricultural areas need to be more supportive toward those who supply their food.	0	0

### Disagree with proposed buffer policy

Disagree proposed buffer policy should be less restrictive 2	Agree 0	Disagree 1
I believe you are correct in addressing this matter, and I believe that you should be even more aggressive that you are proposing - I would say that 15 meters should be the standard across the board for new development, and that you should not have a lower buffer for commercial and industrial.	0	1
The current problem is Kelowna is that land cost of risen greatly. In commercial and industrial lands, it is excessive to required an 8 meter buffer when you consider that no setback is required between industrial and commercial zoned lands. Agriculture is a commercial / industrial function from an economic perspective.  I agree with the additional buffer for new residential subdivisions and institutional uses. For existing lots there is often a covenant that alerts the home owner to the fact that agricultural work is being conducted next door. It is a case of buyer beware.	0	0

#### Other buffer policy comments

Comment unclear on support of policy 1	Agree 0	Disagree 0
Does the neighbourwoods program have a role to play here to help offer trees for these buffer areas? <a href="https://www.kelowna.ca/parks-recreation/urban-trees-wildlife/neighbourwoods">https://www.kelowna.ca/parks-recreation/urban-trees-wildlife/neighbourwoods</a>	0	0

#### Separate secondary uses for properties within the ALR and properties not in the ALR

Few comments were received on this topic, but all were in agreement with the proposed policy as shown in the table below:

Agree with proposed policy 4	Agree 3	Disagree 0
Yes	1	0
Yes, the policy is clear and easy to understand.	2	0
I agree with this change. Other municipalities clearly define the uses permitted in and out of the ALR in their Zoning Bylaws, so should Kelowna.	0	0
Yes, I agree. Uses are more clearly defined.	0	0