Comparison of Draft OCP Gellatly NC to Gellatly Village Study

Key Elements	Gellatly Village Study (GVS) - 2017	Gellatly Neighbourhood Centre (GNC) - Draft OCP	Difference between the GVS and GNC
Purpose	To assess and update the land use and development recommendations	To promote smaller centres in various neighbourhoods in West Kelowna, allowing for diverse types of housing, retail/services, and some office uses, as well as open space amenities.	OCP actually creates a specific Land Use Designation, whereas the GVS only recommends creating one. An option has been presented for Council's consideration to revise the name of this area from the Gellatly Neighbourhood Centre to the Gellatly Village Neighbourhood Centre in recognition of the special scope and scale of this area.
Area	three sites over 5 parcels	one NC over 11 parcels, including 5 parks	The GNC includes additional parcels, including the adjacent City Parks as part of the plan area.
Мар	Willow H PE ACh Solvential and the second s		While the GVS only identified 3 sites, the study did include consideration of adjacent areas that are very similar to the GNC boundary.
	GVS completed a detailed financial analysis as a snapshot in time regarding the financial viability of constructing various development densities including residential and commercial uses with a recommendation that the future land use designation consider at least a minimum of 185 m² (2000 sf) of commercial area and a minimum density range of 0.8 to 1.5 up to a maximum density range of 1.8 to 2.0 FSR. (FSR = Floor	Prior to Council direction on May 16, 2023, the GNC had a proposed	While Council directed the removal of density (GFA) from the OCP, the
	Space Ratio uses a "net" measurement of the floor area which is similar to a measurement of GFA except that the GFA uses "gross" measurement resulting in FSRs being slightly less than	maximum density of 1.5 GFA with recommended increase to 2.35 GFA. Maximum commercial floor space is proposed to be regulated in the Zoning Bylaw, but the OCP establishes policy regarding the appropriate scope	anticipated density within the GNC is generally in alignment with the recommendations of the GVS. A new policy has been drafted as an option for Council's consideration regarding the scope and scale of commercial
Density	equivalent GFA calculations).	and scale of commercial development within the NCs.	development appropriate to the area.

Key Elements	Gellatly Village Study (GVS) - 2017	Gellatly Neighbourhood Centre (GNC) - Draft OCP	Difference between the GVS and GNC
Height	Based on the detailed financial analysis of land and construction cost as a snapshot in time, the GVS recommended that the future land use designation consider a minimum height requirement of 3 storeys and a maximum building height up to 5 storeys. However, the images in the GVS include conceptual drawings with 4, 5 and 6 storey buildings.	Based on May 16, 2023 Council direction, the current GNC includes maximum building heights of up to 6 storeys.	The GNC considers 1 additional potential storey than the GVS, but it is important to note that land and construction costs have substantially increased since the "snapshot" of the GVS in 2016-2017 which may affect viability projections of development in this area which may require consideration of the additional storey. An option has been drafted for Council's consideration regarding limiting height in the Gellatly area to 5 storeys, but this option is not recommended by staff due to the points noted above, and consideration of stepbacks further outlined in the Development Permit guidelines (see addtional detail below).
Policy/Recommendation	Recommendation #1 - Creation of a Gellatly Village Vision Brochure and Web Content and actively market to realtors and developers.	Section 3.7.2.1 Economic Sustainability Policy - Encourage new commercial and residential development specifically in the Neighbourhood and Urban Centres to create vibrant, pedestrian-friendly centres that encourage economic vitality.	The GVS mentions specifically promoting the Gellatly Village area, whereas the OCP has more general references to promotiing and supporting development within all the identified Centres.
Policy/Recommendation	Recommendation #2 - Develop a Gellatly Village Growth Management Designation and policy for the development opportunity sites 1-3 using a 'form based approach'	OCP established the Gellatly NC Land Use Designation, while not form based does require development to adhere to detailed Development Permit Guidelines as per Section 4.2 and 4.7 of the OCP	OCP establishes a land use designation as per the GVS recommendation AND uses DP guidelines and future Zoning BL to establish form.
Building Form & Stepbacks	GVS - consider developing a design guideline based on the massing, orientation and general character as shown in fillustrations within the study	OCP established the NC Development Permit Area, as well as General Guidelines which apply to the Gellatly NC which are generally in alignment with the recommendation of the GVS in regard to form and character. This includes consideration of appropriate stepback along the frontage - 4.7.4.2, 4.7.5.14.a. and b, 4.7.5.15, 4.7.5.18.c, 4.7.5.19, 4.7.5.23, 4.7.5.25, 4.7.5.26, 4.7.5.27, etc. This inlcudes consideration of sun shadowing and impact of mid-rise buildings - 4.2.8.1, 4.2.8.2, 4.2.8.3, 4.2.8.4, 4.7.5.27.a.	OCP and Development Permit Guidelines are in aligment with the GVS recommendation.
Sample Illustrations		4.7.5.25 4.7.5.20 4.7.5.20 1.7.5.	

Key Elements	Gellatly Village Study (GVS) - 2017	Gellatly Neighbourhood Centre (GNC) - Draft OCP	Difference between the GVS and GNC
		Section 2.7.3.4 Gellatly NC Policy - Development in the Gellatly Neighbourhood Centre is encouraged to consider the provision of additional public parking as a much needed amenity within the area, and in support of any commercial uses proposed within the development. DP Guidelines established in Section 4.2.11.6, 7,8,9,10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 14. Additionally, parking is part of the Zoning Bylaw review required to be completed following adoption of the OCP that will look at specific parking requirements within the City.	OCP and future Zoning Bylaw update are in alignment with the GVS recommendation, and boat and trailer parking requirements are already included in the Zoning Bylaw for parcels within 250 m of the waterfront. A small revision has been drafted as an option for Council's consideration to reference boat and trailer parking specifically with other public parking considerations in Policy 2.7.3.5.
	GVS - consider desired open space amenities and features	OCP established the NC Development Permit Area, as well as General Guidelines which apply to the Gellatly NC which are generally in alignment with the recommendation of the GVS in regard to form and character. This includes consideration of appropriate stepback along the frontage - 4.7.4.5, 4.7.5.1, 4.7.5.2, 4.7.5.4, 4.7.5.5, 4.7.5.29.a & b., 4.2.6.15, 4.2.12, etc.	OCP and Development Permit Guidelines are in aligment with the GVS recommendation.
	(e.g., commercial, street fronting townhouse and flex-use	OCP established the NC Development Permit Area, as well as General Guidelines which apply to the Gellatly NC which are generally in alignment with the recommendation of the GVS in regard to form and character. This includes consideration of appropriate stepback along the frontage - 4.7.4.1, 4.7.4.4, 4.7.5.3, 4.7.5.16, 4.7.5.18.a & b, 4.7.5.20, 4.7.5.21, 4.7.5.22, 4.7.5.23, 4.7.5.28, etc.	OCP and Development Permit Guidelines are in aligment with the GVS recommendation.
Sample Illustrations	image courtesy of Cal Srigley		
·	Recommendation #3 - Develop a temporary use policy to	Section 2.7.2.6 NC Policies - Support pop-up uses and structures that are	GV was meant for interim uses, whereas OCP is meant for temporary
	enable temporary uses on Sites 1-3 until such time the market proves viable for redevelopment.	temporary and transportable to enliven streets, public areas, and publicly accessible private spaces.	popup with a full time use but essentially covers some of the same types of uses.

Key Elements	Gellatly Village Study (GVS) - 2017	Gellatly Neighbourhood Centre (GNC) - Draft OCP	Difference between the GVS and GNC
Policy/Recommendation	Recommendation #4 - (a) Consider negotiating public access (via a Statutory Right of Way or road dedication) to Site 1 from Flying Horse Drive (approximately 93 metres). (b) Consider negotiating access (via a Statutory Right of Way or road dedication from the Pointe neighbourhood through to Brown Road to connect the Pointe Neighbourhood to Westbank Centre.	Section 2.7.3.4 Gellatly NC Policy - Development in the Gellatly Neighbourhood Centre must consider the potential for enhanced access between the waterfront and Westbank Urban Centre, especially for pedestrian traffic and the potential to connect to Brown Road and/or other more direct routes.	OCP does not mention Flying Horse Drive or the direct connection to the Pointe from Brown Road. However, Policy 2.7.3.4 does mention enhanced connectivity between the waterfront and Brown Road. Additionally, a new policy has been drafted as an option for Council's consideration regarding securing additional right of ways to enhance public access to the development area in accordance with the recommendation of the Gellatly Village Study.
Policy/Recommendation	Recommendation #5 - Increase provision of waterfront parking (both vehicular and boat/trailer parking) at the time of development application. AND Recommendation #6 - Continue to pursue opportunities to secure additional public parking (vehicular and boat/trailer parking) in Gellatly Bay and other waterfront locations.		OCP does not distinctly note boat and trailer parking, although parking requirements will be reviewed through the update to the Zoning Bylaw and Parking Study. See small revision noted above in regard to boat/trailer parking.
Policy/Recommendation	Recommendation #7 - Consider the opportunity for public transit to provide additional service to Gellatly Bay.	Section 2.7.1 2 NC Objectives - To promote development at a density and location conveniently located in the existing and planned transportation network that supports alternative modes of transportation, and that is built at a scale that is pedestrian friendly to create a built environment that is walkable and bikeable to meet the needs of people of all ages and abilities.	OCP focuses on provision of density to support transit, whereas GVS focus in on providing the service. It is noted that service through this area is considered in the draft Transportation Master Plan with timing to be reviewed with future Transit Planning.
Policy/Recommendation	Recommendation #8 - Review the Gellatly Village Study in 7 to 12 years.	As per LGA, OCP's are recommended to be updated every 5 years.	OCP is likely to be updated on a simliar or more frequent basis than the recommendation in the GVS.