Understanding Our Priorities
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On January 18, 2010, the MD of Foothills and Town of Okotoks adopted the JOINT PLANNING AGREEMENT. Its mission is to create a long term integrated Development Management Strategy for the MD of Foothills and the Town of Okotoks Development Management Strategy Area (DMSA) and protocols for successful joint planning (See Appendix A for a map of the DMSA).

As a step in the process, the Town of Okotoks and the MD of Foothills engaged MetroQuest to conduct a community engagement process. The purpose of the community engagement was to develop a clearer picture of the priorities and values of the community along with their perspectives on how they would like to see growth managed in the DMSA.
The MetroQuest Process

The MetroQuest community engagement process consisted of series of interactive workshops using MetroQuest. MetroQuest allows for 50-year future scenarios to be created and evaluated in a workshop setting using data and outcomes specific to the DMSA. The software allows workshop participants to experiment with various planning decisions relating to growth management and shows the outcomes on a wide range of priorities.

The MetroQuest team worked closely with the Town and MD staff for several months, collecting data and validating future scenarios to prepare MetroQuest for the community engagement workshops for the DMSA. The community consultation process was conducted in June, 2010.

MetroQuest was used in three community workshops hosting a wide range of participants. Two of the workshops were open to the general public and one workshop was conducted for local area business people and developers. The workshops attracted a wide diversity of participants as indicated by the range of viewpoints that were recorded in this process. The workshops engaged 175 participants - about half were residents of Okotoks and half were residents of the MD of Foothills. This report documents the results of these community workshops.

The MetroQuest Process Included:

» Comprehensive data collection and analysis
» A series of community workshops featuring MetroQuest
» Analysis and synthesis of the feedback collected at the workshops

Using wireless handsets, participants voted on policies and priorities and collectively created and evaluated future scenarios. The total number of votes across all workshops was used to determine the most popular choice for each policy area. The popular votes were used to create the preferred future scenario presented in this report. The detailed voting results are presented in Appendix B.

The vision presented below represents the majority opinions of the participants involved in the process. While not everyone agreed on the best direction on each aspect of the preferred future, caution was taken to represent the most popular and frequently mentioned elements. Participants were also provided with a worksheet to record their detailed comments (See Appendix C for a sample worksheet). Appendix D presents all of the raw written comments submitted by participants to allow the reader to understand the thoughts of participants in more detail.
What makes this region special?

The region is growing and will change over the next several decades. Critical decisions about managing growth need to be made. In order to make the best decisions moving forward it is critical for decision makers to understand as much as possible about public values. What are the most important characteristics of the region that need to be preserved regardless of the growth that is expected? To find out more about these priorities, participants were asked, “What makes this region special?”

Here are the characteristics that were most frequently mentioned along with some quotes from participants:

**Beautiful scenery and natural areas**
- Views of the mountains
- *The MD of Foothills is a beautiful place, that is why I want to see the population growth kept inside the DMSA, in order to maintain the overall quality in the MD*
- Our natural beauty – rivers, mountains, foothills and the diverse ecosystem and opportunities for recreation close to home

**Small town character**
- Small town character within rural surroundings
- Town feel rather than city feel
- *Small town feel with a strong sense of community*

**Engaged community**
- Heavy citizen participation in town & MD planning
- A town and MD council that hears what the residents have to say and is responsive
- Community pride and involvement

**Easy to get around**
- Able to get around easily
- Ease of transportation

**Clean and safe**
- Safe & secure community, low crime rate
- Clean air, good water
What makes this region special, continued

**Great community & great people**
- Pride in community – neighbours that know each other. Open & friendly
- Personable services such as schools, local businesses, and churches
- A comfortable place for families to live, grow and age

**Nice walking opportunities**
- Walking paths through neighbourhoods – trails, hiking
- Okotoks has done a great job with ensuring new development has lots of green space and walking paths.
- Excellent networks of roads and trails

**Easy access to Calgary**
- Close enough to the big city arts and culture
- Access, without attachment to Calgary
- Green space yet close to Calgary

**Great rural areas**
- Green space, views, rural lifestyle
- Rural vistas while driving
- Beautiful rural areas

**Great parks and green spaces**
- The “look” and “feel” of the area – the river and trees and green space
- The green space conservation and preservation of arable land and wilderness
- Quiet areas and open spaces

**Environmental leadership**
- We are leaders in environmental innovation and practice/policy. We need to continue to be leaders in urban development centred around solar energy and other environmentally friendly practices
- Our commitment to environmental responsibility
- Thinking green, solar energy, wind power etc.

**Business friendly**
- Strong urban area for residents to conduct business
- Vibrant downtown area

Participant quotes
Results of Priority Ranking Exercise

MetroQuest was configured with 15 priorities representing a wide range of issues including neighbourhood characteristics, environment, transportation and costs. Each participant was asked to rate each priority one at a time on a scale of 1 (high priority) to 5 (low priority).

The following table presents the ranking of the 15 priorities from highest priority at the top to lowest priority at the bottom based on an average of all participant votes. Low scores indicate higher priority. See Appendix E for a breakdown of results by age and location of residence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clean air</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy car travel</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkable neighbourhoods</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower fees and taxes</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet neighbourhoods</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower cost of living</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibrant downtown areas</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More green space</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy access to transit</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low maintenance homes</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorter commutes</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural living opportunities</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower carbon emissions</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller eco-footprint</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large homes with big yards</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following insights emerge when these results are examined:

**Both clean air and easy car travel rank highly.**

Since automobile transportation is responsible for a significant portion of local air quality issues, this may be an important topic for additional discussion.

**Participants value both vibrant downtown areas and quiet neighbourhoods.**

This indicates that a mix of compact development and lower density areas may be desirable. However, large homes with big yards ranked very low indicating a preference for more modest sized homes and properties.

**Local environmental issues are important.**

Global environmental issues such as ecological footprint and carbon emissions ranked lower than local environmental issues such as green space preservation and clean air.
Feedback on Policy Directions for Managing Growth

Based on the most recent projections as many as 60,000 residents could live in this area by the year 2060. This represents more than a doubling of the current population. MetroQuest was configured with two questions with three options each to allow participants to create, explore and evaluate a total of 9 possible alternative future scenarios for the DMSA. The questions were created to explore how the growth that is projected could be accommodated. One question allowed people to indicate where they felt growth should occur in the area and one question allowed participants to indicate the desired density of the new housing to be added to the area. MetroQuest was used to create a projection of how these options might impact the region and specifically the priorities that participants had ranked highly during the priority ranking exercise.

The process was conducted iteratively, allowing participants to evaluate all 9 possible future scenarios before re-voting on scenario choices. Based on all participant votes, the following images show the percent of people who selected each option as their final choice. Below each option is a summary of most frequently cited reasons participants recorded for selecting the option. See Appendix D for all participant comments.
Question 1: DMSA Growth

This question asked, “Where should new development be located?” A range of options were offered allowing participants to allocate new growth either inside the DMSA, on land near to but outside the DMSA, or a mixture of both. The options were:

**Growth Option A:** 30,000 people in DMSA by 2060
This option suggests that the population within the DMSA should be planned to grow to 30,000 indicating that most of the new growth would occur outside the DMSA.

**Growth Option B:** 45,000 people in DMSA by 2060
This option suggests that the population within the DMSA should be planned to grow to 45,000 indicating that new growth would divided between the DMSA and the area surrounding its perimeter.

**Growth Option C:** 60,000 people in DMSA by 2060
This option suggests that the population within the DMSA should be planned to grow to 60,000 indicating that most of the new growth would occur inside the DMSA.

The results of the voting and the most frequently mentioned comments are recorded below.

**Growth Option A:**
30,000 people in the DMSA by 2060 *(favoured by 6% of participants)*

Common reasons cited for voting for this option grouped by theme:

- **Maintains a small town feel**
  - Still want small town feel
  - Maintain a quality of life that cannot be experienced in a mid-sized community
  - Small town/city is what attracts many people, safety, friendly, social, clean

- **Conserves water**
  - Sheep River can only supply so much water, don’t want to pipeline to Calgary
  - Limited water supply
  - Where is the water going to come from?
Growth Option B: 45,000 people in the DMSA by 2060 (favoured by 42% of participants)

Common reasons cited for voting for this option grouped by theme:

**It’s cost effective**
- Will help to keep taxes reasonable without taking away our quality of life
- Initially chose 30k, changed to 45k – must consider the long term implications – we can accommodate the 45k – it will help the community develop the services and amenities we need
- It’s more cost effective to house people in smaller areas

**Growth can be more manageable**
- Comfortable growth for the whole area without becoming overwhelming to the road systems
- Prepares our town without overwhelming it, allows potential for change as necessary
- Slow increases make it easier for infrastructure to keep pace
- Better tax base but still orderly growth

**Creates a wide variety of choices**
- People deserve to be able to live an urban lifestyle or choose between urban and rural
- Growth would support the opportunity for our kids to stay in the community and provide opportunity for their family
- Allow growth within Okotoks and MD to accommodate all types.

**Supports local businesses**
- I want people to be located conveniently close to town to support local businesses
- Keep the town vibrant

Note: Okotoks residents were split evenly between growing the population of the DMSA to 45,000 and 60,000. Only 2 percent favoured limiting the growth to 30,000.
Growth Option C: 
60,000 people in the DMSA by 2060 *(favoured by 52% of participants)*

Common reasons cited for voting for this option grouped by theme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lowers taxes &amp; increases tax base for more amenities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- We need more people to pay for good facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Tax base (lower overall taxes) -&gt; people outside the general area will still use the infrastructure and amenities, therefore they might as well participate in the upkeep and maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- More people for shared taxes, better for businesses, less cost of infrastructure because it isn’t so spread out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Easier to service, less eco impacts, focused application of services and taxes to a smaller area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Participant quotes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preserves agricultural land and green space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Agricultural land should be protected - contain the population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The rural feel, views and lifestyle in the MD lands outside of Okotoks needs to be preserved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I am concerned about the farm land being swallowed up, more density closer to town....as much as I love my acreage it really is not practical. i.e. space or impact on the environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- In order to keep green space and agriculture land we need to concentrate growth in and around Okotoks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Participant quotes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotes economic growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Growth produces jobs, jobs produce higher economic growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Good mix of new businesses opportunities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Participant quotes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responds to growth pressure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Okotoks is a great place and people will want to live here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The area should be allowed to grow as much as it needs to, so that people that want to live here can do so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Close to Calgary, lots of people are looking for a place to retire close to a major city</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Participant quotes**

---

**Note:** A majority of Foothills residents living on smaller parcels (under 6 acres) favoured growing the population of the DMSA to 45,000. Foothills residents on larger parcels (over 6 acres) favoured growing the population of the DMSA to 60,000 thus limiting growth in the MD outside of the DMSA.
Question 2: Density

This question asked, “What density should new development be?” This question asks participants about the types of new housing that they feel would be best developed to accommodate growth. It was recognized that any realistic future scenario for the area would involve a range of new housing and property types ranging from compact housing types like townhouses and condos to suburban single family houses to country residential and hobby farm properties. This question asked participants to indicate where they felt that the emphasis should be placed. Options ranged from:

**Density Option 1: Low Density**

This option places more emphasis on lower density properties such as large lot suburban neighbourhoods and country residential properties. While some more compact housing will be developed, it will be limited with this option.

**Density Option 2: Medium Density**

This option places more emphasis on medium density properties such as standard and smaller lot suburban neighbourhoods, along with duplexes and townhouses. While some lower and higher density housing will be developed it will be somewhat limited with this option.

**Density Option 3: High Density**

This option places more emphasis on high density properties such as small lot suburban neighbourhoods, duplexes, townhouses, and condos. Some less compact housing will be developed, though it will be limited with this option. While this option does not suggest that the area will include many tall buildings such as found in Calgary, it does represent significantly more compact development that is currently the norm in the area.

The results of the voting and the most frequently mentioned comments are recorded below.
Density Option 1: 
**Low Density** *(favoured by 9% of participants)*

Common reasons cited for voting for this option grouped by theme:

**More rural living opportunities**
- I chose rural living and don’t want that to change
- To keep things rural and allow for livestock, outdoor pursuits, hiking, hunting and fishing.
- Low density, quality of life - not too close to neighbour’s backyards.

**Conserves water**
- I feel we should stick to a lower density to conserve resources such as water

Participant quotes
Density Option 2: Medium Density *(favoured by 68% of participants)*

Common reasons cited for voting for this option grouped by theme:

Creates affordable housing options

- *We need more mixed density to accommodate all age groups and income levels*
- *We need to allow the younger population affordable housing and also perhaps seniors to be able to downsize to low maintenance housing. But also to leave open the opportunity for both groups to upgrade and to single family, larger housing as they can afford in the future.*

Participant quotes

Creates a wide variety of choices

- *So there is a mix of lifestyles*
- *Allow for a mix of housing options – otherwise would not attract a mixed population*
- *Let people have options for what they want to live in*

Participant quotes

Preserves open space

- *Provide for more green space area*
- *Prevent sprawl*

Participant quotes

Facilitates more alternative transportation

- *Better for transit, shopping*
- *Means smaller carbon footprint and a more walkable neighbourhood.*

Participant quotes

Note: When polled about priorities, Okotoks residents placed a high value on vibrant downtown areas while also valuing quiet neighbourhoods indicating the importance of striking a balance of neighbourhood types. Large homes with big yards was ranked very low indicating a preference for medium density neighbourhoods.

Creates attractive options for young families and seniors

- *Allow for a place for all ages or families to live and grow in this area*
- *A good mix will help all demographics*
- *I'd like to experience more of a choice as I age too. I'd like to live in an adult – low maintenance community in the country*

Participant quotes

It's not too dense

- *I do not like or want a densely crowded city*
- *Low density is irresponsible for a community to develop, high density should be in Calgary*
- *To be able to have some good amenities but won't be over-crowded*

Participant quotes
Density Option 3:  
**High Density** *(favoured by 23% of participants)*

Common reasons cited for voting for this option grouped by theme:

### Facilitates more alternative transportation
- High density located as close to downtown as possible to utilize the core and allow for a walking friendly downtown area. High density with amenities within walking distance
- The more urban sprawl that is created, the less sustainable a community becomes as travel is increased and walking opportunities decrease

### Preserves open space & agricultural land
- Higher is a better use of land and resources — there is already a lot of low density in Okotoks – reasonable choice
- Housing types and patterns should recognize the need to put the maximum # of residents with quality, low maintenance housing on the smallest possible land mass
- Maintain vistas and landscapes without sprawl, accommodates a range of housing options and supports the CMP nodes and corridors concept
- Will provide higher growth while keeping green space
- In the future we will need more land to produce food and not to cut it up, therefore I vote high density

### Creates a more vibrant downtown
- To have amenities and a vibrant downtown, keep all costs down
- Vibrant shopping/entertainment areas
- Higher density usually results in diversification of the community in terms of shopping, culture and amenities

Note: Participants under the age of 30 favoured higher density development. A majority of participants over age 30 favoured medium density development. Support for high density development decreased as the age of participants increased.

### It’s more affordable
- Lower taxes
- More affordable housing

Note: Okotoks residents were more supportive of high density development than Foothills residents.

When polled specifically about the type of development participants supported for Okotoks the majority of Okotoks participants favoured either status quo or higher density.

Note: When polled about priorities, younger participants (under age 45) placed high value on vibrant downtown areas.
Managing Growth in Okotoks and the surrounding area

By the end of the workshop, participants were starting to form a fairly clear and consistent picture of how they felt growth should be managed in the region. There was a strong consensus on accommodating the majority of the growth either in Okotoks or reasonably close by. Most participants felt that urban densities should be primarily in the Okotoks area and that much of rural land in the MD of Foothills should remain rural. When asked at the conclusion of the workshop about their thoughts on managing growth in the region, here were the most frequently mentioned themes:

**Embrace development**

- Do not try and stop development, embrace change and plan for it
- This is a beautiful place - please keep growing so that we have the tax base to keep our town beautiful and add amenities

**Higher densities should be primarily in Okotoks**

- Urban densities should be restricted to Okotoks
- Keep the majority of the growth within the town of Okotoks
- Keep high density areas within the town of Okotoks
- Okotoks needs to manage most of the growth. The town will need the tax base to keep up with the recreation/schools/infrastructure etc.
- Townhouses and condo’s added in areas within Okotoks
- Keep urban growth in the urban area
- Okotoks needs more high density housing for young families/affordability. This should be in close proximity to the downtown core for easier access to services

**Note:** The majority of participants felt that the growth should be located primarily in Okotoks. This was particularly true for Okotoks residents. Most of the remaining participants felt that it should be divided between Okotoks and Foothills.

**Note:** When polled specifically about the type of development participants supported for Foothills the majority of Foothills participants favoured either one acre or 5 acre parcel sizes with very little support for quarter acre parcels.
Managing Growth, continued

**Densities in the MD of Foothills should mainly be kept low**

- Keep the density in town and allow folks to have space in the rural areas
- The agricultural land should be preserved. The growth should take place within the town limits
- Rural acreage should be available with room for livestock if desired
- Don’t allow urban sprawl from the town of Okotoks into neighbouring larger areas. People have invested time and money in upholding a quality of life here.
- Higher densities should be well-planned with high quality amenities
- High density should also be well done - not people warehouses!
- Better planned space, more interesting multi-family homes
- Why not go up instead of out, save space for picnic areas, sports areas etc.
- Pathways, green space, homes backing onto common space to encourage connections

**Note:** When polled about priorities, Foothills residents placed a higher value on rural living opportunities. Foothills residents with larger properties felt most strongly about this priority. Furthermore, middle-aged participants (45 – 59 years old) felt more strongly than others about this priority.

**Preserve the river valley**

- The river – no large developments allowed near the river, rural
- River Valley development should be curtailed

**Higher density areas should be strategically located to promote access to employment, shopping and transit**

- Higher density development close to the downtown and future shopping areas; make sure there is access and transit for people living in these areas
- Build up with complete neighbourhoods
- Employment corridors located near urban area’s
- Smaller area developed = best plan! Look at Calgary’s growth – it is ridiculous! It is ever growing. Please to don’t let Okotoks be developed in the same manner. High quality and high density developments with residential, commercial and schools all within walking distance

**The MD and Okotoks should continue to collaborate on planning**

- Growth is best managed through: shared responsibility, working together and pre-planning
- Thanks to the MD and Town for working together on these challenging issues. I have seen a shift in this relationship of cooperation and I hope to see it continue to get stronger
- Growth in the area should continue to be managed in a collaborative manner between Okotoks and MD of Foothills. Urban growth should be concentrated in Okotoks with acreage development in MD of Foothills

**Participant quotes**
Managing Growth, continued

**Dealing fairly and openly with land owners will be a key issue for many**

- Landowners need & have a right to know what they can do with their land
- Need to address what is going to happen with undeveloped land that farmers are left with. How do they deal with this and what is the land worth?
- The MD should be very careful about noticing the rights of the landowner to protect their capital. It is most aggravating to have everyone else have plans for you land
- Reeve: smaller focus groups from key areas of concern where growth is anticipated would be very worthwhile before finalizing any development plans.
- Please consider the value of views that people have paid for in the rural areas and how it will affect their home values.

**Many called for the population cap for Okotoks to be re-evaluated**

- Population cap has no merit
- Remove the cap
- Growth management cannot be artificial. The growth pressures will all come down to economics. Growth caps are unworkable.

**Many suggested that Okotoks consider annexing new land in adjacent areas**

- Expand Okotoks to accommodate a larger population to share taxes and help businesses thrive
- The town of Okotoks should annex more land
- Mayor: the town should oppose a development adjacent to the town. The town should not supply and services to MD/third party for any development outside its limits. The Town should promote development within its border and annex lands needed for future growth now before the town is surrounded by other development
Scenario Outcomes: Looking forward to 2060

As a result of the participant voting, a majority of votes were cast for scenario “C2” or increasing the population within the DMSA to 60,000 and focusing on medium density development.

The combination of increased growth in the DMSA and a shift towards medium densities results in some significant changes. This scenario means that very little of the growth that is expected for the area will occur outside of the DMSA thus preserving the rural nature of those areas.

The choice to move away from low density development in favour of medium and higher densities means that:

» The growing population will be accommodated using less open space and agricultural land
» A diverse range of housing types will be developed with an emphasis on smaller lot single family homes and some more compact homes such as townhouses and duplexes
» There will be increased infill development and more vibrant downtown areas
» More residents will be able to live closer to work, shopping, recreation and other amenities
» Transit, walking and biking will become a more attractive option for many residents
» The cost of infrastructure will be minimized due to more efficient use of existing infrastructure.
The image from MetroQuest illustrates the outcomes projected to the year 2060. The map shows a concept of where population growth could occur if the population inside the DMSA area grew to 60,000. The next image shows a side by side comparison of the current populated areas with the concept of 2060 on the left and today on the right. Darker colours indicate areas of higher density. Low density suburban and rural residential areas are show in light yellow.
MetroQuest shows how the future scenario could impact the top five priorities of participants on the right of the image using arrows to indicate better and worse.

MetroQuest shows positive outcomes (arrows pointing to the right) for three of the top priorities:

**Walkable neighbourhoods**

The increase in medium and higher density areas (shown in orange and red on the map) result in a significant increase in areas where walking to and from recreation areas, shopping and some employment areas is an attractive option.

**Clean air**

Relative to the other possible futures considered the scenario selected by the majority of participants shows modestly positive results for air quality. While the increase in population will mean more activity that could impact the air quality, the shift towards more population within walking distance to shopping, recreation areas and transit helps to control the growth in automobile travel, thus reducing automobile related air quality problems. Combined with the prevailing winds, it is not anticipated that air quality will be a significant issue.

**Lower fees and taxes**

By reducing the sprawl of the urban area through medium density development, the scenario uses costly infrastructure such as road and sewer more efficiently. On a per capita basis, this shift will reduce the operating costs of the municipalities.

Two of the top priorities are projected to be negatively affected under the selected scenario:

**Easy car travel**

Because of the dramatic increase in population that is projected, for drivers wishing to travel to and from busy areas such as shopping districts, recreation and employment areas, the future likely means increases in traffic congestion. The situation is not as severe as would be the case if the selected scenario focused primarily on the kind of development where automobile travel was the only viable option for many. Scenarios with either low density development or increased development in areas further away from the existing urban areas in the DMSA such as would be the case in the “30,000” growth option demonstrate poorer results for easy car travel.

**Quiet neighbourhoods**

The shift away from low density means that opportunities for quiet neighbourhoods are slightly lower than is presently the case. The shift is slight as indicated by the short arrow to the left. The map shows that while much of the new development is medium density shown in orange, there are still several new areas of lower density shown in light yellow.
The following graphics summarize the performance of the selected scenario in terms of its expected impacts on five key themes: urban lifestyle, suburban lifestyle, travel options, environment, and cost and taxes.

**Urban Lifestyle**

The shift towards more compact and medium density development and the significant growth of population within the DMSA is expected to have a positive influence on several key aspects related to urban lifestyle. The increase in more compact development near key town areas such as shopping areas means more residents will have the opportunity to live within walking distance of these increasingly vibrant areas. These areas are also likely to be served by frequent transit to other areas both within the DMSA as well as outside areas such as Calgary.

The shift towards more compact and medium density development means that the diversity of housing will increase in the area, providing more access to lower maintenance homes such as row housing, duplexes and smaller lot single family homes.

**Suburban Lifestyle**

By limiting the amount of lower density areas that are developed, the preferred scenario shows modest decreases in the amenities that are typical of suburbs and rural residential areas. Opportunities for large homes with big yards, quiet neighbourhoods, and rural living all show modest decreases relative to the current situation. With the projected population increase, it is expected that drivers will notice increases in traffic congestion, especially if they are driving to key commercial and employment areas.
Travel Options

The preferred scenario results in improvements in many areas of transportation due to increases in the numbers of people with access to convenient transit service and people within walking and cycling distance from key areas. Because of the dramatic increase in population that is projected, for drivers wishing to travel to and from busy areas such as shopping districts, recreation and employment areas, the future likely means increases in traffic congestion making travel by car somewhat less convenient.

Environment

Due to greater access to convenient alternatives to the automobile and an overall trend towards cleaner vehicle emissions and greater fuel efficiency, it is expected that under the preferred scenario the air quality and carbon emissions will improve marginally. These improvements are offset somewhat by the dramatic growth in population that is expected.

Since land is being used more efficiently by reducing urban sprawl, green space and agricultural areas are being preserved. This combined with less automobile travel and a shift towards smaller homes results in a significant improvement in the ecological footprint of the area.

Costs and Taxes

Because infrastructure is being used more efficiently than it is today due to the shift towards more compact development, fees and taxes are projected to be reduced. Since the average size of property is being reduced and more residents will have convenient access to alternative transportation, overall cost of living is expected to be reduced. The increased availability of smaller homes such as townhouses means that people seeking lower maintenance living will have more selection.

Note: Ecological footprint is the measure of the amount of resources that are required to sustain the population, regardless of where those resources are produced.
Additional Priorities to Consider

Participants were asked to identify other priority areas that they felt should be considered in the Development Management Strategy. Here are the most frequently mentioned priorities grouped into themes:

### Economic growth & jobs
- Good jobs locally
- Access to local employment opportunities
- Sustainable work in our community
- Local employment opportunities, development of professional business parks

**Participant quotes**

- Keep costs down
- Operate well within financial means (avoid debt)
- Costs of development!!
- Development needs to pay the way - not increasing tax payers
- Develop industrial areas to help pay taxes

**Note:** When polled about priorities, middle-aged participants (45 – 59 years old) placed a higher priority on lower fees and taxes than both younger and older participants. Senior participants (over age 60) place a higher priority on lower cost of living than younger participants.

### Keep costs down

**Note:** When polled about priorities, Okotoks residents felt more strongly about global environmental issues such as ecological footprint and carbon emission than Foothills residents. Younger participants (under age 45) placed a higher value on reducing carbon emissions than others.

### Environmental sustainability
- The environment is my top priority
- Take care of our environment, leave the world a better place for future generations
- Promote sustainable energy for all
- Energy use -> making alternative energy sources mandatory in new developments plans with more efficient building practices
- Sustainability as a whole -> initiatives to increase carpooling and lower emission vehicles.
- Reeve: please respect the environmentally sensitive areas, restrict sub division development proposals near wetland s, preserve our water resources and reduce our carbon footprint as much as possible.

**Participant quotes**
Additional Priorities, continued

**Preserve the small town character**
- Maintaining a "small town character"
- Small town feel...sense of belonging.
- Sense of community/small town feel

**Participant quotes**

**Safety**
- Maintaining, clean safe neighbourhoods
- If the idea of high density is decided on, there comes a question of security and crime. Higher density = higher crime? How can we resolve this?

**Participant quotes**

**Transit**
- As we grow it is imperative that we have a transit system and that we have shopping close to growth areas to cut down on car travel.
- Regional transit solution (for those still commuting to downtown Calgary for work)
- High speed train!!
- Look at the transit issues

**Participant quotes**

**Parks and recreation**
- Recreational facilities must keep up with growth
- Park and green space development are very high priorities
- Adequate sports/recreational facilities
- Not to compromise existing large parks

**Participant quotes**

**Walking and cycling opportunities**
- Walk ways and bicycle paths
- More bicycle paths
- Don’t compromise walk paths and wide green walk path areas

**Participant quotes**

**Facilities for children and youth**
- All kinds of sport available to keep the kids busy
- Kid friendly – more playgrounds
- Need more youth facilities
- Walkable community means to me a place to walk the dog and kids to ride bikes

**Participant quotes**
### School location

- Schools -> if schools aren’t located properly we will have to bus our kids even more which is turn is going to have negative effects on our air quality
- Putting communities around schools
- Where are the schools going to be? If it is such a big problem now, how will it be with more people?

### Post-secondary education

- Need for post – secondary education facilities
- Quality lifelong learning, kindergarten to University, within region outside of Calgary
- Satellite university possibly outside Okotoks
- Local college

### Health care

- To keep health care facilities
- Close proximity to hospitals/medical care

### Arts and culture

- Arts and culture is important
- New performing arts centre
- Cultural and recreational opportunities
- Recreation and art facilities

See Appendix D for all participant comments.
Feedback on the Workshop

Participants were asked for their opinions and feedback regarding the workshop. The following were the most frequently mentioned comments grouped by theme:

**Great opportunity to provide input**
- I appreciate having input
- Appreciate that you are seeking input – only hope that you listen!
- Helping to shape the future for this area

**Nice use of technology**
- This was a great (anonymous!) interactive workshop, loved the format, the way of voting and the music
- Use of technology – made it easy and instant way to see the voting
- The MetroQuest software was cool! I liked how it showed changes positive and negative to our priorities
- The handsets – great voting process

**Seeing the results instantly**
- Being able to see instant results - wow!
- I like the “key pad” voting aspect. Very interesting results that show instantly
- Appreciated seeing the group choices and their impacts and being able to compare

**Hearing other resident's opinions**
- Participation & discussion, individual ideas
- Interaction with people at the table
- Hearing what residents have to say
- Seeing what others thought – great use of technology

**Visual and informative**
- Well done, informative, entertaining format, thought provoking
- Good thoughtful scenarios offered, it has shifted my perspective
- I found the information invaluable
- Very educational
- Great visual participation!
- Great explanation of things to come
- Big picture approach

**Well-presented**
- The presenter was informative and interesting
- Well presented, I'm glad I came
- Facilitator was very good
- Great job by the moderator
- The handsets – great voting process
Feedback on the Workshop, continued

Thanks to the Town of Okotoks and MD of Foothills

- Great workshop!
- Well done!
- Thank you – great workshop
- Thank you for providing these workshops. Together we grow!
- Great presentation to help people get informed and involved

A few participants shared some criticisms of the workshop

- Nothing new really
- Good tool but very limited in scope, needs to consider broader priorities
- Please try to start meetings on time

Keep up the engagement

- This workshop is very important. It should be advertised/promoted more for more input from all residents
- Engage stakeholders (keep communicating)
- Educating the general public is of the upmost importance so everyone understands the benefits of growth
- Listen to the people – encourage input

Keep working together

- I am pleased to see the MD and Okotoks are talking. I think it’s important that the MD should share cost of recreation facilities, health facilities etc. Planning for growth is imperative.
- Full cooperation between MD & Okotoks
- Priority #1: keep talking to the MD with emphasis on planning
- We are all sharing the same beautiful spot in the foothills - we must get along with our neighbours

Participant quotes

See Appendix D for all participant comments.
Appendix A: Map of the DMSA

This image shows the boundary of the Development Management Strategy Area (DMSA) defined for the Joint Planning Agreement between the Town of Okotoks and the MD of Foothills. The DMSA is the area that is the basis for determining the baseline for future growth projections, related service delivery and cost sharing.
### Appendix B: Raw Voting Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clean air</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 High Priority</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 High Priority</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Low Priority</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 Low Priority</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 Low Priority</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Avg</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>N 158</td>
<td>5 24</td>
<td>60 37</td>
<td>6 47</td>
<td>19 50</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Easy access to transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 High Priority</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 High Priority</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Low Priority</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 Low Priority</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 Low Priority</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Avg</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>N 161</td>
<td>5 24</td>
<td>60 38</td>
<td>6 48</td>
<td>19 50</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Easy car travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 High Priority</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 High Priority</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Low Priority</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 Low Priority</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 Low Priority</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Avg</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>N 161</td>
<td>5 25</td>
<td>60 37</td>
<td>6 48</td>
<td>19 50</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Large homes with big yards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 High Priority</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 High Priority</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Low Priority</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 Low Priority</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 Low Priority</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Avg</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>N 162</td>
<td>5 25</td>
<td>60 38</td>
<td>6 49</td>
<td>19 50</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B: Raw Voting Results

### Question 5: Low maintenance homes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 High Priority</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Low Priority</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Avg: 2.50, N: 161

### Question 6: Lower carbon emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 High Priority</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Low Priority</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Avg: 2.66, N: 160

### Question 7: Lower cost of living

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Participants</th>
<th>What age are you? - Under 30</th>
<th>What age are you? - 30 – 44</th>
<th>What age are you? - 45 – 60</th>
<th>Where do you live? MD of Foothills (6 acres or more)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 High Priority</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Low Priority</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Avg: 2.15, N: 160

### Question 8: Lower fees and taxes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Participants</th>
<th>What age are you? - Under 30</th>
<th>What age are you? - 30 – 44</th>
<th>What age are you? - 45 – 60</th>
<th>Where do you live? MD of Foothills (6 acres or more)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 High Priority</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Low Priority</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Avg: 2.00, N: 162
## Appendix B: Raw Voting Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>More green space</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Quiet neighbourhoods</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Rural living opportunities</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Shorter commutes</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B: Raw Voting Results

### Question 13: Smaller eco-footprint

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>All Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 14: Vibrant downtown areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>All Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 15: Walkable neighbourhoods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>All Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix B: Raw Voting Results

#### Where should new development be located?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### What density should new development be?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Where should new development be located?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### What density should new development be?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This question was asked twice - these are the results of the first time.

Note: This question was asked twice - these are the results of the second time.

Note: This question was asked twice - these are the results of the first time.

Note: This question was asked twice - these are the results of the second time.

Note: This question was asked twice - these are the results of the first time.

Note: This question was asked twice - these are the results of the second time.
## Appendix B: Raw Voting Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>All Participants</th>
<th>What age are you?</th>
<th>Where do you live?</th>
<th>What kind of new development do you favor?</th>
<th>Where do you live?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>What age are you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Under 30</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 30 – 44</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 45 – 60</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Better than 60</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 130</td>
<td>5 26</td>
<td>61 38</td>
<td>5 48</td>
<td>19 46</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Where do you live?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Okotoks (multi-family home)</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Okotoks (single family home)</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 MD of Foothills (under 6 acres)</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 MD of Foothills (6 acres or more)</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Other municipality</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 136</td>
<td>5 26</td>
<td>59 36</td>
<td>7 51</td>
<td>19 50</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>What kind of new development do you favor for Okotoks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Less compact: typically 65 ft. wide lots (2.5 upa) e.g. Air</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Status quo: typically 45 ft. wide lots (6.5 upa) e.g. Crystal</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 More compact: typically 40 ft. wide lots (8 upa) with more</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 135</td>
<td>5 25</td>
<td>58 37</td>
<td>7 48</td>
<td>18 49</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>What kind of new development do you favor for the MD of Foothills ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Five acre parcels (0.25 upa)</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 One acre parcels (1 upa)</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Quarter acre parcels (4 upa)</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 137</td>
<td>5 26</td>
<td>60 36</td>
<td>8 49</td>
<td>19 50</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Urban growth in the DMSA area should be located primarily in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Okotoks</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 MD of Foothills (6 acres or more)</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Divided between both</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 138</td>
<td>5 24</td>
<td>61 36</td>
<td>6 49</td>
<td>19 50</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# My Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>DMSA Growth</strong></th>
<th><strong>Density</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Which choice do you support and why?</td>
<td>Which choice do you support and why?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>My Priorities</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What priorities would you add for consideration?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>What makes this region special?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When planning for the future, what are the most important characteristics of the region that need to be maintained?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**My thoughts on managing growth**
Please share your thoughts on how growth of this area could be best managed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>My favourite part...</strong></th>
<th><strong>Anything else to add?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What was your favourite part of the workshop?</td>
<td>We welcome any other comments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**One minute with the Mayor/Reeve**
If you had one minute to talk to the Mayor/Reeve about managing growth, what would you say?

*Your participation is greatly appreciated*
Appendix D: All Participant Comments

Each workshop participant was given a worksheet to record their thoughts on the questions posed throughout the workshop. All of the comments received are recorded below. The comments in normal typeface are from one of the public workshops and the comments in *italics* are from participants in the workshop that hosted business people and developers. See Appendix C for a sample worksheet.

**DMSA Growth - Which choice do you support and why?**

**Option A – 30,000 People in the DMSA by 2060 (favoured by 6% of participants)**

- 30,000 – still want small town feel
- I feel development should fall outside the DMSA, this lowers the overall density of the MD
- 30,000 – limited water supply
- A – 30,000 I want to live in a town of Okotoks and not a bustling clustered city. It is a great place to raise a family. I don’t want to jeopardize that.
- 30,000 - I don’t think that the environment in this area can support more than 30k people. We will reach our carrying capacity of the watershed and its associated ecological processes.
- 30,000, more rural
- 30k – small town/city is what attracts many people, safety, friendly, social, clean
- Low growth – because this is not the city. I value the small town feel
- A – low density so that a rural life style has some traditional space, therefore growth should not be all localized but spread out
- 30k - Sheep River can only supply so much water, don’t want to pipeline to Calgary
- 30k – water supply limitations and air quality
- 30k – maintain a quality of life that cannot be experienced in a mid-sized community, where is the water going to come from?

**Option B – 45,000 People in the DMSA by 2060 (favoured by 42% of participants)**

- B – majority of growth within DMSA more cost effective to house people in smaller areas
- Med – uses land wisely and allows personal space
- Midrange “B”
- B – Healthy max of density housing -> not houses too close together. Seems to be a glut of condominiums at the moment. More development in town than in the MD. Keep the town vibrant
- B – not realistic for all growth to be wholly inside or outside of DMSA
- 45 – mixture of options
• B – spread population equally
• B – growth needs to be considered in urban settings, agricultural land needs to be preserved
• Option B – avoid growth that leads to derelict areas which would lead to social problems
• 45,000 – have to respond to pressure from outside area – need to have taxes to allow for impact on town
• B – 45,000 – average/middle vote. – expected growth may not reach 60,000. Thought this would be a good way to start then re-evaluate later.
• Given [that the] majority of Okotoks residents are adamant [that the] population cap for Okotoks is 30,000! [Therefore] obviously [the] population in DMSA will be greater than 30,000!
• Med – who is going to farm the little bits of farmland
• B – 45,000 + 15,000 – to consider a mix of Okotoks and rural – for a variety of development
• Medium growth – to allow choices for people to have more or less room
• 45,000 – is large enough, Growing too fast for road and water
• 45,000 – comfortable growth for the whole area without becoming overwhelming to the road systems
• I would like to see minimal growth in this area, understanding that a population cap @ 30,000 is unrealistic through 2060 as close to 30k as possible... I guess 45k is best
• 45,000 and smaller acreages
• 30k -> changed to 45k – I moved here 8 years ago because it was a small town. We were attracted by the charming suburban town. Although it is good to have services, I do not wish to see the town expand too much
• 45k – prepares our town without overwhelming it, allows potential for change as necessary
• Keep new housing and business separate
• 45k – want people to be located conveniently close to town to support local businesses
• Growth at a slow rate to preserve “small town”
• B – Slow, but increasing and not overtaking all our land. Slow increases make it easier for infrastructure to keep pace.
• B – as our resources become scarce, less growth in rural areas and would prefer properties to be balanced
• 45k – a cap has proven unworkable when not defined by natural obstacles
• I can’t see 60k population within that area even just for water concerns alone. Lower population emphasis seems only logical choice.
• People deserve to be able to live an urban lifestyle or choose between urban and rural
• Allow growth within Okotoks and MD to accommodate all types.
• 45k – realistic amount
• B – Some land in the area surrounding Okotoks should remain rural.
• Medium – as I think medium would allow for high end and medium end homes.
• B 45,000 – Too much growth around Okotoks, would be a tax burden on the town
• B – will help to keep taxes reasonable without taking away our quality of life
• Better tax base but still orderly growth
• Initially chose 30k, changed to 45k – must consider the long term implications – we can accommodate the 45k – it will help the community develop the services and amenities we need
• B – Good compromise, covers priorities adequately
• B-45,000 – growth would support the opportunity for our kids to stay in the community and provide opportunity for their family
• 45,000 – easier to control now but could change due to circumstances, need growth to control costs
• 45,000 – this seems attainable and manageable without too much change in the area – not bringing in unsafe areas, crime and high density
• B – 45,000 – I would like to maintain the small town appeal and not shift to a big city
• B – I assumed that some people (boomers) would want 2 – 5 acre lots. Which would likely be outside the area and are not medium density
• 45,000 – reasonable balance – Okotoks should grow larger to accommodate more non-residential growth & industrial development
• Medium 45,000 – sustainable growth
  better all around living experience
• Sustainability - 45,000
• B – it seems to be a reasonable balance of quality of life and eco-friendly
• B – 45,000 – to ensure adequate services in arts, recreation and education

Option C – 60,000 People in the DMSA by 2060 (favoured by 52% of participants)
• C – for increasing economic conditions
• 60,000 C – By the recovery of economy and growth of Calgary more people will move to Okotoks and MD
• Growth needs to be concentrated within the current boundaries of Okotoks and along easily accessed boundaries. The rural feel, views and lifestyle in the MD lands outside of Okotoks needs to be preserved.
• 60,000 within DMSA – Growth needs to be, accessible within the town and on the easily accessed boundaries
• 60,000 inside DMSA - Good tax base
• Okotoks needs to expand to include the total DMSA area; not in favour of 30,000 cap
• 60,000 - Okotoks is a great place and people will want to live here
• 60,000 - growth produces jobs, jobs produce higher economic growth
• 60,000 - supported by the CMP process and keeps small town character with big town amenities
• C – to support economic growth
• 60,000 inside DMSA, leave agriculture land as open space
• C –the area should be allowed to grow as much as it needs to, so that people that want to live here can do so.
• 60,000 – Close to Calgary, lots of people are looking for a place to retire close to a major city.
• High growth = jobs = money
• 60,000 total, 20,000 existing 40,000 new, growth always for the better. Businesses and bigger tax base to have better community facilities
• C – contain growth
• 60,000 we need more people to pay for good facilities
• 60k - it is already happening, the key is how we manage it!
• 60k - people are going to move somewhere, why not here
• Seriously high density in DMSA, to preserve more of MD for agricultural and wildness
• C: 60,000 – development should be concentrated in urban areas to provide service and transport
• C: 60,000 – containment
• 60,000 – more people to pay for good facilities
• 60k – it is already happening, the key is how we manage it!
• 60k - people are going to move somewhere, why not here
• I am concerned about the farm land being swallowed up, more density closer to town....as much as I love my acreage it really is not practical. i.e. space or impact on the environment
• C – less urban sprawl
• High population in city is more appropriate
• Growth centred within the town of Okotoks area
• 60k – because 50 yrs from now Calgary & Okotoks will only be a couple of km’s apart
• More development close to town, 60k
• Agricultural land should be protected - contain the population
• Controlled growth, architectural controls, mix of high density and larger country residential development
• Good mix of new businesses opportunities
• More development in or close to town – 60k
• 60k – need diversity
• 60k – realistic projection
• Don’t spread the town out so much - taxes and fees cannot support it
• New growth in town
• In order to keep green space and agriculture land we need to concentrate growth in and around Okotoks
• I don’t like urban sprawl and think the DMSA is far too large
• Towns need growth but protect agricultural land
• C 60,000 – This saw the greatest improvements in the areas that matter most to me
• C 60,000 – Tax base (lower overall taxes) - > people outside the general area will still use the infrastructure and amenities, therefore they might as well participate in the upkeep and maintenance
• C – Greater number for shared taxes, better for businesses, less cost of infrastructure because it isn’t so spread out
• 60,000 – people inside the DMSA
• C – I believe this gives us the greatest control, it allows us to best utilise the growth in shaping our priorities
- 60,000 – easier to service, less eco impacts, focused application of services and taxes to a smaller area
- Businesses have opportunity to services, transit may work
- High growth
- 60,000
- Support high growth scenario to increase urban living and increase tax base

Density - Which choice do you support and why?

Option 1 - Low Density (favoured by 9% of participants)
- Low density – keeps the rural appearance in the regional setting
- Support for low density (water issues) – commercial and light industrial within local town of Okotoks along Hwy and industrial corridor from High River to Aldersyde
- Low – because the medium seemed a bit too dense and congested
- Low density, quality of life - not too close to neighbour’s backyards.
- I feel we should stick to a lower density to conserve resources such as water
- Low - less crime
- Low density – we have a lot of land in Alberta. Farm commodity prices have been low for a number of years, so no issue on the supply side of farming. Why not spread residential out so people can enjoy the space, ... grow their own food, ... have ownership of something more substantial than postage sized lot where they have no privacy or space to get away from the rat race.
- Low- retain useable land
- Low density – there is lots of land for sprawl, if you look at the area from a plane
- Low density – less congestion - more room
- Low- if people wanted high, go to Calgary
- I chose rural living and don’t want that to change
- Low density – that is in the line with the rural lifestyle we seek here
- A – Low density – to keep things rural and allow for livestock, outdoor pursuits, hiking, hunting and fishing.
- A & C – Prefer to see more green spaces between residents; would like to see more development in existing urban centres.
- Low – maintaining a quality of life that cannot be experienced with high housing
- I don’t think high density housing is appropriate for rural lifestyle. I would prefer 1 to 2 acres.
- Low density – trees and green spaces

Option 2 - Medium Density (favoured by 68% of participants)
- The rural areas should also grow; in the normal fashion in a transition from urban to rural. This also allows for revenues for rural services through taxes
- B – Just fit to the population and widen area
- I picked medium because we need enough space for a yard but not fields and fields
- Density within Okotoks. How about compact homes with larger yards?! If you want lower maintenance follow the Canmore model of natural landscape.
- Medium – the majority of residents favour large yards
- Medium density – I like cluster development if green space is somehow upkept
- Midrange/slow – not city type
- DMSA should be considered urban growth area- all part of Okotoks , mid density
- B – Mix of choices will be required for realism but medium on average
- Med – makes most sense
- Medium – still have the feeling of low density but still be able to put new people in
- Medium – a healthy tax base plus still some elbow room
- 1 and 2 – cross between low and medium, do not turn this into a squished city format
- Medium to high density – cost effect ive to support affordable living, some more costly choices should be available
- Med – allows room for kids to grow up in; people look to Okotoks to retire
- Med – allow for a place for all ages or families to live and grow in this area
- Low cost for young families
- Need some of both
- 2 – I support medium density homes to weed out or avoid ghettos
- Allows for more green space, parks, playing fields
- Med- Alberta resident liked single residences
- Med – we need to allow the younger population affordable housing and also perhaps seniors to be able to downsize to low maintenance housing. But also to leave open the opportunity for both groups to upgrade and to single family, larger housing as they can afford in the future.
- Med density – room for everyone
- Med – so there is a mix of lifestyles
- 2 – Attract residents who want to invest their future in the community.
- Med – prevent sprawl
- Medium – allow for a mix of housing options – otherwise would not attract a mixed population
- Medium – because you attract more average families
- 1 - I like the rural style of the MD, but could feasibly see either options. Depends where they are applied. – after demo I understand that the density would be applied reasonably and changed to 2 - medium
- Medium – since I’d like to experience more of a choice as I age too. I’d like to live in an adult – low maintenance community in the country
- Med – to allow choices for people to have more or less room
- Medium – I like the feel and openness of single dwelling home not the high rise, compact feel of high density housing with the attendant parking issues.
- Medium density housing provided choices for more people
2 – medium – gives diversity to low/high, uses less land than low, gives some options for balance
Medium, keep services concentrated somehow
Allow proportionate growth, its more fair
Medium density to provide for more green space area
Medium with green space
Medium – fits the mentality of the people in the area better
Medium – it provides choice
Medium – we need a good balance
Medium – still allows for enough variation and choice
Keep it north of town
Medium – more smaller acreages, more condos, stay with country feel without high rises, don’t obstruct views.
Medium – more range of buildings -have to have a choice for every persons needs or wants
Medium – urban sprawl should be minimized. Development should take part within the town of Okotoks
Medium – variety of housing low cost ranging to higher housing costs
Let people have options for what they want to live in
We need more mixed density to accommodate all age groups and income levels. We cannot continue to use up all our land.
Maintain medium density – with a mix or rural and urban growth. Good family atmosphere
Medium – as we need more choices for housing but if 60k for population were the goal, high would be my choice
Medium – allows for a wider range of people
With high density there seems to be more crime and social problems. Low density is preferable for families
Medium- better for transit, shopping
Rural areas should be 1 to 2 acres max
Medium – need diversity of housing and use of land
Medium – offers quality lifestyle for all
Medium – means smaller carbon footprint and a more walkable neighbourhood.
Medium – I believe that this is the most flexible option
A mix diversity of residents
2 – better planned space, more interesting multi-family homes
2 or 3 – these choices appear to minimize the footprint and maximise our priorities
2 - Medium Density – I do not like or want a densely crowded city
2 – population will still be tolerable
2 – gives people a bit of space
2 – still not crowded
Medium – a good mix will help all demographics
- **Medium density** – low density is irresponsible for a community to develop, high density should be in Calgary
- 2 – medium – offers the best quality of life for the most number of people
- **Medium density** – we need a good mix, similar to the existing scenario
- Medium – still able to have the same style of homes and living we do now
- **Medium** – too expensive for a spreading land mass, possibly moving to high density as population gets older?
- To have medium density, better planning, quiet neighbourhoods
- **Medium** – aesthetic still with quality of life living
- 2- medium – this supports a cross section of family types and financial situations. Not supportive of high density due to dislike of crowding and noise
- Med – smaller homes with the same or a little bit smaller lots, but some multi-family is required
- 2. – I like the medium density for what it will provide – more urban downtown but still “smaller” feeling
- **Medium is a better living style**
- 2 – **Medium** – I support 1, 2, 3 - variety is important to meet with lifestyle desires.
- **Medium density** – to be able to have some good amenities but won’t be over-crowded

**Option 3 - High Density (favoured by 6% of participants)**
- High density with amenities within walking distance
- 3 – for increasing economic conditions
- High – housing types and patterns should recognize the need to put the maximum # of residents with quality, low maintenance housing on the smallest possible land mass
- High – smaller development footprint = more open space
- High – maintain vistas and landscapes without sprawl, accommodates a range of housing options and supports the CMP nodes and corridors concept
- 2 and 3 – high density in areas and low density for green spaces
- High – best use of land, no wasted land, maintenance costs low
- The high density – because acreages are a waste of valuable land
- Not a fan of urban sprawl
- I support high density because it has the smallest environment impact. We can fit much more people into this land base if we put more people per square meter. Also higher density usually results in diversification of the community in terms of shopping, culture and amenities
- High density located as close to downtown as possible to utilize the core and allow for a walking friendly downtown area
- I prefer either high or low density – medium is just an extension of Calgary
- High, already too much single family. Little opportunity for singles and seniors. Not enough density to support services
- High density – less of a footprint, lower unit cost to build, more attractive to developers
• A & C – Prefer to see more green spaces between residents; would like to see more development in existing urban centres.
• High density – shortage currently
• High – lower taxes
• Med/high – spread out doesn’t make sense when looking at footprint, commute, walkable neighbourhoods etc.
• High – cheaper housing
• High density – will provide higher growth while keeping green space
• In the future we will need more land to produce food and not to cut it up, therefore I vote high density
• Reduction of rural sprawl
• High densities – to have amenities and a vibrant downtown, keep all costs down
• High: there is significant area surrounding Okotoks for lower density dwellings and these areas will most likely remain because of the farming/ranching dynamic. We should focus on higher densities to offset the effects of lower density areas.
• 3 – High density – concentrated growth nodes, better public transit solutions, and clustering residential areas provides for larger green space areas.
• 2 or 3 – these choices appear to minimize the footprint and maximise our priorities
• High density – attracts a variety of dwellers and they increase the cross section of social strata and opinions. Allows for aging in place. Changes lifestyle, less footprint
• Multi families
• High density – more affordable housing
• Higher is a better use of land and resources – build up with complete neighbourhoods – there is already a lot of low density in Okotoks – reasonable choice
• I support high density, but not at the expense of market consideration and where people want to live (i.e. single family, etc)
• High density should also be well done - not people warehouses!

My Priorities
• More economic growth within the region through added commercial and industrial initiatives, both rural and urban
• Lower fees and taxes
• The existing residential development along with 2A to continue to be developed only as a residential area only. There is no compromise on this item.
• Water supply for wider area
• Weighted voting for rural boundaries vs. suburban Okotoks residents
• Maintaining the rural lifestyle, views, etc. Controlled architectural controls and defined usage for all development along boundaries and roads/ highways into Okotoks.
• Plan for green space, recreation space
- Highway entrances need to be designed to have alternative commercial development
- I would like to see highway department engaged because they always wait till traffic is a problem before they fix it. We can foresee it happening, so why don't we fix it before it's a problem
- Good jobs locally
- Educational opportunities improvements
- Cultural and recreational opportunities
- Maintaining a “small town character”
- Regional transit municipal services, recreation, public space and quality of the same
- Regional transit between communities and Calgary
- Lower taxes
- Quality lifelong learning kindergarten to University, within region outside of Calgary
- NO CMP!
- Concentrating on growth close to Okotoks
- Access to amenities such as recreation
- Access to local employment opportunities
- Keep shopping options balanced and keep shops accessible (parking) don’t screw up parking and accessibility (like on the main street) for aesthetics
- Local recreation opportunities, local for work-from-home opportunities
- Mix of housing options
- Resources available such as water and services
- Keep the small town atmosphere, but have more/new people
- Recreational and educational facilities
- University outside town, sport centre outside town
- Shopping, transit, need more youth facilities
- Satellite university possibly outside Okotoks
- Sports facility outside town
- Quantity of water, hospitals, fire, police, college
- Quantity of water, hospitals, fire, police, olds college/mini salt, green space
- Abide by wishes of majority! Okotoks residents for Okotoks! Densities immediately adjacent to Okotoks boundaries must be low, graduate out of higher – if in keeping with MD residents wishes
- To maintain agricultural portrayal
- To keep health care facilities
- Small – easy to keep areas, open space is an opportunity for unsightly lots
- Recreational facilities must keep up with growth
- A few more acreages closer to town, you cannot have farmland completely surrounded by small parcels.
- We should put a drive on for clean commercial and clean industrial to increase the tax base so not all the burden is carried by the home owner in both Okotoks and the MD
• More green space, open to school in urban, more commercial job opportunities
• Maybe a little place to buy a loaf of bread or milk instead of having to get into your car and drive.
• Transit system
• Recreation and art facilities
• Shopping – most large stores are moving into Okotoks area
• Close proximity to hospitals/ medical care
• More commercial base, shopping access/ variety of stages
• Recreational facilities need to expand along with the population growth.
• Recreation, kids grow up to stay in town
• I have not seen anything yet regarding resources “water” where is it going to come from?
• Easy access
• Walkable neighbourhood
• Encourage use of technology to convince employers to increase use of telecommuting employees. Would address many economic & social issues.
• Encourage property owners to preserve asset value by timely & competent maintenance
• Missing amenities - a city of 60,000 needs a hospital, sports, retail, industrial, parks, police, schools, jobs, hotels
• Less drive through traffic, better traffic control, water supply
• Encourage revitalization of older neighbourhoods while maintain current density
• Look at the transit issues
• All kinds of sport available to keep the kids busy
• Quit “planning” the MD and town should just “handle” (i.e. maintain) for the growth that happens
• I believe the priorities were adequate – perhaps add commercial developments and public facilities
• Limit population and development to protect ecosystem
• Rapid rail travel
• Transportation is a high priority, i.e. bridges, road improvements, rail transit
• Rural living - more variety options than acreage and for executive home. For example, adult community that is low maintenance, complimentary energy with green space and its own community within the community
• Developing DMSA retirement housing in rural areas – people want to remain in rural areas!
• If the idea of high density is decided on, there comes a question of security and crime. Higher density = higher crime? How can we resolve this?
• Free Wi-Fi access for handheld telephone, computers to reduce need to travel
• Ability to work in neighbourhood centre for networking
• The environment is my top priority – which was covered but it’s linked to our health in there but hard to quantify in these scenarios. i.e. air quality can only go down with an increase in population regardless of the scenario
• I presently live on 5 acres – I own a semi truck and would be happy to live on a smaller parcel (1 acre) I find there is very few smaller places that allow such a business
• Impact on the water supply, clean air, easy car travel
• Attracting new graduates that leave Okotoks to go to school
• I support max population density per acre of land for all type of housing. That means high density apartments would have more open space around them to allow the same “overall” space as low density single family housing.
• Pathways, green space, homes backing onto common space to encourage connections
• Water sources - Where is the water going to come from to support the population?
• What about environmental suitability?
• If people in the town or MD want more development then let them do it in existing higher density areas not a rural area
• Quality of life important, low density rural options important.
• Commercial development such as Costco, Wal-Mart should be kept out of sight so overall feel is one that is personable.
• Equal opportunities for all land owners
• Transportation public and private, cooperation in planning so things can be done smoothly. Zone an area for large office complexes which would act as employment centres for Okotoks and MD residents. And a tax base
• Areas for seniors - walkable, community feel. Vibrant shopping/entertainment areas. Arts and culture is important
• Transportation in the community and between communities
• Post-secondary education
• Sustainable work in our community
• The river – no large developments allowed near the river, rural
• Looking at the % of age related needs
• Walk ways and bicycle paths
• I feel that the meeting was good, but when you have people from within the town and people surrounding the town you get a mixed message. Average owners would like to keep things the same.
• Recreation opportunities are important planning issues in our region and they are absent from the survey.
• Quality of life
• Controlled standards in building/good solid planning
• Some open spaces remain for outdoor recreation
• Open rural areas need good road access
• Keep industrial area between Okotoks and Aldersyde
• Do not affect the million dollar views with towers.
• With land development go with clusters of homes on 1 or 2 acre lots with shared green space
• Further out of town allow larger lots
• Encourage theme developments with common areas
• Maintain existing rural acreages, blended in with surrounding development
• Need to damn the river for more water; we have all the water we need running right down the river.
• Environmental management, water usage, landfills
• Local employment opportunities, development of professional business parks
• Water quality and conservation
• Sustainable growth water consideration and conservation, rails, transit to Calgary. Roads to accommodate the growth before, rather than after population growth
• #1 preserve and conserve water quantity and quality, #2 developments must be balanced. #3 promote sustainable energy for all
• Affordability across all age groups
• With whatever choices are made regarding our growth we should be taking a serious look at building more “green” homes i.e. collect water on their roofs instead of shedding water. How about gray water recycling within homes? Rail transport!!
• Opportunity to live a rural lifestyle
• Can’t put a wall around Okotoks
• To better serve our residents we need additional people to provide more and better services.
• Pathways
• Support for seniors
• Post secondary education
• Water to match sustainability
• Need a mix of housing so residents can age in place and young adults can start families
• I support 30k DMSA model as long as the MD does not allow intense residential growth on our doorstep.
• Complete community, green space, recreational facilities
• Recreational facilities
• Small town feel, existing plans, sense of belonging.
• The town and MD need to work together to sustain what is here and make it better. Right now I think they are like water and oil and not closely knit neighbours
• Extra work on transportation
• Paying for and installing infrastructure now, rather than when it is too populated
• I find it interesting that we were not asked who liked their bread, pasta, beef, chicken etc. Where will the food producers go if agricultural land continues to be used for urban growth?
• High speed train!!
• Adequate sports/recreational facilities
• New performing arts centre
• Local college
• Mass transit system
- Higher density development close to the downtown and future shopping areas make sure there is access and transit for people living in these areas
- Responsible water usage and waste management
- Energy use -> making alternative energy sources mandatory in new developments plans with more efficient building practices
- Sustainability as a whole -> initiatives to increase carpooling and lower emission vehicles.
- Regional transit solution (for those still commuting to downtown Calgary for work)
- Concentrated areas for business, etc. (work/live)
- Make taxes fair (business vs residential)
- Welcome more people (better for business, better for sharing tax load)
- Keeping the balance urban/rural
- Maintain community spirit but with orderly growth
- Maintaining, clean safe neighbourhoods
- Town council with open minds not personal agendas that stifle growth
- Approval process – there needs to be a “stream-lined” process that developers and residents can follow. This process needs to be “public” to ensure everyone is aware and to keep “unnecessary” costs down. We need to keep all costs down because lots are selling because of “price point”
- Access to water in this arid region. We must not go out of our watershed region for water. Only develop within the ability of Sheep River (maybe Hopewood) watershed – to support growth.
- Clean, safe community
- Keep a “small-town” philosophy for community development
- Park and green space development is very high priorities
- Sense of community/small town feel
- Sustainability – water issues, Opportunity for business, recreation, education
- Mix of businesses – community events and recreation
- I fear that too much growth would compromise the small town feel that we have come to love. I feel it’s a double edged sword, and I don’t want to compromise the safety and security of our town. We are very fortunate that our homes are less affected by crime, I don’t want to see growth change that
- Safe neighbourhoods
- Recreational activities
- Community spirit, be proud of who we are
- Employment opportunities
- Watershed protection
- Multiple housing choices – for all incomes
- Social amenities for all age groups
- Business developments opportunities
- Larger yards, average homes, larger apartments
- Not to compromise existing large parks
- Don’t compromise walk paths and wide green walk path areas
• Light industrial
• Need for post – secondary education facilities
• Caring communities (to others and towards the environment)
• Slow, steady growth – no explosion
• Pet friendly – low cost animal license, dog off leash parks
• Kid friendly – more playgrounds
• Need more rentals for people moving
• Approval process – stream lined; Process needs to be public
• Water a priority!!
• Walkable community – means to me a place to walk the dog and kids to ride bikes. I do not want to walk to work or shop
• Social wellness
• Employment corridors located near urban area’s
• Reduce commuter dependency
• Public transit options
• Need for more distributed work centres
• More bicycle paths
• Social wellness – more opportunities favoured toward older age groups (45-65) “young” seniors
• The town has a huge youth population and caters to that as it should but would like more opportunities for older families
• Affordable neighbourhoods/housing (single family)
• More business involvement to bring more to this area. Small houses, large yards, more industry needs (light)
• Quality design (not just urban design)
• Social inclusiveness and provision of social programs (it’s hard to get them in after the fact)
• Market considerations for who is coming and what their priorities are
• Local business development
• Keeping costs down
• Rich farmland, less acreage produces more products. Sustainable development is a very important. Maintaining current geography
• Where is the water going to come from
• Arts/culture and education opportunities

What makes this region special?
• Views of the mountains
• Lower density appearance – especially near major thoroughfares
• Clean
• How do we insure that water resources will provide for the planned growth?
• What will the town and MD institute as items to be addressed such as light pollution and noise pollution?
• With growth anticipated when do we provide input for an Area Structure Plan as the boundaries expand?
• Green space, views, rural lifestyle
• The MD of Foothills is a beautiful place, that is why I want to see the population growth kept inside the DMSA, in order to maintain the overall quality in the MD
• Small town character within rural surroundings
• Preservation of agricultural land
• Preservation of environmental preserves, river valleys, forested areas etc.
• Kind people, local businesses, Sheep River, Big Rock, views and open space
• Clean air, family, walkable, “green” mindset, feel of country living regardless of where inside MD/Okotoks region
• Small town feel of Okotoks while accommodating increased growth
• Rural vistas while driving
• Heavy citizen participation in town & MD planning
• Preserve river valley, keep high industrial standards to maintain air quality (no Cargill type emissions) and safety (no jail type developments)
• Sheep River valley
• Town feel rather than city feel
• Excellent recreation opportunities
• Beautiful rural areas
• Growth is critical
• Capping population growth does not make any sense
• Keep the western way of life
• The ability to afford single family dwelling
• Maintain small town – rural flavour, do not what to be suburb of Calgary
• Green space, open areas, commute to Calgary, bike paths, baseball & soccer field (& adequate parking)
• Semi-arid region
• Natural resources are limited and water in particular
• CANNOT look to Bow River
• Okotoks residents priority for finite growth strategy; Do not want to lose Okotoks 30,000 pop cap (by reference to sheep river carrying capacity)
• Preservation of river valley
• Relativity easy access to Calgary
• Quiet areas and open spaces
• Proximity to work/employment areas
• Ease of transportation
• Land and area is used efficiently
- Green areas and recreation
- This area is special to me because it’s in proximity to Calgary, the airport, mountains, USA. Greater density won’t change these things
- Keep out high emission industry
- Close schooling
- Close enough to the big city arts and culture
- Recreational facilities
- Quality of urban life
- Park space
- Close to Calgary, commute time, walking areas
- Lots of treed areas; beautification aspects in all developmental plans.
- Mountain views – river runs through town – small town feel
- This region is part of South Sask. River water shed. Water availability is a major issue. It appears the MD council does not take this issue into account. Every development decision going forward needs to take water availability into account
- To be able to get around easily
- Not too busy; have all necessities
- Air and water quality
- Lifestyle based on outdoor activities
- Safety and security
- Pride in community, residents engaged
- Community that is open and friendly
- Excellent networks of roads and trails
- Mountain view, clean air, good water, quality of amenities, quick access to west
- Cut out acreage sprawl – governing views and farm land
- Air and water quality
- Walking paths through neighbourhoods – trails, hiking
- Pride in community – neighbours that know each other. Open friendly
- A safe community – region
- A town and MD council that hears what the residents have to say and is responsive
- It’s beautiful here, so let’s build but build long lasting beautiful facilities
- You can’t “plan” the future
- Transit – Southland has been providing public transit for 30 years, let them continue
- The “small town” feel
- Maintaining natural amenities
- Lack of water – seasonal fluctuations so that water conservation is a big priority – the river is important to preserve for fish habitat and quality of life
- Peaceful and prosperous area
- No major outbreaks from mother nature
- Variety of shopping and recreational areas
The “look” and “feel” of the area – the river and trees and green space
Opportunity for interesting and unique development
Family friendly
Quality of life!
Keep the town growth to a reasonable level so as to maintain the rural space that we enjoy now. I like the fact that my neighbours aren’t any closer than they are. The abundance of wild life
The green space conservation and preservation of arable land and wilderness
Easy commute to Calgary
Access to Calgary – football, hockey, real recreation facilities that I can get into
Big sky
We are leaders in environmental innovation and practice/policy. We need to continue to be leaders in urban development centred around solar energy and other environmentally friendly practices
The way the area is currently divided. More density in closer to the town of Okotoks. Access to the town with current population
The carrying capacity of the environment in this region. If we exceed it. We can’t fit any more people in, even if the MP plan says we can.
We can’t live without water so we should not be growing beyond our water demands
Welcome attitude in town and likeable seclusion around
The Sheep River valley should be preserved
River valley, green space, pathways, size, people, safe, good amenities for small community
Proximity to Calgary
Okotoks is appealing because it has a small town feel as well as a small town charm. It is beautiful with walking paths and green spaces.
This area has a culture of small holdings, family and acreage living.
Is that it is a rural town, with small town values, clean air, wild life on our doorsteps, personable services such as schools, local businesses, and churches
A country feel
Keep rivers clean, do not allow polluting industries. Keep building school as needed. Keep air clean so we can see the mountains. Minimize stop lights to keep traffic flowing.
Park, outside, green area
We should be a localized community with a vibrant core area. Public transportation both local and inter-city
Character within each of the communities and areas
Preserve farmland, the MD maintaining its mandate to operate as a rural region and not as an urban or semi-urban region, the town operate as an urban entity and improve dramatically in future planning
Friendly, hospitable, rural flavour, thinking green, solar energy, wind power etc.
The beautiful scenery and surrounding area, to try and keep as much of the history and small town appeal as possible.
• No commercial west of the town or SW of Okotoks
• Rural areas/ sense of space
• Strong urban area for residents to conduct business
• Smaller town feel, small town values
• View, pristine river valley, historical – cattle, oil, nature
• Mountain views, country feel, clean river with river walk ways, lots of trees, commute to Calgary is short.
• Rural and city town balance
• The picturesque wide open spaces and the foothill natural landscapes. Also the agricultural land much be protected for future generations
• Mountain views need to be maintained - this is unique to this area
• “breathing room” – mountain views, green space
• Small town feel, warm friendly people
• Match future development with similar proposals and types of existing developments. Promote population growth in existing urban areas. Do not permit development in areas that are “environmentally sensitive”. No more backfilling of wetlands for subdivision developments. Group industrial growth with existing industrial areas.
• Must maintain its unique character and small town community feel
• Be a leader in sustainable living understanding that by reaching for the moon we will land amongst the stars.
• First of all it’s not Calgary! We have everything without having to run into a big city too often. It’s beautiful and we try to think sustainable but can go so much further.
• Small town feel, maintaining farming and heritage
• Community spirit needs to be maintained
• Sheep River valley
• 3 types of people here; rural, single family and condo living
• Sheep River, views of the mountains
• Proximity to mountains and recreation
• Production of the rural landscape
• Keep higher population in town
• Protection of the Sheep River Valley
• Clean and sustainable
• Small town feel with a strong sense of community
• Growth is inevitable, let’s embrace it, celebrate it and utilize it!
• Water
• Green space yet close to Calgary
• The rural nature of this community
• Sense of community, agriculture and acreage, ability to have some animals.
• Sports accessibility
• Safe & secure community with a low crime rate
• Vibrant downtown area
• Clean air with lots of green/park space
• Okotoks has done a great job with ensuring new development has lots of green space and walking paths. This is why Okotoks attracts young families. In future young families will be living with extended family members and live closer to their loved ones.
• Our natural beauty – rivers, mountains, foothills and the diverse ecosystem and opportunities for recreation close to home
• Our heritage – buildings & developments should reflect the style of our heritage – Cochrane is a great example of this
• Our commitment to environmental responsibility
• The Sheep River
• Make it affordable for both business and residents
• Higher density keeps infrastructure cost down (lower taxes)
• More people, makes businesses more successful, keep Okotoks a place people want to move to or just come to enjoy the variety of businesses, sports and recreational facilities
• No slums and crime, great community spirit; free enterprise feeling, support for local businesses
• The way people interact with each other
• The two most important characteristics do not need to be maintained: proximity to Calgary and proximity to the mountains (recreation and rivers)
• We need to maintain our identity (we’re not Calgary)
• It is new, young and progressive. We have residents willing to consider having, and paying for, high quality services – i.e: arenas, pools, arts facilities, etc. - and will demand high quality civic infrastructure – roads, water & sewer – which works as designed
• Will support technology
• Protect our river and watershed, respect our river
• Downtown boutique/small business feel
• Sense of community/friendly neighbourhoods
• Increase living in close proximity to Okotoks
• Mountain views & access to outdoor recreation
• Architectural controls
• Planned growth to ensure natural beauty is preserved
• More businesses to support residential growth
• Continued choice for residential types
• More commercial/industrial
• We need to maintain the character we have in town. Along with our water supply
• Community pride and involvement
• Safety
• Education opportunities
• Recreational choices
• A comfortable place for families to live, grow and age
- A place where amenities (social, medical, businesses) are available without having to go to Calgary.
- A place where basic services are available and self sustaining (real cost rates)
- Access, without attachment to Calgary
- Recreation and development of further rec.
- Walk paths
- Sustainability, environment protection and maintenance
- Workable infrastructure for the population projected
- Green walkable spaces, quality of living (outside/inside living)
- The commitment of the town to the upkeep of town grounds and support of town services
- Churches, outdoor activities, parks, outdoor theatre, water parks
- Rural atmosphere in the town of Okotoks
- The quality of my home life, I want to be able to choose how big my home is because that is what I paid for. All the other things are secondary
- Less noise, travel, pace for living slower, more involvement in your community
- Watersheds for protection
- Local agriculture
- Small town feeling
- There are still a lot of very productive farms and ranches in the area. Hobby farms that plant a lot of trees and grow produce for urban centres – reduces eco foot print/healthier lifestyle
- Our backyard (50k west) and the natural beauty it has along with the opportunity to enjoy it via case of access to roads, paths, trails and facilities
- Continue to develop pathways, green spaces
- Post secondary education and arts/culture centre

My thoughts on managing growth

- Minimum subdivision size
- Urban growth within current urban area
- Don’t need to go to 60,000 within DMSA!
- Quality of life for both Okotoks and MD residents – that is why we chose these communities (rural + urban) in the first place!!!
- There needs to be a mix of development both within and outside the towns boundaries
- Planning needs to happen soon on all highway lands within the DMSA. The Landowners need & have a right to know what they can do with their land
- Engage those who have most at stake in terms of land
- Rural densities should be very low throughout the DMSA
- Urban densities should be restricted to Okotoks
- River Valley development should be curtailed
Calgary metro-population plan
All future growth include renewable energy
Keep most growth in town, otherwise you’ll have too many “satellite districts” sprout up and therefore increase the need for fire departments and staff
Keep recreation central as well
Be realistic, people will come, so get ready. Don’t try to be too dense. Looks great on paper but no one wants to live there if it attracts the wrong kind of people.
Cooperative planning with MD, town and Calgary
Concentrate growth in Okotoks & minimize growth in MD
Use tax policy to limit land sales & subdivision as a wealth management tool
Developing the area within Okotoks first and graduation out, as growing. Not allowing huge suburbs outside of town limiting and urban growth area, until most of the town area is used.
Upgrade roads to accommodate growth
Much more discussion is needed re: water as growth limiting reality. Myths associated with growth i.e. “must grow or die”
No large lots, people can’t maintain anymore than 1 acre. More residents enjoy weekend camping.
Most development in the MD should be 1-2 acre lots in clusters to maintain larger green areas
Okotoks should expand to 45,000 to allow areas for young families to stay in area.
The people are going to come, we cannot stop them, people need a place to live
Why not go up instead of out, save space for picnic areas, sports areas etc.
Planning has to be cooperative – common interests need to take precedence over private interests
The MD should not be involved in development of lands adjacent to the town of Okotoks. Okotoks should develop land/areas surrounding the town and supply services to those areas only. The town should not be involved in supplying services to third parties or MD for areas outside town limits.
More growth close to Okotoks
Management should always take the long view. Work the plan; be very careful with approval of variances. Try to bring jobs to Okotoks, especially knowledge workers.
Develop a plan that acknowledges priorities of the community but remains flexible longing community consultations
Hands off
Save nature in area; control development
Why not let as many people as possibly can move here
To be open to the priorities and ideas for future growth
Consider more areas – like Drake Landing
Concentrate shopping – high traffic areas
Train – for transportation to and from Calgary
As you’re doing - some town hall meeting with demographic stats!
• High density – transit models, green space for wildlife and conservation and preservation of sensitive areas
• This is the wrong attitude “managing, managed” we need leadership to encourage and foster growth to shape it the way you want it. Manage means you are reacting to what you do not understand or control or lead. How about planning growth everywhere!
• I chose to live here because of the small city feel. It is an excellent place to raise a family and I want that to carry on.
• Growth can only be managed if we stay within the capacity of the Sheep River
• Increase Okotoks to 30,000, allow MD up to 1 house/ 2 acres
• Keep high density areas within the town of Okotoks
• Slow it down so we don’t lose quality development and have commercial areas that have a higher quality
• Smaller area developed = best plan! Look at Calgary’s growth – it is ridiculous! It is ever growing. Please to don’t let Okotoks be developed in the same manner. High quality and high density developments with residential, commercial and schools all within walking distance
• Don’t allow urban sprawl from the town of Okotoks into neighbouring larger areas. People have invested time and money in upholding a quality of life here.
• No commercial developments – big box businesses such as Wall-mart, car dealerships etc.
• I believe the town of Okotoks must have a mix between rural and urban
• Make reasonable, concrete forecasts and plans so that people purchasing land know what to expect for the next 15-20 years. Do not turn hwy 2A into McLeod Trail Calgary.
• It needs to be balanced. The town growth (houses) but there is no spaces allow for essential services such as school, daycare/preschool, cultural, gym, etc.
• I’d like to see a complete community with industry, retail and residential
• Growth is best managed through: shared responsibility, working together and pre-planning
• The self interest that influences planning decisions in should be set aside. The powers to be should consider the present and the future residents and their best interests. Unfortunately the past is done and hopefully we do better going forth
• Keep the density in town and allow folks to have space in the rural areas
• Economic pressures will force growth
• Transportation is important
• Water quality – amount will be pushed by demand
• Townhouses and condo’s added in areas within Okotoks
• Add 1 acre parcels within 5km radius of town, 5 acres parcels further out
• Preserve the surrounding growth as much as possible in its present state
• More people in town
• The agricultural land should be preserved. The growth should take place within the town limits
• Install water lines and sewer lines from Calgary along the 2A, so that development can be done in an orderly fashion, rather than a hodge podge of a development
• Keep urban growth in the urban area
• Slow and steady wins the race, informing and educating the public on the necessity of growth
• Do not allow growth to outstrip available resources.
• It must be done in a cooperative manner with both parties respecting that they must move forward as a unit
• Concerned that we won’t manage growth sensibly – be proactive not reactive
• Planned out smart – know for sure how much water we need for any growth
• Need opportunity for all kinds of development with some outside of the box thinking
• Rural acreage should be available with room for livestock if desired
• My preference is urban growth to accommodate better urban planning
• Good planning
• Keep the majority of the growth within the town of Okotoks
• Potable water is the number one consideration when considering growth scenarios
• Water and crime are critical!
• Don’t give in to development pressures
• Stick to values that come with a small town
• Create strategic development plans with Okotoks and the MD of Foothills.
• Deal with water problem first
• Keep the growth contained to non-productive land
• Be in contact with large landowners who have a lot at stake
• Water problems
  • Most of the urban growth should occur within the town of Okotoks. It would be handled by a planning department overseeing the region rather than one by one development requests hap hazardously around the region
  • I am pleased to see the MD and Okotoks are talking. I think it’s important that the MD should share cost of recreation facilities, health facilities etc. Planning for growth is imperative. As we grow it is imperative that we have a transit system and that we have shopping close to growth areas to cut down on car travel.
  • An awareness of the detrimental effects that big box development has on the downtown core of a city
  • The more urban sprawl that is created, the less sustainable a community becomes as travel is increased and walking opportunities decrease
  • Full cooperation between MD & Okotoks
  • Schools -> if schools aren’t located properly we will have to bus our kids even more which is turn is going to have negative effects on our air quality
  • Select or identify the growth nodes both inside the town of Okotoks as well as outside
  • Reduce the development of agricultural land by encouraging cluster residential neighbourhoods
  • Continue to ensure conservation measures with new developments
  • Expand Okotoks to accommodate a larger population to share taxes and help businesses thrive
  • Understand that good growth is healthy and should be encouraged but with a system. Create new neighbourhoods for families southwest of Okotoks where there is room for nice views and larger lots
• Information is very important. Get as much as you can, ask for help.
• Urban growth within Okotoks but with ability of community to preserve clean water
• Get good transit connections to Okotoks and other rural communities
• Keep development high quality
• Rural residential development should pay its way in terms of impact on urban infrastructure – roads, arenas, etc.
• Don’t be tempted by rural developers who sees a profit in developing cheap because they don’t pay for urban services
• We need to embrace that growth is inevitable and make sure we have a long range plan that best reflects our current resident’s priorities.
• Growth needs to occur where the taxes are needed most to maintain and improve infrastructure
• Continued public involvement
• More emphasis on business – not just residential
• By developing within the entire region, it wouldn’t be so compact and city like. It would allow for growth but not so dense where we still would have the smaller town feel
• Okotoks needs to manage most of the growth. The town will need the tax base to keep up with the recreation/schools/infrastructure etc.
• Water is not as issue. The issue is to manage the amount of water coming by, we use less than 1% and put 80% back
• Have a strategy – look at business/industrial locations of access carefully
• Clarify what is wanted –> economy or regional cooperation
• High growth, medium density
• Divided between Okotoks and the MD with accountability (financial and otherwise) from both for services and infrastructure
• I truly believe we the tax payers should have the right to vote on what happens in this town
• Okotoks needs more high density housing for young families/affordability. This should be in close proximity to the downtown core for easier access to services
• Communities should have a smaller footprint or more density, more choices in a smaller area
• Continuing to cooperate between the two municipalities
• More higher cost areas, less multi-families
• Developer demand should be seen as part of Okotoks solutions not always as problems – demand quality but also support market demand to keep Okotoks urban
• Putting communities around schools
• Water – high quality water is critical. Green space and retaining current geography (don’t bulldoze trees and hills) ugly and messy
• Balance, balance, balance, quality of life. Environment and infrastructure
• Growth in the area should continue to be managed in a collaborative manner between Okotoks and MD of Foothills. Urban growth should be concentrated in Okotoks with acreage development in MD of Foothills
My Favourite part...

- Appreciate that you are seeking input – only hope that you listen!
- The music
- Interactive map showing footprint change with choices
- Seeing results
- Fast feedback
- Well presented, I'm glad I came
- Being able to see instant results wow! Lots of different thinking
- This workshop focused on your own planned process. As a member of this community for 40 yrs instead an opportunity to provide input prior to arriving at this point.
- Good tool but very limited on scope, needs to consider broader priorities
- Level of preparedness (i.e. problems with audio-visual)!!??
- Great explanation of things to come
- Educational
- Voting
- Nothing new really
- Enjoyed the visual comparisons of different priorities on growth areas
- The feedback
- Results – computer data; fast response time
- I like the “key pad” voting aspect. Very interesting results that show instantly
- Interactive
- I was very disappointed in this workshop; I learned very little when you consider I sat there for 2 hours!!
- Was very well presented
- Visual
- Big picture approach
- Modelling tool to illustrate options
- Visual presentation of impact of growth
- Being able to see the effects of the developments
- Use of technology – made it easy and instant way to see the voting
- The fact that they do this
- The music!
- Immediate feedback the pushing the button
- The opportunity to participate
- The voting button and seeing immediate statistic of the votes
- Cookies!! – informative – how mixed up we are
- Voting system, instant group answers, this opportunity to provide comments
- Seeing the projected growth and where it may be concentrated
- Voting in privacy
- The cookies! Thanks!
• Inform residents of the outcomes based upon their choices.
• Good thoughtful scenarios offered, it has shifted my perspective
• The electronic control units work well
• Seeing the changes to where the development ends up based on the different scenarios
• I liked the comparisons of the population densities and impacts
• Great software program – should be useful in the decision making process
• Facilitator was very good
• The voting
• The quick feedback
• The information on priorities and how different scenarios can impact those priorities
• The remotes and being able to give our choices and having immediate results
• Informative
• Interaction
• Cookies! And the opportunity to vote
• I found the information invaluable
• Comparing different growth scenarios
• Music
• Cookies
• Seeing Okotoks growth relative to density
• Interaction with people at the table
• The input/comment sheets... as long as they are considered!!!
• The quick feedback using the option finder
• Seeing the voting results
• The voting buttons
• Technology
  • Seeing the various choices changing the final outlook
  • Comparing our priorities to the density question
  • The handsets – great voting process
  • Very educational
• Appreciated seeing the group choices and their impacts and being able to compare
• Interesting way to poll the audience
• Interesting votes
• Hearing what residents have to say
• Seeing impact of different population
• Participation/interaction
• Looking at simulations that showed different scenarios
• Reviewing different scenarios and how that affects the priorities
• Seeing what others thought – great use of technology
• All of it – ok – the music!!
• The MetroQuest software was cool! I liked how it showed changes positive and negative to our priorities
• Seeing the scenarios change with different choices of priorities
• Participation & discussion, individual ideas
• Finding out other peoples community priorities about growth planning
• This was a great (anonymous!) interactive workshop, loved the format, the way of voting and the music
• The presenter was informative and interesting
• The immediacy of the feedback by use of the handsets
• Seeing how our choices on priorities are affected by the different population/density options
• Sharing of group statistics
• Voting on items with handsets
• Helping to shape the future for this area
• Interesting to see MetroQuest in action
• Seeing what the actual results are with what we went - eye opening
• Interactive, interesting, informative
• The interaction
• Reviewing instant results and voting

Anything else to add?
• To give senior discounts for property tax
• Rural and urban voters have different expectations!!!!
• Questions need to be more specific with urban range choices
• You should give a definition of urban and rural because people might have different opinions.
• We need to be very expedient in this process so surrounding land owners know what rules are governing their land
• Nice job facilitator
• Need to include where services would be
• No acronyms
• Start on time. Less emphasis on interlude music selections (a novelty, not a priority)
• I found it hard to pay attention with the constant flash of the camera. I DO NOT give permission for my picture to be used for any purpose.
• I appreciate having input
• Obviously with Okotoks pop cap of 30,000 – first option is NOT an option.
• I’d be interested to know how the model works
• Keep a real life perspective
• Why do we not get water from Calgary?
• You should notify residents of Okotoks and MD of the initial maps and projections
• This workshop is very important. It should be advertised/promoted more for more input from all residents
• It is nice to see the water issue gone
• Well done!
• Be sure to publish interim reports for public info
• Manage expectations
• When talking township and MD - let’s DO the things we talk about
• MDP not clear
• We would like to know more about business, commercial and industrial use too.
• Thank you – great workshop
• More development for seniors in the rural areas
• Good luck to those involved. This is a highly complicated and political area of development
• No water no life to sustain, where are you going to get your water support for all this growth?
• There is no way that the quality of our air will be improved.
• Why are we even considering growth in the green triangle if we don’t have enough water for 60,000?
• Let the existing residents develop Area Concept plans and stick to them. With strict land use bylaws
• Thanks for offering this workshop! Wish it was on Saturday instead and more people would attend!
• Where are the schools going to be? If it is such a big problem now, how will it be with more people?
• Keep working together please
• School land, transportation, more infrastructure/activity for all age groups, better Dog Park!
• Please try to start meetings on time
• Great visual participation!
• The push in this presentation toward the benefits of higher density is not unbiased
• Need to talk to land owners close to town
• Management of water
• Good luck
• Why did we vote twice on DMSA 30-45-60 vs. high-med-low... which vote counted?
• Failed to take water into consideration
• Thank you for providing these workshops. Together we grow!
• Well done, informative, entertaining format, thought provoking
• Focus more on sustainable living for this population growth. Growth is great but nowadays it has to be smarter.
• Great presentation to help people get informed and involved
• Rather than having these sessions open to anyone they should have been targeted to specific areas in order to get a clearer idea of priorities
• Great workshop!
• Discuss crime that comes with greater populations
• Discuss senior services as a priority
• No questions were asked about social, family and quality of life that comes from living in a small town
• What about the water problems
• Okotoks is a wonderful community, with great facilities and great geographic location. Let’s share it with others – we will all benefit.
• This format is a great way of soliciting feedback, perhaps similar sessions may be utilized in the future
• Great job by the moderator
• Thanks for the invitation
• People find a 50 year horizon difficult, talking about 10yr increments might clarify choices or priorities better
• Maybe more choices (i.e.) 50’ lot small homes – big lots in town
• Recreational and cultural needs
• Enjoyed the interactiveness of the presentation
• If we add density, doesn’t the “walkable” decrease at a point. (i.e.) – New York City – lots of density and walking cannot be fun at times
• More business and industry promotion
• Avoid the urban design/walkability trap – there are many ways to make neat communities that don’t come out of form-based code and awnings over every window!!
• We have an attractive place for people to come to, how we can stop them if were still allowing people to raise families here. Change and growth must happen
• I hope they use the information that has been gathered

One minute with the Mayor/Reeve
• Give us the opportunity to be more involved in the planning prior rather than reacting to your plan
• No to 60,000 and CMP
• Preserve rural community
• Quality of life – both urban and rural – highest priority
• Development into rural needs to be usage & architecturally controlled
• I welcome the planning process but I do like the idea of keeping development along the already major highways and existing communities and not the shotgun approach to development all over the MD
• Remove the cap
• Efficient infrastructure
• Slower growth can occur if all developers had to include Eco/renewable/ smart grid
• No CMP, we can look after ourselves
• How can you provide enough water for 60,000 people?
• Quit having mini-satellite communities in the MD. They cause traffic, use services but probably freeloard on town taxes, well-treed and other naturally beautiful areas. People can accept density if they have access to these
• Population cap has no merit
• Water resources is most critical
• There should be guidelines made and followed for all application equally. Development should be made in Okotoks and surrounding area prior to MD.
• Adopt an open mind – and cease catering to minority vested interests
• Okotoks should have grown to keep control of area growth ie; Sandstone Springs, Wind Walk
• Mayor – be more open to people outside
• Reeve – easier to development
• Reeve – the MD should not be involved in developing land adjacent to a town. The MD seems to contradict its MDP 2010 plan by proceeding to development close to Okotoks
• Mayor – the town should oppose a development adjacent to the town. The town should not supply and services to MD/third party for any development outside its limits. The Town should promote development within its border and annex lands needed for future growth now before the town is surrounded by other development
• The town of Okotoks should annex more land
• Town annex more land
• I would ask the Reeve what he plans on doing about water licenses. It seems you can obtain one then use it like a commodity to sell to someone else if you don’t need it. Cargill runs a huge business off a license owned by Ducks Unlimited. How does that work?
• Plan, plan, plan (i.e. don’t stop strategizing)
• Engage stakeholders (keep communicating)
• Don’t over commit (promise what can be realistically delivered)
• Operate well within financial means (avoid debt)
• Tactical behaviour must support latest plan
• Go for it, growth is vital to the economy
• Planful and purposeful way of doing town business – e.g. do not issue development permits without first obtaining water licenses
• Involve community in process of planning
• Keep in mind the “big picture” – Okotoks is not an island
• Communicate, communicate, communicate
• Look after the kids of tomorrow, build the soccer facility ASAP!! Or at least pick a sport for them to play!
• Do your best to achieve balance
• Costs of development!!
• Please consider a variety of housing and work towards using the existing train as a commuter train – great alternative to travel. Plus brings in tourism – day trips from Calgary and area
• I don’t want to retire in a town or city – allow developments for senior in the rural area
• I would like to congratulate him on effective management thus far and hope he helps maintain a smaller footprint and higher density in the future
• Plan for growth, otherwise we will never achieve the outcome we want
• I don’t understand why growth is planned without knowing where water will come from
• Do not let the north gateway corridor turn into a commercial zone filled with car lots and mini storage
• Let’s be unique and stop wanting to look like Calgary, demand developers provide communities that meet our lifestyle needs that are made in Okotoks, rather than cookie cutter
• Build whole communities – based on school, commercial, walking paths, and green space. Not based on how much money the developers can make.
• Try at all cost to preserve the culture and lifestyle of this area, country living. When oil and gas have driven this area’s economy, what will we have left if we allow urban sprawl into rural areas?
• Growth has occurred all over North America and the world where people find the area desirable; as long as the population of Calgary grows - this area will grow. Recognize this and work proactively and cooperatively with all stakeholders.
• It is about time that we are asked our opinion... if not a little too late
• Growth is happening in the MD and in Okotoks, growth will continue to happen – it’s how we manage it! Working together to achieve the goals of both the MD and the Town
• I need at least a half an hour.
• Thanks to the MD and Town for working together on these challenging issues. I have seen a shift in this relationship of cooperation and I hope to see it continue to get stronger
• Growth management cannot be artificial. The growth pressures will all come down to economics. Growth caps are unworkable.
• Please consider the value of views that people have paid for in the rural areas and how it will affect their home values.
• You can plant trees but you can’t build mountains.
• Keep Okotoks in Okotoks
• Need to address what is going to happen with undeveloped land that farmers are left with. How do they deal with this and what is the land worth?
• I think the growth in the area should be contained not allowed to grow around the town perimeter
• What are your plans to tie into City of Calgary water and sewer?
• Wake up! Look at any other major Canadian city development - this is not new! Toronto, Montréal and Vancouver!
• Make sure you consider social housing
• For the Reeve: how does he plan on protecting the environment and land while growth happens?
• Reeve: please respect the environmentally sensitive areas, restrict sub division development proposals near wetlands, preserve our water resources and reduce our carbon footprint as much as possible.
• We are all sharing the same beautiful spot in the foothills we must get along with our neighbours.
• Water!!
• Mayor: grow
• Mayor, your article in the Wheel was spot on!!
• The MD should be very careful about noticing the rights of the landowner to protect their capital. It is most aggravating to have everyone else have plans for your land.
• When will you annex my land for proper urban planning?
• Reeve: smaller focus groups from key areas of concern where growth is anticipated would be very worthwhile before finalizing any development plans.
• Limit growth! Build bike baths
• Not considered was ‘Quality of Life’ - it is what people are moving to small towns for.
• Consider other social impacts... example crime
• Do not try and stop development, embrace change and plan for it
• Don’t you realize you need commercial growth to sustain the town.
• Develop industrial areas to help pay taxes
• How can we continue to be globally recognized for our eco-friendly alternatives?
• I would like to know if they have looked to other rapid growth communities in Canada/USA/Europe to see other success and mistakes made from and learn from them.
• Don’t freeze land, acreage development must be allowed, as some people still want animals. Farmers should be allowed to develop on their own land.
• The town of Okotoks needs to grow to sustain its overall health. Growth should be slow & sustainable with our own water supply coming from the Sheep River.
• Priority #1: keep talking to the MD with emphasis on planning
• Have common sense and be fair (19.5% tax increase in one year is not fair)
• Let orderly growth happen, cooperation is the key!
• Cooperation is the key. Ensure that the relationships between Town and the MD does not slow growth down, but creates a healthy sustainable growth.
• No water – no growth
• Keep MD development “rural” - don’t urbanize the MD
• Stress the importance of maintaining a high quality of life. To me this means taking care of our environment, fostering community involvement and interaction and taking care to maintain our small business downtown core.
• Educating the general public is of the upmost importance so everyone understands the benefits of growth
• Listen to the people – encourage input
• Think about how you would want your grandkids to live, and how you would allow for those kids to sustain the lifestyle we have come to enjoy.
- Do not allow growth of communities outside of the town borders, save more land for Okotoks’ future
- Get an agreed strategy in place and stick to it for at least 10 yrs then review progress, confirm water availability
- Development needs to pay the way - not increasing tax payers
- Continued growth in residence and industrial to keep taxes down
- We need to have open talk with Mayor and others (to cooperate on both sides)
- You need to provide what the market is asking for. Sometimes only time can transform communities into the ultimate design. Supply must equal demand
- 45,000 population for Okotoks
- Plan/plan & communicate for people & businesses
- Balance and good decision-making abilities within Administration are key – don’t rely on a book or a code to make good decisions for the Okotoks context
- This is a beautiful place - please keep growing so that we have the tax base to keep our town beautiful and add amenities
- Take care of our environment, leave the world a better place for future generations
- Make sure you balance quality of life and the environment
- Put in the proper infrastructure before the population needs it (i.e. – double lane the 32st street bridge now while there is no traffic in the way)
- Be flexible to ensure the lifestyle and desires of all residents can be met
Appendix E: Detailed Results of Priority Ranking Exercise

The following tables present the ranking of the 15 priorities used in MetroQuest for the DMSA. Each participant was asked to rate each priority one at a time on a scale of 1 (high priority) to 5 (low priority). Low scores indicate higher priority. The first table presents the average rating of all participants and then subsequent tables present the results subdivided by location of residence and age group.
The priorities have been colour coded in three sets (high priorities in green, middle priorities in yellow, and lower priorities in red) according to the results of all participant voting. The colour coding remains constant on the tables below where the results are presented for different age groups and where people live in separate tables. This allows the reader to see key differences between the subset group and the average across all participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Participants</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>Clean air</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>Easy car travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>Walkable neighbourhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Lower fees and taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>Quiet neighbourhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>Lower cost of living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>Vibrant downtown areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>More green space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>Easy access to transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>Low maintenance homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>Shorter commutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>Rural living opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>Lower carbon emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>Smaller eco-footprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>Large homes with big yards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants value both vibrant downtown areas and quiet neighbourhoods indicating that a mix of compact development and lower density areas may be desirable. Large homes with big yards ranked very low however indicating a preference for more modest sized homes and properties.

Both clean air and easy car travel rank highly. Since automobile transportation is responsible for a significant portion of local air quality issues, this may be an important topic for additional discussion.

Global environmental issues such as ecological footprint and carbon emissions ranked lower than local environmental issues such as green space preservation and clean air.
### MD of Foothills Residents (more than 6 acres)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>Easy car travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>Rural living opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>Lower fees and taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>Clean air</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>Quiet neighbourhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>Lower cost of living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>Walkable neighbourhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>Shorter commutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>Vibrant downtown areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>Easy access to transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>Low maintenance homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>More green space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>Large homes with big yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>Smaller eco-footprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>Lower carbon emissions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Foothills residents place a higher value on rural living opportunities such as hobby farming compared with Okotoks residents. Foothills residents with larger properties felt most strongly about this priority compared with other participants.

### MD of Foothills Residents (under 6 acres)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>Lower fees and taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>Clean air</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>Lower cost of living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>Walkable neighbourhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Quiet neighbourhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>Easy car travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>Rural living opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>More green space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>Vibrant downtown areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>Low maintenance homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>Easy access to transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>Lower carbon emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>Shorter commutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>Smaller eco-footprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>Large homes with big yards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Okotoks Residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>Clean air</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>Walkable neighbourhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>Vibrant downtown areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>Quiet neighbourhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>More green space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>Lower carbon emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>Easy car travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>Lower cost of living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>Smaller eco-footprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>Low maintenance homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>Easy access to transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>Lower fees and taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>Shorter commutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>Rural living opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>Large homes with big yards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Okotoks residents felt more strongly about global environmental issues such as ecological footprint and carbon emission than Foothills residents.

Okotoks residents place a high value on vibrant downtown areas while also valuing quiet neighbourhoods indicating the importance of striking a balance of neighbourhoods types. Large home with big yards was ranked very low by these participants indicating a preference for medium density neighbourhoods over low density areas.
### Participants under age 45

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Feature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.73</td>
<td></td>
<td>Walkable neighbourhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vibrant downtown areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.83</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clean air</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.93</td>
<td></td>
<td>Easy car travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower carbon emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower cost of living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>More green space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quiet neighbourhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.43</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shorter commutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.45</td>
<td></td>
<td>Easy access to transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower fees and taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.70</td>
<td></td>
<td>Smaller eco-footprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural living opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>Low maintenance homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Large homes with big yards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Younger participants (under age 45) placed a higher value on vibrant downtown areas than others.

Younger participants (under age 45) place a higher value on reducing carbon emissions than others.

### Participants aged between 45-59

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Feature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.57</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clean air</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.90</td>
<td></td>
<td>Easy car travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.95</td>
<td></td>
<td>Walkable neighbourhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.97</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower fees and taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quiet neighbourhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural living opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.36</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower cost of living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>Easy access to transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shorter commutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.45</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vibrant downtown areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.55</td>
<td></td>
<td>More green space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.58</td>
<td></td>
<td>Smaller eco-footprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.61</td>
<td></td>
<td>Low maintenance homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.77</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower carbon emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>Large homes with big yards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Middle-aged participants (45 – 59 years old) placed a higher priority on rural living opportunities than both younger and older participants.

Middle-aged participants (45 – 59 years old) placed a higher priority on lower fees and taxes than both younger and older participants.
### Participants over age 60

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>Easy car travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>Clean air</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>Quiet neighbourhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>Lower cost of living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>Walkable neighbourhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>Lower fees and taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>Vibrant downtown areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>Low maintenance homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>More green space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>Easy access to transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>Lower carbon emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>Rural living opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>Smaller eco-footprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>Shorter commutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>Large homes with big yards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Senior participants (over age 60) place a higher priority on lower cost of living than younger participants.