

LINE NO.	NAME	SUMMARY OF COMMENT	INDICATED POSITION	ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE
1.	Audet, Danielle	"Leave our village alone" – Naramata Resident	Not in support.	No comment.
2.	Azizi, Moojan	Request than an amendment be made to Policy 1G-1 to allow for consideration of providing community water servicing to Resource Area lands along a serviced line or alternatively, requests that their property be designated as an "Agricultural Area" in the RGS despite not being in the ALR.	[not stated]	The Resource Area (RA) land use designation in the electoral area OCP Bylaws has historically been applied to large rural parcels and un-surveyed Crown land. These lands are generally not provided with community services, recreation and infrastructure (e.g. water and sewer). Agricultural activities on these parcels have also historically been in the form of ranching and grazing with water provided by private on-site sources (e.g. well). Parcels that are being re-developed with more water intensive forms of agriculture (e.g. vineyards and/or tree fruits) that require connection to a water system should consider being re-designated to "Agriculture" (AG) and included in the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR).
3.	Baird, Christina	Requests that the Naramata Village Settlement Area be reduced in size to match the Naramata village centre as identified in the current Electoral Area "E" OCP.	Not in support.	The RGS Bylaw provides long-range (20+ years) planning direction and it is anticipated that the various communities and municipalities in the South Okanagan will change incrementally over time. The Regional District cannot stop change from occurring or promise to preserve a community as it exists at a specific point-in-time. What the Regional District can do, through various land use tools such as an RGS, OCP and Zoning bylaws is to try and direct growth in a way that is socially, economically and environmentally sustainable and that make efficient use of public facilities, land and other resources to support and enhance regional sustainability and resilience. At present, "Naramata" is a designated "Rural Growth Area" under the RGS Bylaw and, as a result, is a focus for infrastructure upgrades (e.g. water and sewer) as well as accommodating a certain amount of population growth over the next 20 years. Removing "Naramata" as a growth area, or limiting it to a small area of land fronting Robinson Avenue west of Fourth Street would adversely affect the long-term development of the broader village area as well as the provision of public infrastructure (e.g. water and sewer upgrades). This could have implications for the creation of a vibrant village area that is able to sustain multiple businesses year-around, provide community services (e.g. library, school, etc.) or development of alternate forms of housing that are more affordable than a traditional single detached family home. For these reasons, planning staff do not support removing "Naramata" as a growth area or reducing the footprint of the growth area to a small section of land fronting Robinson Ave.
4.	Baker, Graham & Catherine	Requests that the Naramata Village Settlement Area be reduced in size to match the Naramata village centre as identified in the current Electoral Area "E" OCP. Concerned with increased traffic, density, vacation rentals and a shift in village character.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 (above). With regard to the concern regarding vacation rental uses, this is seen to be a regional issue and one that the RDOS Board may identify as a strategic project for 2023 or 2024, and which would be completed separately from the current RGS and OCP bylaw reviews. While planning staff are aware of the wildfire hazard concerns associated with having only one constructed road access into the community (e.g. Naramata Road), it is not aware of the local road network being incapable of handling additional traffic volumes associated with residential, agricultural and/or tourist commercial uses. Maintenance and upgrading of the local road network is a provincial responsibility that is administered by the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure (MoTI).
5.	Ball, Joanie	Not in support of the proposed amendments.	Not in support.	No comment.

COLOUR LEGEND:

Electoral Area "A"
 Electoral Area "C"
 Electoral Area "D"
 Electoral Area "E"
 Electoral Area "F"
 Electoral Area "I"
 Penticton
 Unknown

LINE NO.	NAME	SUMMARY OF COMMENT	INDICATED POSITION	ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE
6.	Ball, Mik	Expressed that the proposed Village Settlement Area is far in excess of what Naramata requires. Concern that Naramata will become a bedroom community and the infrastructure such as the single road into Naramata will be overburdened as a result.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 (above). Please see response to traffic concerns at Line No. 4 (above).
7.	Bell, Nancy	"I strongly disagree with this Development. Leave our village "ALONE""	Not in support.	No comment
8.	Bell, Tyler	"Do Not Approve this Development" "NO NO NO" "NO" NO""	Not in support.	No comment.
9.	Berry, Cheryl	Requests that the Naramata Village Settlement Area be reduced in size to match the Naramata Village Centre as defined in the Electoral Area "E" OCP Bylaw. Suggests that aside from the Naramata Village Centres, Naramata be designated as Rural Residential Area. Requests that the Population and Demographics section be re-written to reflect that in many communities there is construction of homes that are not counted in the population data and that the RGS should reflect that many homes are owned by people who do not reside in Naramata full time and so are not include in the census numbers cited in the RGS. Recommends that the RGS support the introduction of an Empty Homes/Speculation Tax of BC. At the end of the second paragraph of the Housing and Development section add "greenhouse gas emissions and urban heat islands caused by construction and concrete". Recommends that the Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation section end after the third paragraph and a description of the possible agricultural consequences of heat domes and extreme weather be added.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 (above). The RDOS relies on Statistics Canada for Census data and does not have the resources to obtain or monitor data on second homes/seasonal homeowners. The Regional District does, however, track/issue permits for short term Vacation Rentals operators. Should the RDOS Board wish to consider petitioning the province to have the South Okanagan included in the "Empty Homes/Speculation Tax" (electoral areas and municipalities), further investigation is recommended before this is included as a policy statement in the RGS and, subsequently, the various electoral area and municipal OCP Bylaws. Support from the Councils of Penticton, Summerland, Osoyoos and Oliver is seen to be critical to such an initiative. Inclusion of "greenhouse gas emissions and urban heat islands caused by construction and concrete" at the end of the second paragraph of the introduction to the Housing and Development section of the RGS is too specific and otherwise captured by the reference to "ecosystem function." The Regional District, in partnership with a number of South Okanagan municipalities, was recently awarded grant funding from the province to further explore heat mapping for the area. The outcomes of this project may include recommended amendments to the RGS and OCP Bylaws that speak to heat domes and other extreme weather events.
10.	Berry, Deb	There are some valid amendments however the Naramata Village Settlement Area is very large and will allow for too much building height, density etc. Suggests that a more limited area be considered.	[not stated]	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 (above).
11.	Berry, Julie	Leave Naramata as is. Concerned with development on hillsides and high traffic on the roads.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 (above). Please see response to traffic concerns at Line No. 4 (above).
12.	Berry, Mark	Concerned that Naramata Road cannot handle the growth and Naramata is under pressure from developers. Concerned that we are limited in how much more water can be pumped from Okanagan Lake before long term damage is seen considering that water levels in the watershed and Okanagan Lake have been low the past decade.	Not in support.	Please see response to traffic concerns at Line No. 4 (above). Water use is an issue that affects the electoral areas and municipalities equally, however, it is the Province of British Columbia that authorizes licenses and approvals. Planning staff are aware that the Okanagan Basin Water Board (OBWB) undertook an "Okanagan Water Supply and Demand Project" between 2005-2010 that concluded, amongst other things, that: <i>Although the amount of water licensed for human use is about double the amount actually used, there is no guarantee that the licensed amount will be available in any given year.</i>
13.	Berry, Matt	Requests that the Naramata Village Settlement Area be reduced in size to match the Naramata Village Centre as defined in the Electoral Area "E" OCP Bylaw. Lists other concerns such as water usage, transportation, loss of trees	[not stated]	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 (above). Please see response to water concerns at Line No. 12 (above). Please see response to traffic concerns at Line No. 4 (above).

COLOUR LEGEND:

Electoral Area "A"
 Electoral Area "C"
 Electoral Area "D"
 Electoral Area "E"
 Electoral Area "F"
 Electoral Area "I"
 Penticton
 Unknown

LINE NO.	NAME	SUMMARY OF COMMENT	INDICATED POSITION	ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE
		and greenspaces and more vacation rentals. Suggests that a speculation/empty home tax be applied in Area "E".		Please see response to vacation rental concerns at Line No. 4 (above). Please see response to Speculation/Empty Home Tax at Line No. 9 (above).
14.	Berry, Parker	Concerned that the RGS will change downtown Naramata to a higher density which will lead to developers buying land and doing development that destroys the character of the town, destroys sensitive ecosystems/ riparian areas and which will be purchased by people who are not active members of the community (vacation homes). Support density in larger centres like Penticton and Kelowna.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 (above). Section 2 of the existing RGS Bylaw is dedicated to Ecosystems, Natural Areas and Parks with objectives and supportive policies which aim to protect the health and biodiversity of ecosystems in the south Okanagan. Updates or amendments to section 2 of the bylaw is beyond the scope of the current RGS Review Further, the RDOS OCPs require that any development in or near riparian areas and environmentally sensitive lands requires approval of a development permit which includes submission of a report completed by a qualified environmental professional to minimize the impact of development on the natural environment. The proposed amendment bylaw directs that 95% of development should occur in growth areas (such as Penticton).
15.	Berry, Wanda	Concerned that the Naramata Village Settlement Areas boundary is more expansive than expected. Says there is a lack of affordable housing and that expansion of the upper (Lakeview) and lakeshore will not address this issue and that we should start by looking at what lots are already available. Concerned with the pace of change. Lists concerns surrounding water. Asks "Has the watershed survey announced by the Province in January been looked at? Is the watershed protected, perhaps by being dedicated Provincial park? Where will the run-off go as the amount of green space is replaced by concrete? Down our creeks into the water intake?"	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 (above). Supporting Policy 1G-4 speaks to applying supportive zoning to designated community watersheds under the <i>Forest and Range Practices Act</i> , to maintain and manage local water quality and quantity. Further regulations on watershed management are included within the electoral area OCP Bylaws. In British Columbia, private property owners are required to ensure that water being discharged from their property does not cause a "nuisance" (e.g. flooding or property damage) on any downstream properties. The Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure (MoTI), is responsible for the public road network and any drainage systems that have been constructed in the road reserve.
16.	Bertoia, Colleen	States that not enough information presented on costs and who pays for: sewer system, road development, water upgrades. Says the Naramata village already has small lots and doesn't need more density.	Not in support.	Copies of the current and past years RDOS Budget and Financial Statements are available for review on the RDOS website: https://www.rdos.bc.ca/finance/budget-and-financial-statements/ Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 (above). Please see response to traffic concerns at Line No. 4 (above).
17.	Blanche, Robert	"Leave Naramata Development Alone. No to exploitation of a beautiful small town"	Not in support.	No comment.
18.	Blann, Chris	Does not support the Naramata Village Settlement Area, supports the status quo for Naramata. Asks questions related to sewer: "Where does the 2 acre plant go? Who pays for it?"	Not in support.	To provide feedback or learn more about the development of a Liquid Waste (Sewage) Management Plan for Naramata visit: https://storymaps.arcgis.com/stories/b733002949fa42e582d293edd1742a51 or email info@rdos.bc.ca
19.	Boncey, Leigh	Suggest that better public transportation be looked at. States that density should remain in the town proper (Oliver) and that any new retail or building improvement above a certain amount be required to have residential above or behind the building.	[not stated]	BC Transit provides transit services within communities in the RGS Area. Transit related policies are included under the Infrastructure and Transportation section (section 3) of the RGS (see policies 3D-5 and 3D-6). Amendments to section 3 of the bylaw is outside of the scope of current review but may be part of a future RGS review. Additional public transit policies are included within the various electoral area and municipal OCP Bylaws as well as in the Transit Future Plan for the Okanagan Similkameen.

COLOUR LEGEND:

Electoral Area "A"
 Electoral Area "C"
 Electoral Area "D"
 Electoral Area "E"
 Electoral Area "F"
 Electoral Area "I"
 Penticton
 Unknown

LINE NO.	NAME	SUMMARY OF COMMENT	INDICATED POSITION	ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE
				Please see response to growth in electoral areas at Line No. 14 (above).
20.	Bonnett, Cliff	Wishes for the Naramata Village Settlement to match what is in currently in the Area "E" OCP.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 (above).
21.	Borhi, Elizabeth	Asks if consideration has been given for the fact that the South Okanagan is arid and our water supply is limited. Concerned that increased growth and development will put stress on the water supply. (Penticton Resident)	[not stated]	Please see response to water usage at Line No. 12 (above).
22.	Botsford, Tim	Concerns surrounding the RGS in relation to increased Traffic on Naramata Road, lack of regulations/restriction on maintaining mature trees in the village, impact on quiet life in the village. Asks how local village character will be preserved should the amendment be approved and how the approval process for new development will be guided by local values and input.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 (above). Please see response to traffic concerns at Line No. 4 (above).
23.	Bottaro, Melvin	Requests that the Naramata Village Settlement Area be reduced in size to match the Naramata Village Centre as defined in the Electoral Area "E" OCP Bylaw	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 (above).
24.	Bouwmeester, Tim and Laurie	Requests that the Naramata Village Settlement Area be reduced in size to match the Naramata Village Centre as defined in the Electoral Area "E" OCP Bylaw. Concerned that the proposed Village Settlement Area would result in more traffic on Naramata Road that Naramata is already at or over capacity. Concerns for congestion and safety in emergency situation.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 (above). Please see response to traffic concerns at Line No. 4 (above).
25.	Brennan, Christine	Not in support.	Not in support.	No comment.
26.	Brown, Adele & Randy	Not supportive of further densifying Naramata, concerned it will lose its unique and attractive atmosphere.	Not in support.	No comment.
27.	Brungardt, Richard	Asks that the Naramata Village Settlement Area be reduced in size to match the current Naramata Village Centre Area identified in the Electoral Area "E" OCP.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 (above).
28.	Chaise, Cindie	Not in support.	Not in support.	No comment.
29.	Chapman, John	Provides background information on his property regarding storm water and sewer in the sage mesa area. Thought that Greater West Bench (GWB) areas would be considered for inclusion as a Rural Growth Area which would provide confirmation of RDOS support for pursuing sewer connection to Sage Mesa and encourages that the GWB be considered for inclusion as a rural growth area as part of the current review. Provides supportive reasoning for this suggestion.	[not stated]	Section 7.2.1.4 of the Electoral Area "F" OCP Bylaw No. 2790, 2018, states the following: <i>Subject to sewer and stormwater servicing, and community input, will explore designating the areas of potential 'pocket development' shown on Figure 15 within the greater West Bench area as a Rural Growth Area during the next Electoral Area "F" OCP Bylaw No. 2790, 2018 28 scheduled South Okanagan RGS review (2020).</i> The respondents property is shown on Figure 15 of the OCP as one of the "potential areas for future densification." To date, sewer and stormwater infrastructure has not been provided to the Greater West Bench area that would allow for new growth areas under the RGS to be considered for this area.
30.	Chapman, Tom	Found the process flawed due to COVID protocols. "Difficult to align with the questions and formulations as proposed". Feels the process needs to be revisited and carried out in a manner more in keeping with standard sub-RGS reviews.	Not in support.	There were no COVID protocols restricting the public consultation process for the RGS review which occurred in July to September 2022. The concerns expressed <i>may</i> relate to the public consultation process and events held in relation to the Electoral Area "E" OCP review.

COLOUR LEGEND:

Electoral Area "A"
 Electoral Area "C"
 Electoral Area "D"
 Electoral Area "E"
 Electoral Area "F"
 Electoral Area "I"
 Penticton
 Unknown

LINE NO.	NAME	SUMMARY OF COMMENT	INDICATED POSITION	ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE
31.	Cooke, Bonny	Naramata Village is a high functioning, long established community and increased density will alter that. Increase density in the hills instead where there is no community to disrupt. People want to age in pace in the village as they know it (quiet, green space) and this should be supported. "Start opening up Crown land to drop housing costs, and reinvigorate resource- based communities.... populate the North..." Pave 202 road and develop along road 202.	[not stated]	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 (above). Encouraging development of the hillsides east of Naramata would represent "rural sprawl", and runs counter to the current RGS objectives of prioritizing infill development, establishing growth boundaries and ensuring the new infrastructure is provide in a cost-effective manner. The release of Crown land is a provincial matter, as would be the upgrading of the 201 Forestry Service Road between Kelowna and Penticton, and any upgrades of the road network through Naramata to Kelowna.
32.	Cooke, Judy	States that densification will not solve the issue of empty homes and that this issue should be resolved first. Naramata should be kept as a "village".	Not in support.	No comment.
33.	Cossentine, Anne	The Village Settlement Areas is too large and should be reduced in size. Feels the proposed amendment does not adequately reinforce the regions opposition to municipal development beyond a compact core. Supports an unoccupied home tax for the whole region. The proposed amendments fail to address/restrict short term rental. Supports the removal of Greata Ranch as a Growth Area and the addition of DRAO to the bylaw. Suggests that the word "extensive" in policy 1-G is too broad and may contradict its intent. Feels the objective and supporting policies in the Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation section are not ambitious enough and the timelines should be shortened. Suggests the addition of a policy which discourages further fossil fuel infrastructure in the region.	[not stated]	Please see response to vacation rental concerns at Line No. 4 (above). Please see response to Speculation/Empty Home Tax at Line No. 9 (above). Use of the term "extensive" in policy 1-G to be discussed by the Technical Advisory Committee on defining this term or determining a more appropriate term.
34.	Coulter, Patrick	Requests that the Naramata Village Settlement Area be reduced in size to match the Naramata Village Centre as defined in the Electoral Area "E" OCP Bylaw.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 (above).
35.	Daly, Bob & Sheila	Commented that they are unsure if the RGS is the way to address it but subdivisions in OK Falls are squeezing lower income residents out of the community. Suggests co-op, mixed-income housing or development rules requiring a percentage of any new development be below-market rent.	[not stated]	Section 4B-3 of the RGS currently speaks to: "Support [for] a range of accessible and affordable housing."
36.	Davies, Betsy	In favour of the Village Settlement Area. Says Naramata village needs a sewer system, development, more density and affordable housing so younger families can afford to live in Naramata.	Supportive of the proposed amendment.	Please see response to development of a Liquid waste (Sewage) Management Plan for Naramata at Line No. 18 (above).
37.	De Raadt, Jacob	Suggests that bolder colours be used on the Maps. Notes that "nobody of the single largest ethnic community of agricultural residents (most of them orchardists and vineyardists) of Area 'A' attended the Open House" held in Osoyoos and it may be premature to continue with the amendment without their input on Goal 7 (Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation). Asks that his small holding property be permitted agriculture as a principal use.	[not stated]	The colour pallet used for the growth management map will be reviewed. An interactive mapping tool is available to more easily navigate what classifications apply to each property: https://rdos.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=e5a5092427d440e8b618918ba00f39f5 With regard to the demographics of open house attendees, an effort to notify as many residents affected by the RGS review as possible of when/where/how to obtain more information and how to provide feedback on the proposed amendment to the RGS bylaw unaddressed mailers were sent to all addresses throughout the South Okanagan Sub-RGS Area advertising the public open house events and other ways to learn more information on

COLOUR LEGEND:

Electoral Area "A"
 Electoral Area "C"
 Electoral Area "D"
 Electoral Area "E"
 Electoral Area "F"
 Electoral Area "I"
 Penticton
 Unknown

LINE NO.	NAME	SUMMARY OF COMMENT	INDICATED POSITION	ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE
		Makes recommendations for textual and grammatical changes to pages 1 to 14 of the amendment bylaw. Asks that the climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation section be removed as "there is no "scientific consensus" at all, locally, provincially, nationally and internationally" about climate change.		the project. The events were also advertised by newspaper advertisement, on Facebook and through Voyent Alert! The respondent's property is currently zoned Agriculture One (AG1), which lists "agriculture" as a principal permitted use. The property is currently designated Small Holdings (SH) under the Electoral Area "A" OCP Bylaw. With regard to the concerns about textual and grammatical changes, these have been reviewed and changes will be made as appropriate. The RDOS in partnership with its member municipalities, developed regionally coordinated Climate Action Plans (CAPs). The CAPs provide targets to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in local government operations as well as community-wide emissions reductions. These efforts are in response to Provincial legislative requirements to have targets, policies and actions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions set in our local OCPs, and to undertake voluntary commitments made by our local governments under the BC Climate Action Charter.
38.	Dicken, Gary	Would like Naramata to remain as is, does not want increased density which will ruin the rural nature of the area.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above).
39.	Doering, Lynn	Notes several infrastructure challenges such as sewage treatment, water quality, Naramata Road, preservation of trees and green spaces, how the school and other community services will cope with increased population, and the need for housing affordability for people living and working in the area. States that a well thought out, carefully managed plan is necessary where additions are made as infrastructure changes allow.	[not stated]	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above).
40.	Doroshuk, Eric	Wants Naramata to remain a village not a high density centre.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above).
41.	Douglas, Barbara	Concern that the proposed amendment will result in densification resulting in more temporary occupants and vacation rentals.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above). Please see response to vacation rental concerns at Line No. 4 (above).
42.	Evans, Janyce	Expressed that "if it's not broken... do not attempt to fix it" and that the increased taxes for the Naramata village residence is unacceptable and will be a hardship for many.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above). The proposed RGS amendments are policies statements and do not relate to current or proposed taxation levels.
43.	Felton, Lynne	Requests that the Naramata Village Settlement Area be reduced in size to match the Naramata Village Centre as defined in the Electoral Area "E" OCP Bylaw.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above).
44.	Gale, Stefanie	Concerned with development and higher density in the Naramata Village Area. Concerned that as the RGS overrides the OCP, development, zoning changes may take precedent over community wishes. Would like the Village Settlement Area to be re-drawn and for the OCP to have more input.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above). Under Section 445(1) of the <i>Local Government Act</i> : <i>All bylaws adopted by a regional district board after the board has adopted a regional growth strategy, and all services undertaken by a regional district after the board has adopted a regional growth strategy, must [emphasis added] be consistent with the regional growth strategy.</i> Accordingly, the OCP will not be "overridden", instead, it will be updated to be consistent with the RGS (as required by legislation).

COLOUR LEGEND:

Electoral Area "A"
 Electoral Area "C"
 Electoral Area "D"
 Electoral Area "E"
 Electoral Area "F"
 Electoral Area "I"
 Penticton
 Unknown

LINE NO.	NAME	SUMMARY OF COMMENT	INDICATED POSITION	ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE
				Please see response to changes in zoning, permitted uses, density and community input at Line No. 22 (above).
45.	Gammer, Nick & Berna	Do not want increased density in the Naramata Village (Such as townhouses and duplexes). Requests that Naramata Village be low density designation and that the Naramata Village Settlement Area be reduced in size to match the Naramata Village Centre as defined in the Electoral Area "E" OCP Bylaw.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above).
46.	Gane, Mike & Christine	<p>"subject to servicing requirements" needs to be clarified.</p> <p>Kaleden residents voted against a community sewer system and do not want multi-home septic systems.</p> <p>Asks that Kaleden be removed from the RGS entirely.</p> <p>Policy IB-6 speaks to maintaining primary school facilities in Village Settlement Areas - How will the RDOS protect Kaleden elementary?</p> <p>Asks who the RDOS should be representing: "the citizens living in the Okanagan Similkameen; or the developers and investors who want to exploit the Okanagan Similkameen for monetary benefit?".</p> <p>RDOS allowed Naramata Benchlands – why?</p> <p>RDOS allowed Heritage Hills which "was not done according to subdivision rules of one hectare per lot for individual septic systems"...and they were "allowed a community septic system that is now failing. Does the RDOS have a plan to fix it or have the authority to make the developer pay for it.</p>	[not stated]	<p>The reference to "subject to servicing requirements" can be reviewed, but is generally a reference to the provision of community water and sewer and is usually detailed further in OCP, zoning and subdivision servicing bylaws.</p> <p>The draft amendment bylaw was prepared prior to the vote on the Kaleden Sewer Expansion Project. The RDOS Board has indicated that it will consider a review of zoning regulations in Kaleden in 2023 as a result of recent strata septic system proposals.</p> <p>The removal of Kaleden as a growth area is not supported for many of the same reasons as outline in relation to Naramata in Line 3 (above).</p> <p>The Regional District has the ability to regulate land use and can use this authority to require that the use of the Kaleden Elementary School site is for educational and related purposes.</p> <p>With regard to who the RDOS should be representing, the Board's Mission Statement is "To initiate and implement policies which preserve and enhance the quality of life and serve the broader public interest in an effective, equitable, environmental and fiscally responsible manner."</p> <p>The development of the Naramata Benchland site was determined by the Board to be consistent with its land use objectives and policies.</p> <p>Heritage Hills was subdivided in accordance with the Regional District's Subdivision Servicing Bylaw.</p> <p>The failure of the community septic system at Heritage Hills is being addressed by the province.</p>
47.	Garfield, Ray	"We don't need/want it" – Naramata Resident	Not in support.	No comment.
48.	Gibbs, Martin	"Naramata is no longer Naramata stop the new developments"	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above).
49.	Gillard, Lori	Asks that the Naramata Village Settlement Area be reduced in size to match the current Naramata Village Centre Area identified in the Electoral Area "E" OCP.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above).
50.	Gingara, Brian	"Profiteering: Only the locals & business (Local) should profit from this historic town!!"	Not in support.	No comment.
51.	Gingell, Janie	States that the density result should be "a result of the OCP plan not the precursor". Asks that the RDOS delay any decision on the RGS until the Electoral Area "E" OCP is complete. Does not support doubling the housing density in Naramata, suggests a smaller area, if at all. Duplexes should only be allowed on parcels above a certain size and the number of apartments units per block and the height of them should be restricted. Suggests vacation	Not in support.	<p>Please see response to the relationship between an RGS and an OCP at Line No. 44 (above).</p> <p>Permitted uses, density, and height is defined through the OCP and Zoning Bylaw.</p> <p>Please see response to vacation rental concerns at Line No. 4 (above).</p> <p>Please see response to ecosystem protection within the RGS Bylaw and development in sensitive ecosystems and riparian areas at Line No. 14 (above).</p> <p>Please see response to traffic concerns at Line No. 4 (above).</p>

COLOUR LEGEND:

Electoral Area "A"
 Electoral Area "C"
 Electoral Area "D"
 Electoral Area "E"
 Electoral Area "F"
 Electoral Area "I"
 Penticton
 Unknown

LINE NO.	NAME	SUMMARY OF COMMENT	INDICATED POSITION	ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE
		rental TUPs be required to have a long-term tenant of property owner on site. Clearcutting should be banned and plans should define what trees or shrubbery are to be retained or removed. Concerns regarding traffic on Naramata Road in the event of an emergency.		
52.	Goldman, Lori	Asks that the Naramata Village Settlement Area be reduced in size to match the current Naramata Village Centre Area identified in the Electoral Area "E" OCP.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above).
53.	Graham, Peter	Naramata does not have the tax base to cover the proposed capital projects. Residents outside of the proposed growth area will not vote to pay for projects in the growth area. Asks why Naramata is in the same category as Kaleden and Gallagher Lake and asks if Naramata has the water supply to support growth. Naramata Water Distribution system requires upgrading prior to growth.	Not in support.	The Regional District generally seeks to find grant funding opportunities to off-set the cost of major capital infrastructure projects. As per draft Amendment Bylaw No. 2770.02; "Village Settlement Areas are generally historic communities that were established to serve as the local hub for surrounding agricultural land development in the early 20 th Century, but were never incorporated." Please see response to water concerns at Line No. 12 (above).
54.	Grant, Gayle & Rick	Not in support of the proposed amendments	Not in support.	No comment.
55.	Gritten, Robert	Does not take issue with the concept of a RGS setting boundaries and recommended density and form of development to occur within those boundaries but does have some concerns. Densification should only occur in a format that fits the existing village character. Naramata Village Settlement Area should be reduced to a reasonable walking distance from the village core. If sewer is introduced the boundary and density can be amended. "Educate the population to what 30, 60 or 75 units per hectare looks like. Confirm that there has never been development within area E that is greater than 30, despite comments to the contrary. Publicly debate what metric is relevant to Naramata in the context of form of development." "Review the work resulting from committee and community input to the OCP and other relevant initiatives and incorporate preferences of the community into the RGS."		Please see response to development of a Liquid waste (Sewage) Management Plan for Naramata at Line No. 18 (above). A strict adherence to "existing character" can be challenging as it is difficult to define and can be used to frustrate new development proposals. Acceptable walking distance for basic amenities can vary between 400 metres to 1km depending on location and topography and the type of amenity being accessed. This measurement <i>could</i> capture many of the lands being proposed for inclusion in the "Village Settlement Area." Preparing visual materials that present various levels of density can be explored. The Regional District does not keep stats on the actual density occurring on properties, but a couple of random examples of existing density levels within the village area indicate the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 650 Ellis Avenue (18-unit townhouse on 0.7 ha): 26 units/ha 210-290 Anna Avenue (9-unit townhouse on 0.3 ha): 28 units/ha 126 Robinson Avenue (12-unit apartment building on 0.26 ha): 47 units/ha Please see response to the relationship of the RGS Bylaw to all other bylaws adopted by a local government at Line No. 44 (above). The RGS is a regional bylaw that must be supported by multiple local governments.
56.	Grove, Alan	Feels the proposed amendment are in contradiction to the results of recent project/survey results for Naramata. Concern that single family dwelling will be diminished in favor of higher density (duplex/triplex/multi-unit dwelling that will place too much population pressure on the area. Economic development is necessary but should occur mindfully. The current Village center is the area for small amounts of growth. The character of the community should be preserved. Concerns surrounding infrastructure and the single road in and out of Naramata.	Not in support.	The survey for Naramata was completed as part of the Electoral Area "E" OCP Review, which remains on-going and has not been finalized. The Regional District is aware of the comments provided by the residents of Electoral Area "E" regarding growth management objectives and policies. Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above). No comment regarding economic development occurring "mindfully". Please see response regarding how the Village Settlement Area will be incorporated into the OCP at Line No. 44 (above).

COLOUR LEGEND:

Electoral Area "A"
 Electoral Area "C"
 Electoral Area "D"
 Electoral Area "E"
 Electoral Area "F"
 Electoral Area "I"
 Penticton
 Unknown

LINE NO.	NAME	SUMMARY OF COMMENT	INDICATED POSITION	ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE
				Please see response to traffic concerns at Line No. 4 (above).
57.	Gunning, Cam	Supports smart densification in Naramata and would like to see people living in the village. Feels the RGS doesn't have adequate protection against vacation rental. Need for historic protection and tree protection prior to allowing a growth area as suggested. Asks that the village settlement area be kept to the Naramata Village Centre and that that area be developed with community consultation to work towards having people living in Naramata full time.	Not in support.	Please see response to vacation rental concerns at Line No. 4 (above). Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above). Heritage Conservation is addressed under Part 15 of the <i>Local Government Act</i> and requires that the Regional District adopt separate bylaws for this purpose. Heritage Conservation can impose certain obligations, including financial on a community seeking to undertake the historic protection of buildings. Under Section 509 of the <i>Local Government Act</i> , the RDOS Board may only regulate the removal of trees in areas that have been designated as being subject to flooding, erosion, land slip or avalanche.
58.	Hackworth, Nicole	States that the introduction of sewer services will allow low density residential to be utilized up to 45 units for duplexes per hectare which will change the landscape of Naramata village. Feels that a jump to medium density for a new larger village centre would be detrimental to the village. Supports the village centre remaining medium density and its current size and for the rest to remain low density.	Not in support.	Please see response to development of a Liquid waste (Sewage) Management Plan for Naramata at Line No. 18 (above). Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above). Please see response to changes in zoning, permitted uses or density at Line No. 22 (above).
59.	Hackworth, Ross	Feels low density, not medium density would better serve Naramata.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above).
60.	Halfhide, Dennis	Does not support the proposed size of the Village Settlement area or medium density for this area. Feels that the current village size is adequate. Supports a sewage system for the current Naramata Village Centre area. Does not support housing on the hillside or in the village which sit empty or are used for vacation rental. Recommends vacation rentals be required to have an owner on site. Sites concerns with water and storm water for hillside development. Concerns with Naramata Road being the single road in the event of a fire.	[not stated]	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above). Please see response to development of a Liquid waste (Sewage) Management Plan for Naramata at Line No. 18 (above). Please see response to vacation rental concerns at Line No. 4 (above). Please see response to concerns regarding run-off at Line No. 15 (Above). Please see response to traffic concerns at Line No. 4 (above).
61.	Halladay, D. Ray	No further development above the KVR. Maintain existing building standards in Electoral Area "E". Supports the Naramata Village Settlement Area with the limitations that "all ALR, streams, gullies and other protected areas are protected from any and all adjoining development of any kind". "A sewage treatment facility is designed and included in planned zoning that will service all areas proposed for development by the year 2030" and that "a second major access road connecting Naramata village to Penticton is developed"	Supports the proposed amendments with some changes.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above). ALR land is proposed to be classified "Agriculture Area", supportive policy 1F-10 supports efforts to minimize conflicts between farm and non-farm uses through edge planning in an effort to preserve ALR and agricultural land for incompatible neighbouring land uses. Please see response to development in sensitive ecosystems and riparian areas at Line No. 14 (above). Please see response to watershed protection at Line 15 (above). Please see response to development of a Liquid Waste (Sewage) Management Plan for Naramata at Line No. 18 (above). Please see response to traffic concerns at Line No. 4 (above).
62.	Handfield, Robert	Supports most of the proposed amendments except for density infill in Kaleden. Kaleden is not a suitable area to build multi-unit housing due to steep terrain and small lots. Infrastructure improvements (community sewer and road improvements) are necessary if higher density housing is to occur. Kaleden should be removed from the designated growth area.	Not in support.	Please see response to the link between growth and servicing at Line No. 3 & 21 (above).

COLOUR LEGEND:

Electoral Area "A"
 Electoral Area "C"
 Electoral Area "D"
 Electoral Area "E"
 Electoral Area "F"
 Electoral Area "I"
 Penticton
 Unknown

LINE NO.	NAME	SUMMARY OF COMMENT	INDICATED POSITION	ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE
63.	Hanna, Trevor & Stacey	Supportive reducing the Villages Settlement Area to size of the current Naramata Village Centre in the Electoral Area "E" OCP. Discourage densification of the village. Not supportive of a community sewer system. Do not support large scale hillside development. Given the one road in and out of Naramata "Increasing traffic is irresponsible".	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 (above). Please see response to development of a Liquid Waste (Sewage) Management Plan for Naramata at Line No. 18 (above). Please see response to traffic concerns at Line No. 4 (above).
64.	Hardardt, K	Supportive of the proposed amendment	Supports the proposed amendment.	No comment.
65.	Hardman, Debra	Supportive of the current Naramata Village Centre in the Electoral Area "E" OCP. "The balance of Naramata to be classified as rural residential, Agricultural area or Agricultural Land Reserve."	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above).
66.	Hawes, Sharon	Not in support. Naramata has infrastructure limitations that need to be addressed prior to densification such as the one road in and out of the village. Asks if the road will be widened. States that the Village water supply is inadequate for increased density and needs to be sufficient and sustainable. Asks who will pay for a sewer and treatment facility and what the timeline would be, who in the village would have sewer service. Concern that the limited police enforcement and volunteer fire department at present levels would be insufficient for an increased population. More stores and services would be required if density increases. Asks if the zoning accommodates this and if this proposal includes restrictions on where structures can or can't be built. Asks how the best aspects of the village be preserved.	Not in support.	Please see response to traffic concerns at Line No. 4 (above). Please see response to water concerns at Line No. 12 (above). Please see response to development of a Liquid Waste (Sewage) Management Plan for Naramata at Line No. 18 (above). Please see response to changes in zoning, permitted uses or density at Line No. 22 (above).
67.	Henderson, Craig	Requests that the Naramata Village Settlement Area be reduced in size to match the Naramata Village Centre as defined in the Electoral Area "E" OCP Bylaw.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above).
68.	Hirse Korn, Linda	Supports the notion of tourism development and amenities to support tourism but does not support the proposed level of densification without addressing the following issues: egress/ingress and the lack of long-term rental accommodation.	Not in support.	Please see response to traffic concerns at Line No. 4 (above).
69.	Hoath, Kim	Not supportive of higher density in Naramata or hillside development. The Naramata Village Settlement Area should be limited to the Naramata Centre area. States that "any new planning should engage the locals with full disclosure of plants, green trail routes, planning for park and tree protection and emergency evacuation in the event of wildfire or other imminent risk". Suggests a hovercraft, water taxi service as a creative transit option.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above). The RGS is a regional bylaw that must be supported by multiple local governments.
70.	Hoiss, Sybil	Notes that the climate change section doesn't mention encouraging tree canopies within city limits, promoting tree planning or protection of trees. Highlights the benefits of having healthy tree canopies in urban areas.	[not stated]	Please see response to tree regulation at Line No. 57 (above).
71.	Jackes, Renate	Feels there wasn't community involvement in the creation of the strategy. Does not support higher density in the Naramata village. Opposed to multi-	Not in support.	The RGS is a regional bylaw that must be supported by multiple local governments and was originally drafted between 2004 and 2010 before being adopted on April 1, 2010.

COLOUR LEGEND:

Electoral Area "A"
 Electoral Area "C"
 Electoral Area "D"
 Electoral Area "E"
 Electoral Area "F"
 Electoral Area "I"
 Penticton
 Unknown

LINE NO.	NAME	SUMMARY OF COMMENT	INDICATED POSITION	ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE
		family development on Hayman Road. Concerned that this amendment will mean large development will occur with little or no community consultation/feedback or that the amendment will mean that the lots across from her home will now be zone for multifamily development.		Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above). Please see response to changes in zoning, permitted uses or density at Line No. 22 (above).
72.	James, Sian	Supports housing for locals and maintaining the village character, not big developments for rich absent owners.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above).
73.	Johnstone, Keith & Susan Seddon	"We do not support the proposed amendment to the South Okanagan sub RGS at this time."	Not in support.	No Comment.
74.	Jones, Dick & Darlene	Feels we should stick to the recommendations in the Electoral Area "E" OCP. A sewer system is needed to improve lake water quality, but not at the expense of getting high density housing.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above). Please see response to development of a Liquid waste (Sewage) Management Plan for Naramata at Line No. 18 (above).
75.	Karr, Mary Alyce	"Naramata slow not Naramata grow"	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above).
76.	Kato, Don & Judy	Asks that the "downtown" be kept to the current Naramata Village Centre area and that sewer be brought into only that area to begin with. Concerns regarding access to potable water and the amount of effluent going in to the lake if housing is doubled.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above). Please see response to development of a Liquid waste (Sewage) Management Plan for Naramata at Line No. 18 (above).
77.	Kellough, Mary	Feels the strategy does not address infrastructure issues related to greater density (transportation, sewage, policing). Taxation for empty homes and rules around vacation rentals in Naramata should be addressed prior to increasing density.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above). Please see response to development of a Liquid waste (Sewage) Management Plan for Naramata at Line No. 18 (above). Policing are outside of the Regional District's jurisdiction. Please see response to vacation rental concerns at Line No. 4 (above).
78.	Kerford, Sandra	Opposes the inclusion of Hayman Road in the Naramata Village Settlement Area.	[not stated]	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above).
79.	Kerford, Scott	Opposes the inclusion of Hayman Road in the Naramata Village Settlement Area. Opposes any changes to building rules (setbacks, parcel coverage, building height, number of buildings on a lot).	[not stated]	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above). Building envelopes are regulated through zoning bylaws.
80.	Kirschmann, Sue	Asks that the Naramata Village Settlement Area be reduced in size to match the current Naramata Village Centre Area identified in the Electoral Area "E" OCP. Concerned with the effects of developments, tourism, cycling, and emergency situations on Naramata Road. Feels the inclusion of the word "generally" in policy 1B-3 leaves the door open for the RGS to supersede the communities' wishes. Asks that wording be added to 1B-8 to say that precedence will be given to businesses that are year round and provide amenities for residents. 1D-4 - suggest the word "generally" be removed to strengthen the policy. 1F-9 - asks if restrictions can be added to restrict the number or percentage of rooms that can be for non-farm use. 1G-4 - asks that the word "designated" be removed so that the policy applies to all watershed.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above). Please see response to traffic concerns at Line No. 4 (above). With regard to the inclusion of the term "generally" in policies 1B-3 and 1D-4; the RGS is a regional bylaw that must be supported by multiple local governments. The RGS contains objectives and policy statement not regulations that can be enforced to the exact wording – there is discretion at the board table to assess the merits of an application against these policy statements. With regard to the suggestion for policy No. 1B-8, the Regional District generally does not have the legal authority to regulate commercial businesses in this way. With regard to the suggestion for policy No. 1F-9, local governments do have the authority to regulate the size and number of accessory dwellings on lands in the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR). The Regional District currently does regulate these matters, but it is not clear what the respondent is seeking.

COLOUR LEGEND:

Electoral Area "A"
 Electoral Area "C"
 Electoral Area "D"
 Electoral Area "E"
 Electoral Area "F"
 Electoral Area "I"
 Penticton
 Unknown

LINE NO.	NAME	SUMMARY OF COMMENT	INDICATED POSITION	ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE
				With regard to the suggestion for policy No. 1G-4, the Regional District has historically relied on the province to formally “designate” community watersheds under Section 150 of the <i>Forest and Range Practices Act</i> . Removing the word “watershed” would have the policy apply to <i>all</i> lands within the Regional District and member municipalities.
81.	Lacis, Norbert	Asks that the Naramata Village Settlement Area be reduced in size to match the current Naramata Village Centre Area identified in the Electoral Area "E" OCP. Asks why such a significant change is proposed while the OCP is under review.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above). The <i>Local Government Act</i> requires any regional district with an RGS to consider an update to their RGS once every five years. The current RGS Review was commenced in 2020 whereas the current Electoral Area “E” OCP Bylaw Review was commenced in late 2021.
82.	Lacis, Patti	The small village of Naramata cannot support large developments. Small changes should be made over time. Asks where the Electoral Area "E" OCP fits into this and states the timing of the RGS review is poor.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above). NOTE: it is not agreed that the village of Naramata is unable to support development and it is not clear what is meant by the reference to “large developments”. Please see response to how village settlement area will be incorporated into the OCP at Line No. 44 (above). Please see response to the timing of the RGS review at Line No. 79 (above).
83.	Laminska Johnson, Elizabeth	Supports the proposed amendment if it does not lead to more vacation homes. Asks how the Vista development was approved and why.	Supports the proposed amendment.	Please see response to vacation rental concerns at Line No. 4 (above). Information regarding the rezoning of the land to facilitate the “Vista” development can be found here: https://www.rdos.bc.ca/development-services/planning/current-applications-decisions/electoral-area-e/e2010-001-zone
84.	Lende, Brenda	Does not support the proposed Village Settlement Area for Naramata or its objective to support higher density. Does not support the RGS population estimates for Area “E” as 42% of homes were not included.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above). Please see response to population estimate concerns at Line No. 9 (above).
85.	Lennie, Dawn	The proposed Village Settlement Area for Naramata is too large. 30 units a hectare should be the limit. Too many empty home and vacation homes. No development above the KVR.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above).
86.	Lennie, Doug	No development above the KVR. 30 units a hectare should be the limit. Too many vacation homes.	Not in support of the proposed amendment	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above).
87.	Lennie, Wyatt	Hopes that housing for vacation rental would decrease and permanent housing is increased.	Not in support of the proposed amendment	Please see response to vacation rental concerns at Line No. 4 (above).
88.	Lewko, Jack	Strongly disagrees with the proposed amendment. Concerned that Naramata road is already too busy.	Not in support.	Please see response to traffic concerns at Line No. 4 (above).
89.	Libby, Dave	Concern that even a small growth area for Kaleden will overwhelm the infrastructure (especially water) which is expensive to upgrade. Small communities need lots of time and forward planning to raise money for these changes and this should be taken in to consideration.	Neutral at this time.	The response to growth management at Line 3 (above) is seen to be applicable to Kaleden. Please see response to grant funding for major infrastructure projects at Line No. 53 (above).
90.	MacKay, Wendy	Would like more transparency and clarity for all RDOS department as to the processes, how taxpayer money has and will be spent, the opportunity to provide feedback as to how property owners want to proceed, breakdown of staffing and wages.	Not in support.	Copies of the RDOS budget and financial statements are available for review on the RDOS website: https://www.rdos.bc.ca/finance/budget-and-financial-statements

COLOUR LEGEND:

Electoral Area “A”
 Electoral Area “C”
 Electoral Area “D”
 Electoral Area “E”
 Electoral Area “F”
 Electoral Area “I”
 Penticton
 Unknown

LINE NO.	NAME	SUMMARY OF COMMENT	INDICATED POSITION	ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE
91.	Mackenzie, Barbara	Opposes the inclusion of Hayman Road in the Naramata Village Settlement Area.	[not stated]	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above).
92.	Mackenzie, Dave	Opposes the inclusion of Hayman Road in the Naramata Village Settlement Area. Growth will results in increased taxes to pay for infrastructure.	[not stated]	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above).
93.	Maisey, Ed & Gail	States that Naramata's infrastructure could not support the proposed density and that hemorrhaging trees and green space would be nonsense to do just to permit increased density.	Not in support.	Please see response to the link between growth and servicing at Line No. 21 (above). Please see response to ecosystem protection within the RGS Bylaw and development in sensitive ecosystems and riparian areas at Line No. 14 (above).
94.	Malette Kaolin	Concerned with current unregistered vacation homes in Naramata and that the amendment will increase tourist and vacation rental homes and the unaffordability for those who grew up in Naramata.	Not in support.	Please see response to vacation rental concerns at Line No. 4 (above). The RDOS operates under a complaint based enforcement process. If you are aware of vacation rentals operating without permit, you can submit a bylaw complaint form by email (bylaw@rdos.bc.ca), mail or drop-off at RDOS offices, so RDOS bylaw enforcement can investigate and work towards achieving compliance.
95.	Maloney, Tom	Not in support of the proposed amendments	Not in support.	No comment.
96.	March, Don	"We already over populated for the area"	Not in support.	No comment.
97.	March, Sandra	Naramata is a village not a town and needs to be kept this way. There is only one road in and out. The downtown core is overcrowded.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above). Please see response to traffic concerns at Line No. 4 (above).
98.	Marquis, Dennis	Concerned that the proposal would result in losing the reason why people love living in and visiting Naramata should the amendment go ahead.	Not in support.	No comment.
99.	May, Cecily	Asks that the Naramata Village Settlement Area be reduced in size to match the current Naramata Village Centre Area identified in the Electoral Area "E" OCP.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above).
100.	McClelland, Hugh	Asks that the Naramata Village Settlement Area be reduced in size to match the current Naramata Village Centre Area identified in the Electoral Area "E" OCP.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above).
101.	McConnell, Gail	Concerns with egress/safety in relation to fire, medical or police emergency. Asks who will be held accountable for decisions made at this time regarding development that will inevitably result in traffic on Naramata Road and within the village and how this traffic will be managed. Expressed that it isn't fair or reasonable for those with functioning septic systems to have to pay into a sewer system fee plan.	Not in support.	Please see response to traffic concerns at Line No. 4 (above). Please see response to development of a Liquid waste (Sewage) Management Plan for Naramata at Line No. 18 (above).
102.	McConnell, Mike	More information must be available to the public. Would not be fair to have to pay for sewers if you are currently on a good septic system. Naramata Road cannot handle increased traffic. Concern that more vacation rentals will be an outcome of the amendment. Will more sidewalks and streetlights be a result of the amendment? Concerns it will be more costly than residents can absorb.	Not in support.	Please see response to development of a Liquid waste (Sewage) Management Plan for Naramata at Line No. 18 (above). Please see response to traffic concerns at Line No. 4 (above). Please see response to vacation rental concerns at Line No. 4 (above). Sidewalks are currently administered by the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure (MoTI) as the authority responsible for the road network in the Regional District. If the community wanted sidewalks, this could be addressed by the Regional District through an agreement with the Ministry to take over this responsibility within a defined area and creation of a service area to fund the infrastructure.

COLOUR LEGEND:

Electoral Area "A"
 Electoral Area "C"
 Electoral Area "D"
 Electoral Area "E"
 Electoral Area "F"
 Electoral Area "I"
 Penticton
 Unknown

LINE NO.	NAME	SUMMARY OF COMMENT	INDICATED POSITION	ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE
				The Regional District supports a “dark skies” approach to street lighting and currently discourages the installation of street lighting outside of designated Primary and Rural Growth Areas in order to preserve the rural character of the electoral areas.
103.	McLellan, Tom	States that our population growth estimates are out of touch with home construction and development. The agricultural roots of Naramata need to be protected.	Not in support.	Please see response to the use of Census data at Line No. 9 (above). The 2021 Housing Needs Report prepared by the RDOS, Penticton, Summerland and Keremeos can be accessed here: https://www.rdos.bc.ca/assets/PLANNING/AreaX/2020/HNR/HousingAssessment.pdf Agricultural lands in Electoral Area “E” have generally been designated as Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR) by the provincial government. The preservation of ALR lands for agricultural uses is supported by the RGS.
104.	Mehrer, Rene	States that densification will result in too much traffic in and out of the Naramata village and will change the character of the village.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above). Please see response to traffic concerns at Line No. 4 (above).
105.	Miller, Billy	"Bullshit" – Naramata resident	Not in support.	No comment.
106.	Moon, Monica	The proposed amendment are not in the best interest of the environment, wildlife or residents of Naramata. The Naramata Village Settlement area is too large (doubling limits from 30 to 60 units per hectare). Concerns with hillside development (mudslides, slides and sink holes). Concerned with big trucks on narrow roads (Hayman Rd.)	[not stated]	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above). Please see response to traffic concerns at Line No. 4 (above).
107.	Murrin, Laurie	Concerned that the proposal would result in losing the reason why people love living in and visiting Naramata should the amendment go ahead.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above).
108.	Nixon, Alan	Current infrastructure will not support proposal. No guarantee of low cost or rental housing, likely more summer houses. Concerns that what makes Naramata an attractive destination will be lost and Naramata may become a “dormitory” for people working in Penticton. Black top concrete will increase surface water and will require a drainage system.	Not in support.	Please see response to link between growth and servicing at Line No. 21 (above). Please see response to concerns regarding run-off at Line No. 15 (Above).
109.	Palazoo Joseph & Kimberly	Densification will alter the character of Naramata village. Traffic on Naramata Road would be hazardous. No protection of greenery of the suggested area is included in the plan. A sewage treatment plant would be an added expense to the current tax base and is unwanted. Concerns for resident safety and added police costs. Concerns densification will result in more summer and rental housing which is not needed.	Not in support.	Please see response to traffic concerns at Line No. 4 (above). Please see response to ecosystem protection within the RGS Bylaw and development in sensitive ecosystems and riparian areas at Line No. 14 (above). Please see response to development of a Liquid waste (Sewage) Management Plan for Naramata at Line No. 18 (above).
110.	Pankiw, Bill	Not supportive of growth in Naramata. Concerned growth will bring crime and theft.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above).
111.	Peterson, Kell	“Request UBC and the government to restart the Canada, US, Sweden, (and Europe) (NA) interdisciplinary IISRE research initiative (The International Institute for Sustainable Regional Economies) at UBC, UNBC, WSU, MSU”	[not stated]	No comment.
112.	Pipars, Robert	Asks that the Naramata Village Settlement Area be reduced in size to match the current Naramata Village Centre Area identified in the Electoral Area "E" OCP. Asks that developers not be allowed to determine size, density and	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above). Please see response to changes in zoning, permitted uses or density at Line No. 22 (above). Please see response to traffic concerns at Line No. 4 (above). Please see response to protection of ALR lands at Line No. 101 (above).

COLOUR LEGEND:

Electoral Area “A”
 Electoral Area “C”
 Electoral Area “D”
 Electoral Area “E”
 Electoral Area “F”
 Electoral Area “I”
 Penticton
 Unknown

LINE NO.	NAME	SUMMARY OF COMMENT	INDICATED POSITION	ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE
		character of Naramata and that agriculture be supported. Concern that there is only one road in and out.		
113.	Pipers, Patricia	Existing infrastructure cannot support increased density in Naramata. Concerned about congestion on Naramata Road (Emergency situations). Roads off of Naramata road are too narrow. If a sewage treatment and piping and required existing residents will pay more than development.	Not in support.	Please see response to changes in zoning, permitted uses or density at Line No. 22 (above). Please see response to traffic concerns at Line No. 4 (above). Please see response to development of a Liquid waste (Sewage) Management Plan for Naramata at Line No. 18 (above).
114.	Pope, Bob & Lynda	Asks that the Naramata Village Settlement Area be reduced in size to match the current Naramata Village Centre Area identified in the Electoral Area "E" OCP. Not supportive of a sewer system to accommodate densification. Naramata Road requires improvement prior to increasing housing. Suggests vacation rental TUPs be required to have a long-term tenant of property owner on site.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above). Please see response to development of a Liquid waste (Sewage) Management Plan for Naramata at Line No. 18 (above). Please see response to traffic concerns at Line No. 4 (above). Please see response to vacation rental concerns at Line No. 4 (above).
115.	Repassy, Imre	Concern that the process and the RDOS cannot be trusted	Not in support.	No comment.
116.	Reynolds, Jeff	Does not support increased density in the village or in Naramata area	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above).
117.	Richardson, Ann	Concerns with increased densification as a result of the proposed densification which will result in "Dark houses" in the Naramata Village. Vacation Rentals need to be addressed in the RGS.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above). Please see response to vacation rental concerns at Line No. 4 (above).
118.	Riley, Dave	Supports the notion of tourism development and amenities to support tourism but does not support the proposed level of densification without addressing the following issues: egress/ingress and the lack of long-term rental accommodation in Naramata.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above). Please see response to traffic concerns at Line No. 4 (above).
119.	Rodger, Brian and Louise	Densification will alter the character of Naramata village. Traffic on Naramata Road would be hazardous. No protection of greenery of the suggested area is included in the plan. A sewage treatment plant would be an added expense to the current tax base and is unwanted. Concerns for resident safety and added police costs. Concerns densification will result in more summer and rental housing which is not needed.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above). Please see response to ecosystem protection within the RGS Bylaw and development in sensitive ecosystems and riparian areas at Line No. 14 (above). Please see response to traffic concerns at Line No. 4 (above). Please see response to development of a Liquid waste (Sewage) Management Plan for Naramata at Line No. 18 (above).
120.	Rollins, Mandy	Does not support the creation of a Village Settlement Area and its objective of higher density. Does not support the RGS population estimates for Area E as 42% of homes were not included. Does not support the amendment as the Electoral Area "E" OCP is in process.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above). Please see response to the relationship between an RGS and an OCP at Line No. 44 (above). Please see response to population estimate concerns at Line No. 9 (above).
121.	Roskell, Richard	Not supportive of the amendment to the RGS as it expands the area in the Naramata Village that may be used for high density.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above).
122.	Roulston, Earl	Concerned that higher density in Naramata will destroy the rural character and charm of the Naramata village	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above).
123.	Roy, Jean-Pierre	"Everyone currently living here, moved here as size and densification appealed to them. No change required".	Not in support.	No comment.

COLOUR LEGEND:

Electoral Area "A"
 Electoral Area "C"
 Electoral Area "D"
 Electoral Area "E"
 Electoral Area "F"
 Electoral Area "I"
 Penticton
 Unknown

LINE NO.	NAME	SUMMARY OF COMMENT	INDICATED POSITION	ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE
124.	Salting, Cyndie	Not in support of the proposed amendment	Not in support.	No comment.
125.	Sandunsky, Sarah	The “provision of a diverse range of housing types to meet the needs of all residents” in policy 1B-9 does not go far enough to capture the affordability gap, ensure the sustainability of rural communities, protect neighborhoods, and retain “a village-like character”. Proposes the following: a) Affordable housing for families, members of the workforce, and low-income residents be specifically prioritized in the Village Settlement Areas section of the RGS. b) Short-term vacation rentals be restricted to a bed-and-breakfast style of home-based business that requires at least one permanent resident to live within the property year-round.	Not in support.	Regulating housing in the way proposed (e.g. for workforce and low-income residents) would require the Regional District to become more actively engaged in the housing market (e.g. the creation of a Housing Authority might be one possibility). Generally, local governments will perform this roll by using tools such as “regional growth strategies, housing action plans, and zoning to support housing affordability.” Please see response to vacation rental concerns at Line No. 4 (above).
126.	Schaffer, patrick	Naramata road will not be able to accommodate increased population density which may lead to accidents on the road.	Not in support.	Please see response to traffic concerns at Line No. 4 (above).
127.	Sequeira, Janice	Asks that the Naramata Village Settlement Area be reduced in size to match the current Naramata Village Centre Area identified in the Electoral Area “E” OCP. Traffic in and out of Naramata should not increase. Vacation rentals/ seasonally occupied houses should be decreased or kept in check. Do not increase the stress on our environment (water system, air quality, green spaces).	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above). Please see response to vacation rental concerns at Line No. 4 (above).
128.	Shaw, Lauren	Asks that the Naramata Village Settlement Area be reduced in size to match the current Naramata Village Centre Area identified in the Electoral Area “E” OCP. Requests that future meetings regarding the RGS regarding Naramata would be open to the public. Requests that the RDOS redefine “growth” as the 2021 census data is not reflective of the fluctuating season population and rapid development in Electoral Area “E”.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above). Six (6) public open meetings were held in relation to the current RGS review throughout the south Okanagan RGS Area. Please see response to population estimate concerns at Line No. 9 (above).
129.	Shea, Carol	Proposed amendment doesn’t reference water use or fire protection which are major factors in growth.	Not in support.	A principal objective of the RGS is to encourage development and growth where basic services such as water and sewer infrastructure is available. Growth areas are generally provided with fire protection services, the exceptions being Greata Ranch and Twin Lakes.
130.	Sinclair, Barbara	Keep Naramata as is to current Naramata Village Centre - concerned with business and noise on Naramata Road and in the village, and ugly new buildings that may be built if proposal goes ahead.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above). Please see response to traffic concerns at Line No. 4 (above).
131.	Sinclair, James Douglas	Feels the Naramata area will be permanently harmed if the proposal goes ahead. Keep to existing Naramata Village Centre. Concerned with increased traffic and emergency situations (fire) on Naramata Road.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above). Please see response to traffic concerns at Line No. 4 (above).
132.	Skode, Shanda	There needs to be another road in and out of Naramata prior to any more housing. Naramata Road is over capacity (Concern for evacuation in event of fire). Water and run off from outlook has yet to be addressed. Naramata is unaffordable for many. Better infrastructure is required prior to more density. More housing will destroy the charm of the village.	[not stated]	Please see response to traffic concerns at Line No. 4 (above). Please see response to concerns regarding run-off at Line No. 15 (Above). Please see response to links between growth and servicing at Line No. 21 (above).

COLOUR LEGEND:

Electoral Area “A”
 Electoral Area “C”
 Electoral Area “D”
 Electoral Area “E”
 Electoral Area “F”
 Electoral Area “I”
 Penticton
 Unknown

LINE NO.	NAME	SUMMARY OF COMMENT	INDICATED POSITION	ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE
133.	Smallwood, Barb	Favours some growth for Naramata but is not in support of the proposed amendments to the RGS. The Village Settlement area designation would be costly and result in increased taxes. The Village should be protected from growth or changes to density. Naramata should not become a 'city'. New developments should be kept to 2-3 stories with 50% maximum parcel coverage. Maintain the scenery and character of the village.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above). Please see response to changes in zoning, permitted uses or density at Line No. 22 (above).
134.	Smiley, Joanne	Supports the proposed amendment if section 11.3.4 of the Electoral Area "E" OCP happens ("Supports a range of residential densities and parcel sizes for the existing residential areas in the Plan Area"). Low cost rental homes are necessary for families to live in Naramata and for the school to thrive. Limiting the conversion of low and midrange homes to vacation rentals is necessary.	Supports the proposed amendment.	Please see response to vacation rental concerns at Line No. 4 (above).
135.	Stokes, Graeme	"We moved to Naramata for its village, not to be part of an urban like development"	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above).
136.	Suremann, Beatrice & Ralph	"The RGS should not take precedence over the OCP."	Not in support.	Please see response to the relationship between an RGS and an OCP at Line No. 44 (above).
137.	Sutherland, Gary	Not in support of the proposed amendments	Not in support.	No comment
138.	Sutherland, Pam	Not in support of the proposed amendments	Not in support.	No comment
139.	Sutton, Chris	Concerned that the proposed amendment will put at risk the natural beauty and character of Naramata and could result in Naramata Centre closing and being replaced by condos. There is lots of opposition to densification in Naramata which has been made evident by other developments.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above).
140.	Szabo, Gil	Believes that the previous RGS and the proposed growth estimates in the RGS amendment are flawed and should be recalculated with a 1.5% annual growth rate.	[not stated]	The Regional District cannot mandate growth rates and, instead, merely tries to predict the most likely anticipated growth rate for a 20 year period based on historic trends and available data. Between 1996 and 2021, the RGS Area population increased by 16.91% with an average annual growth rate of 0.63%. Municipal areas increased 0.7% a year, while the Electoral Areas increased 0.36% a year. For these reasons, a 1.5% growth rate is unlikely to occur.
141.	Tauzer, David	Supports the concept of the RGS and Village Settlement Area, a more conservative boundary such as the current Naramata Village Centre would be more appropriate. Strategies should be implemented to address housing such as a speculation tax, changes to Vacation rental regulations to require a permanent resident to live on each rental property and more. The village cannot be densified until these issues have been addressed. Concerned for increased traffic on Naramata Road resulting from more housing. The potential construction of a Community Waste Management System would inadvertently allow development and densification in the area serviced. Requests that all future RGS review should be presented in open public meeting in each effected community, and that the RGS address and redefine the term "growth".	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above). Please see response to Speculation/Empty Home Tax at Line No. 9 (above). Please see response to vacation rental concerns at Line No. 4 (above). Please see response to traffic concerns at Line No. 4 (above). The construction of a community sewer system would not "inadvertently" allow development to occur. Please see response to development of a Liquid Waste (Sewage) Management Plan for Naramata at Line No. 18 (above). Six (6) open public meetings (5 in person, 1 on-line) were held in relation to the current RGS review throughout the south Okanagan RGS Area in an effort to engage with the many communities that participate in the bylaw.

COLOUR LEGEND:

Electoral Area "A"
 Electoral Area "C"
 Electoral Area "D"
 Electoral Area "E"
 Electoral Area "F"
 Electoral Area "I"
 Penticton
 Unknown

LINE NO.	NAME	SUMMARY OF COMMENT	INDICATED POSITION	ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE
142.	Tauzer, Lila	Does not support increasing the size of the Naramata Village settlement area or greater density in the village core. The current zoning and density is sufficient. Asks why this change is occurring now and who it is benefiting. The Naramata village character needs to be preserved. Suggests speculation/empty/ second home tax or bylaws to limit short term vacation rentals or requiring a long term renter or resident to be on site for vacation rentals.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above). Please see response to why an RGS review is occurring now and the frequency of RGS reviews at line No. 79 (above). Please see response to vacation rental concerns at Line No. 4 (above). Please see response to Speculation/Empty Home Tax at Line No. 9 (above).
143.	Taylor, Chad	Asks that the Naramata Village Settlement Area be the lower village only, no hillside in the boundary.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above).
144.	Taylor, Valerie	Asks that the Naramata Village Settlement Area be reduced in size to the lower village basin and off the hillsides.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above).
145.	Thomsen, Robert	"Don't destroy are village" – Naramata resident	Not in support.	No comment.
146.	Thomsen, Sandra	"Leave are village small and beautiful" – Naramata Resident.	Not in support.	No comment.
147.	Tomczuk, Katherine	Objects to densification for the following reasons: inadequate infrastructure, 40-45% of houses in Naramata are empty most of the year, wants to maintain Naramata's quality of life (not just seasonal vacation homes). Restrictions on vacation rentals should be imposed (residency requirements, speculation surcharge tax on other homes, more options for seniors and young families). The process should be reviewed in 5 years to see if medium density can be accommodated at that time. Feels the survey was skewed towards development from the start and RDOS planners have not listened to Naramatians wants/needs.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above). The proposed amendment links development to servicing and states that any new development of increased density would be subject to servicing requirements (such as upgrades to sewer or water). Please see response to vacation rental concerns at Line No. 4 (above). Please see response to why an RGS review is occurring now and the frequency of RGS reviews at line No. 79 (above). The RGS review did not include a survey. Perhaps talking about a survey circulated as part of the Electoral Area "E" Official Community Plan Review and update.
148.	Van Heerden, Elizabeth	Notes that the current Electoral Area "E" OCP includes the objective (10.2.2) to "prevent rural sprawl by limiting development on small holdings" but that the boundary for the proposed Village Settlement Area for Naramata include 53 small holding properties (10 "farm status", another 13 actively used for agriculture and other for hobby farms. States that "This boundary is NOT in the current OCP and RGS cannot unilaterally draw the boundaries without the OCP BYLAWS supporting such boundaries."	Not in support.	The Small Holdings (SH) properties referenced in the representation are generally not in the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR) and should be considered for re-development subject to the provision of water and sewer infrastructure. Please see response to the relationship between an RGS and an OCP at Line No. 44 (above).
149.	Van Heerden, Schalk	"Schedule 'B' map shows the new classification of Village Settlement Area for Naramata without any qualification that the boundaries are conceptual only and to be determined by an updated OCP for Area 'E'." Inclusion of small holding lots contradicts proposed RGS policy 1B-2 and Area "E" OCP objective 10.2 The existing Naramata Village centre fulfills proposed RGS objective 1-B – asks why increase the Village Settlement area beyond the NVC? The terms "growth" and "Development" are not defined. "Singular metric for evaluation of Growth and Development does not render credible results for the Board or Administration." As nearly half of property owners in Area "E" having principal residences outside of Area "E" meaning	Not in support.	Please see response to the relationship between an RGS and an OCP at Line No. 44 (above). Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above).

COLOUR LEGEND:

Electoral Area "A"
 Electoral Area "C"
 Electoral Area "D"
 Electoral Area "E"
 Electoral Area "F"
 Electoral Area "I"
 Penticton
 Unknown

LINE NO.	NAME	SUMMARY OF COMMENT	INDICATED POSITION	ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE
		that population census data does not actually reflect stresses being placed on current and future local resources (“roads, storm water drainage, potable/irrigation water purveys, fire protection services and eventual community liquid water management systems”) during peak seasons.		
150.	Van Westen, Anna & Jacob	Naramata Road is not big enough to support proposed amendments and would be a disaster in the event of an emergency. Village would be lost with housing over 2 stories in height. Sewer system will disturb underground springs, creeks and rivers. Study is necessary to determine what level of growth can be handled in the Naramata village/area.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above). Please see response to traffic concerns at Line No. 4 (above). Please see response to development of a Liquid waste (Sewage) Management Plan for Naramata at Line No. 18 (above).
151.	Van Westen, Margaret	[no comments]	Not in support.	No comment.
152.	Van-Battum, Angelika	The proposal will take away the character and charm of Naramata village.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above).
153.	Verde, John & Rosa	This is not the right time to expand the Naramata village development boundaries. Focus on the current Naramata village centre and later on expand if necessary. Higher density housing and tourist accommodation belongs in the village centres not in the wider area proposed in the RGS bylaw amendment.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above).
154.	Verpaelst, Nicole	Does not support the creation of a Naramata Village Settlement Area and its objective of higher density. Does not support the RGS population estimates for Area “E” as 42% of homes were not included.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above). Please see response to population estimate concerns at Line No. 9 (above).
155.	Vezina, Martine	Does not support the creation of a Village Settlement Area for Naramata and its objective of higher density.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above).
156.	Watson, Dave	Concerned that an increase in density in the Naramata village will not preserve the character of the area. Suggests a smaller area for densification than proposed and a limit to the number of apartment units per block and a height limit of 3 storeys. Suggests vacation rental TUPs be required to have a long-term tenant of property owner on site; Clearcutting be banned and plans should define what trees or shrubbery are to be retained or removed. Concerns regarding traffic on Naramata Road in the event of an emergency.	Not in support.	Height regulations are prescribed through the Zoning Bylaws. Please see response to vacation rental concerns at Line No. 4 (above). Please see response to ecosystem protection within the RGS Bylaw and development in sensitive ecosystems and riparian areas at Line No. 14 (above). Please see response to traffic concerns at Line No. 4 (above).
157.	Watts, Janet	Objects to the densification of the Village of Naramata and the inclusion of Hayman Road. Need more housing in the village and more family homes or rental homes as opposed to holiday homes.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above). Please see response to vacation rental concerns at Line No. 4 (above).
158.	Watts, Tim	Not supportive of densification and a sewer system in Naramata. Concerned with number of “dark homes” in Naramata. Concern that the results of the study examining the costs and benefits of a sewer system in Naramata and a study of the groundwater entering the lake will be written with a specific result in mind and has not addressed other issues. Concern regarding where a wastewater treatment facility could be located in Naramata and how this would negatively affect the enjoyment of neighbouring uses.	Not in support.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above). Please see response to development of a Liquid waste (Sewage) Management Plan for Naramata at Line No. 18 (above).

COLOUR LEGEND:

Electoral Area “A”
 Electoral Area “C”
 Electoral Area “D”
 Electoral Area “E”
 Electoral Area “F”
 Electoral Area “I”
 Penticton
 Unknown

LINE NO.	NAME	SUMMARY OF COMMENT	INDICATED POSITION	ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE
159.	Zvonarich, Gail	Does not like the subdivision and urban sprawl destroying the community. States that urban sprawl should go to Penticton or Kelowna and that the RDOS is focused on making money through land taxes, water, garbage pickup, etc. Concerned that more development will aggravate existing water issues given RDOS already issues water advisories. Too much traffic on Naramata road and states that Arawana road is like a freeway and is unsafe. Concerned that the crime rate will go up.	Not supportive.	Please see response to growth management at Line No. 3 & 31 (above). Please see response regarding links between growth and servicing at Line No. 21 (above). Please see response to water concerns at Line No. 12 (above). Please see response to traffic concerns at Line No. 4 (above).

COLOUR LEGEND:

Electoral Area "A"
 Electoral Area "C"
 Electoral Area "D"
 Electoral Area "E"
 Electoral Area "F"
 Electoral Area "I"
 Penticton
 Unknown