

Lesley Gibbons

From: Marnee Vala [REDACTED]
Sent: August 19, 2025 1:54 PM
To: Planning
Cc: JP Vala
Subject: Opposition to Development Variance Permit Application No. C2025.023-DVP – 577 Road 2, Oliver, BC

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

JP and Marnee Vala
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Date: August 19, 2025

To:
Planning Department
Regional District of Okanagan-Similkameen (RDOS)
101 Martin Street
Penticton, BC V2A 5J9
Email: planning@rdos.bc.ca

Re: Opposition to Development Variance Permit Application No. C2025.023-DVP – 577 Road 2, Oliver, BC

Dear RDOS Planning Department,
I am writing to express my opposition to Development Variance Permit Application No. C2025.023-DVP regarding the proposed expansion of the packing house at **577 Road 2, Oliver, BC**.

As a resident living at the intersection of **Road 2 and Primrose Lane**, my household is directly impacted by the ongoing and unresolved issues related to traffic from this facility. While I want to make it clear that we **support local agriculture and small businesses**, the **traffic problems created by this operation have not improved** over time, and **no clear plan has been proposed** by the applicant to address these long-standing concerns.

We recall that a similar variance application was submitted a couple of years ago, and despite the community raising concerns at that time, **nothing has changed**. The applicant has made no meaningful improvements to address the traffic and safety issues their operations create.

Currently, **heavy semi-truck traffic** from the facility:

- Struggles to navigate the **tight corner** from Primrose Lane onto Road 2, resulting in damage to driveways, signage, and utility infrastructure.
- Uses the **Flume 2 bridge**, which is not suited for vehicles of this size and weight.
- Regularly **blocks Road 2** due to a lack of space to safely maneuver.
- Demonstrates little regard for the safety and comfort of nearby residents.

An additional concern is the **intersection of Road 2 and Highway 97**. Trucks turning onto the highway from Road 2 often:

- Take an excessive amount of time to turn safely,
- **Block the entire intersection**, causing traffic delays and safety hazards, and
- Force vehicles turning off the highway to yield or stop abruptly due to limited space and visibility.

The current traffic infrastructure is already insufficient, and an expansion of the packing house will undoubtedly worsen these issues unless substantial changes are made.

I therefore **strongly oppose** this application unless it includes:

- A properly designed **truck turnaround and staging area on-site**,
- A new **traffic management plan** that minimizes disruption to local roads and neighborhoods, and
- A commitment to **actual enforcement and accountability** for ongoing traffic issues.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I trust the RDOS will consider the safety, quality of life, and fairness to surrounding residents before granting any further variances.

Sincerely,

JP and Marnee Vala

JP and Marnee Vala

Lesley Gibbons

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: August 26, 2025 9:03 AM
To: Planning
Subject: I have no objection for the development of Permit (Dvp Application no c2025.023.Dvp 577 Rd 2 (lot 1,plan kap 22963 ,DI.2450S,SDYD)

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

Sent from my iPhone

Lesley Gibbons

From: Joe and Beatrice Barreira [REDACTED]
Sent: August 31, 2025 7:56 PM
To: Planning
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Opposition to DVP Application No. C2025.023-DVP (577 Road 2)

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Planning Department,

I am writing in response to the Development Variance Permit (DVP) Application No. C2025.023-DVP for the property at 577 Road 2. As a nearby resident, I wish to formally register our strong **opposition** to this proposal based on the community impact below:

1. Noise and Light Pollution

The activities on this property already generate excessive daytime noise, disrupting the quiet enjoyment of our homes. Loud Compressors and forklifts are heard ALL DAY/NIGHT. Sometimes we hear activity 24/7, meaning we can hear noise at 3am etc. The Compressor runs all night long. Additionally, at night, the floodlighting is so bright that it intrudes into our bedroom windows and it affects our ability to rest which we need as two [REDACTED]. Despite repeated complaints to the owners about the lighting and noise from the compressors and nighttime activities, no effective mitigation has been implemented to date. Granting this application would legitimize and likely worsen these disturbances, with even more light pollution and more excessive noise which is already overbearing.

2. Road Safety and Traffic Hazards

Traffic volumes related to this property have escalated over the years, far beyond what is appropriate for an agricultural parcel. Large semi-trailers use local roads daily, and their wide turns frequently cause property damage and strike electrical posts. This poses a serious public safety hazard and increases the risk of service disruptions. Additional traffic will only amplify these dangers and add more damage to our properties.

3. Security and Community Safety

With increased vehicle activity has come increased risk of theft and trespass. We are already concerned about suspicious activity linked to the higher traffic flows and have experienced several petty thefts. We have had to step up our security in order to feel safe in our home, and allowing further intensification of use will exacerbate these risks and undermine neighbourhood security. Our neighbor, my mother (in law) [REDACTED] is already worried about the increase of people walking around the neighborhood and people walking into her property from gaps in the fencing. She has also experienced small petty theft, and can hear people walking to and from the property in the early hours of the morning.

4. Land Use and Compatibility

We honestly believe the property is not being used strictly for single-farm purposes. Instead, it is being operated in a way that involves reselling and storing products from other farms, creating a commercial hub that is incompatible with the intent of the zoning. This deviation from permitted use contributes directly to the over-intensification of traffic and storage problems. The damaged fencing on the Bligh side is one visible consequence of these practices. We also see a lot of other 'labeled' trucks coming to the property DAILY, which seems odd for a farm of this size. We once owned a farm from single use, and we are aware of how often we were able to pack and ship produce. The activity we observe daily, suggests that they are re-selling other farms produce and is using the property as a hub. We strongly suggest you to investigate this before you consider expanding the land permit.

As such, we believe the requested variance does not support the public interest, nor does it respect the rights of surrounding residents to a safe and peaceful community. The cumulative impacts — noise, lights, traffic hazards, theft concerns, and land-use incompatibility — are already being felt. Approving this variance would only entrench and expand these problems.

We (Joe and Beatrice Barreira) respectfully urge the Regional District to deny this application in order to protect the safety, livability, and character of the neighbourhood.

Thank you

Sincerely,

Beatrice and Joe Barreira



Lesley Gibbons

From: maria barreira [REDACTED]
Sent: September 4, 2025 8:35 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Application No C2025.023-DVP

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

I am writing this to inform you of my concerns regarding this development. I was just visiting my mother September 23-28. During that time on a trip into town my husband and I watched a semi truck and trailer turn from road 2 onto Highway 95. In order for it to turn it had to completely block both lanes on the highway. It drove on to the opposite lane in order to manoeuvre the turn. On our way back we and other traffic were stopped on Road 2 for 10 min as a semi truck and trailer had blocked both lanes in its attempt to park at the facility. The next day my husband watched a semi truck and trailer drive past Primrose lane, then it tried to back up onto Primrose lane in order to go back down Road 2. It spent 40 min trying to turnaround at the intersection before giving up and driving up Road 2 over the ditch bridge. That's not a big bridge. I'm not an engineer but It would be a disaster for farmers to loose the use of the ditch in the summer.

The traffic isn't the only issue with this facility. My [REDACTED] mother has to hear the compressors for the storage cycle on and off 24 hours a day 365 days a year. When trucks are loaded at night you hear the constant beeping of the forklifts. You can't open your windows or the noise keeps you up. We've had to get blackout curtains for the windows due to the blinding bright light shining into all the windows that face the facility. The light is so bright that it illuminates the trees on the other side of the house. Multiple people have complained to them about the bright lights and noise to no avail. Then there are the rats that have come since the facility started.

If this facility is allowed to get bigger things will only get worse. It's the county but it's noisier than in the city where I live.

Maria Barreira

Sent from my iPad