

Subject: FW: Sun and sand development area d

From: Walter Gaal
Sent: December 1, 2021 7:53 AM
To: Info E-Box <info@rdos.bc.ca>
Subject: Sun and sand development area d

Good morning

I would like to voice my opinion and concern regarding Sun and sand proposed development to be discussed Dec 2nd board meeting.

While iam in favour of development and improved services for Okanagan falls I feel that we have to be careful in the fact that developments happen that support our infrastructure and beautify our community.

In the case of this development we have to be vigilant in the protection of our parks and lakeshore.

Also I would like to see upgrades to railway lane and eighth Ave as part of the development including parking and sidewalks.

Our adjacent parks and lakeshore are a beautiful and need to be protected

Please give consideration to the above in your desision process

Walter Gaal

Lauri Feindell

Subject: FW: Sun & Sand re-development proposal

From: judy garner
Sent: November 30, 2021 9:59 AM
To: Christopher Garrish <cgarrish@rdos.bc.ca>
Cc: Ron Obirek <robirek@rdos.bc.ca>
Subject: Sun & Sand re-development proposal

Hi Chris

I was one of the residents that attended the meeting Matt organized last Friday. Thank you for giving us all that time. It was very helpful to get your expertise on our questions and I felt that you really knew what you were doing. Following your recommendation that now is the better time to comment, I have written a letter to the Board with my thoughts and am sending it to you as you suggested.

Kind regards, Judy

Lauri Feindell

Subject: FW: Sun'n'Sands / LiamFirst -- support for rezoning... Request for revised Recommendation

From: Matt Taylor

Sent: December 1, 2021 9:27 AM

To: Christopher Garrish <cgarrish@rdos.bc.ca>; Planning <planning@rdos.bc.ca>

Cc: Ron Obirek <robirek@rdos.bc.ca>

Subject: Re: Sun'n'Sands / LiamFirst -- support for rezoning... Request for revised Recommendation

Relative to support provided earlier, I was working on the assumption that an updated / revised proposal would be submitted prior to December 2 reflecting the buyer's public statements that their plans now involved: 2 buildings with 4 floors of 6 units and a parkade-storey, with no variance for height or parking. In the absence of an updated / revised proposal I really don't see how the recommendation can be considered at this time, and I would be in favour of tabling to a future date with sufficient time for evaluation by decision-makers.

I apologize for the continual refinements in my position,

Respectfully

Matt

Lauri Feindell

Subject: FW: Sun'n'Sands / LiamFirst -- support for rezoning... Request for revised Recommendation

From: Matt Taylor
Sent: November 29, 2021 3:18 PM
To: Christopher Garrish <cgarrish@rdos.bc.ca>; Planning <planning@rdos.bc.ca>
Cc: Ron Obirek <robirek@rdos.bc.ca>
Subject: Re: Sun'n'Sands / LiamFirst -- support for rezoning... Request for revised Recommendation

My support was only for rezoning of the land.
I would be opposed to present wording of Recommendation provided to the Board that specifies the size of the proposed apartment.
I would want the words '60 unit' removed for my support to stand.
This is an important point, since the current wording likely implies acceptance of a building that requires a significant variance that I cannot support.
I would request that the Recommendation be amended as follows: THAT Bylaw No. 2455.48, 2021, being a bylaw to amend the Area "D" Zoning Bylaw to allow for the development of a ~~60-unit~~ apartment building at 5356 8th Avenue, Okanagan Falls be read a first and second time and proceed to public hearing;
Respectfully,
Matt

On Nov 28, 2021, at 8:05 PM, Matt Taylor wrote:

I write in support of the proposal to rezone. While I do chair the Okanagan Falls Community Association and the closest strata complex (KAS1845), it is important to note that the following comments reflect solely my opinions as an individual, and not those of these 2 named organizations.

By way of context, our own building in Okanagan Falls while not lakeshore is built immediately adjacent to a park, with an average of 2 bedroom units, significantly less than presently required setbacks (as little as 3' approx.) and parking allocation (1.5 spots per unit approx). While there are issues — notably parking -- and being so close to park we too were quite possibly viewed askance at time of development; our buildig that is one of the first things anyone sees on entering the community from the south, is now generally viewed as a quite beautiful asset to the community.

Now we have another development proposed nearby, that will significantly impact the look of the community and will in future be the first thing that anyone sees on entry from the north. And while there are a number of concerns with the buildings proposed, I support the present request for rezoning subject to transfer of ownership of a frontage strip no less than 7m — and ideally 20m — from the existing property to RDOS. For a number of reasons that land

transfer has been sought for decades, and in my mind this transfer addresses the need and complies with the terms informally proposed.

As this frontage strip has been sought for many years, and as it involves a formal transfer of ownership, I personally don't see value in waiting to rezone. Further delay could result in the offer being withdrawn and the community again copes with the present problematic situation, with no linkage between parks, continued parking issues on Railway Lane with the current RV occupants exceeding their parking space, a relatively unaesthetic use of the land that is far below 'highest and best use' and a much-disputed right of access to the waterfront.

Concerns to be addressed at a later stage of the Development, but critical to my support are as follows:

- Height not to exceed that permitted under the proposed zoning, with the exception of a building placed parallel with 8th Ave on the rear 1/3 of the property that could go to a height enabling one more floor;
- Significantly enhanced form and character relative to proposal provided, as befitting a higher end, signature lakeshore building in the town centre;
- Parking that meets the required allocation, in view of commonly encountered problems and the expectation that many units will have 2 cars;
- A revised description of the proposal should be brought forward immediately, eliminating the height and parking variances and improving form / character description. The community needs proper engagement on any variances in these areas.

With respect for the views expressed by others in the community and without discounting the importance of infrastructure, I don't see the infrastructure issues cited as a factor in the Rezoning Proposal. It's the developer's responsibility to pay their share. While the service providers have identified significant gaps — water / sewer / fire-water — there are plans in place to address these through preparation of master plans, conversion to RDOS, grant financing, etc. More units will spread these costs over a larger base, and the improvements are necessary independent of this proposal.

Two very interesting suggestions were recently suggested.

1. **Convert the land to a park** as was done several years ago with the much smaller Lamb property for approximately \$800k.... While this would require a change in the OCP, and although the Community could be said to have more waterfront park than warranted by present and even anticipated population, it would be difficult to refuse if the property were gifted. The Community is unlikely to be able or willing to afford the purchase through additional tax dollars. As well, the present owner has an accepted offer. Without funding I'd say this is a very low probability but those that want it should be invited / encouraged to pursue funding and bring it forward as a firm offer.
2. **Enter into a land swap** with buyer / seller, rotating the parcel 90 degrees and transferring the SW corner of Kenyon for a bit more than 1/2 of the northern end of the current orientation.... This offers the possibility of a 1 or 2 buildings built parallel to 8th avenue, lakefront view for all units, sloping the building to the back with a wider base than top, increased market value, and potentially a much more attractive building for the community and future owners. Parcel dimensions would need to be altered slightly to protect view of NE corner of OK Corral property as that too will likely be developed as residential apartments. This swap really could enable a signature building for the community. This would be a complex negotiation, but might provide greater satisfaction

for all players. Efforts to negotiate could take place after the rezoning, commencing perhaps after 1st reading.

I would expect that property values in the surrounding neighbourhood are going to be significantly positively affected by this Development, moreso if done as suggested above.

While I hope a land swap can be affected, I think the community and neighbours will gain by rezoning in and of itself. As well, I would hope the developer can present further detail demonstrating an aesthetically pleasing building (s); with no or only a very modest height variance at the rear; improved form and character befitting a high quality signature building; and adequate parking. In my mind, this gives us the outcome that may actually offer a net benefit to all parties.

Respectfully,
Matt

Matt Taylor, Landlord

Lauri Feindell

Subject: FW: Sun & Sand RV Park

From: Randy Galbreath

Sent: November 27, 2011 5:20 PM

To: Info E-Box <info@rdos.bc.ca>; Planning <planning@rdos.bc.ca>; roberik@rdoa.bc.ca; Christopher Garrish <cgarrish@rdos.bc.ca>; OKFalls Rec <OKFallsRec@rdos.bc.ca>; Parks <parks@rdos.bc.ca>; okanaganfallscommunity@gmail.com

Subject: Sun & Sand RV Park

To Whom it may concern

I am writing to express my deep concern about the proposed development at the Sun & Sands location. I own 800 Railway Lane Okanagan Falls. I have been an owner since 1999 and have witnessed the lack of development and if you will slow death of OK Falls. I would like it to be known that I am not against development but it certainly should not come at any cost.

As an owner I have experienced the poor water quality from time to time and the lack of drainage from stormwater. From what I understand it is that the water is controlled by OKFID which is essentially tax payers of OK Falls and the sewer is controlled by the RDOS on top of that the highways and roads are a provincial issue. It is my opinion that sustained growth and development cannot happen without a common entity so that a global opinion as to what the needs and priorities are for the people of OK Falls. At this time we clearly have a water and sewer system problem on top of some others. I do not see how any development permits could possibly be issued by an individual or separate entity or government arm without these prior organizational issues solved.

As much as I want OK Falls to prosper we cannot allow further development under the chaotic system that is currently in place. If allowed to go forward it may initially look like progress but there can be no long term solutions or prosperity under a chaotic system. I do not see any way that this development should be allowed to proceed as myself other owners in OK Falls will be left with the Chaos and the bills.

Additionally to the water, sewer, roads and adequate parking issues this complex will impose on OK Falls without proper thought, and that is the height of the complex it would be an abomination to the surrounding properties as well as imposing one other issue upon the citizens of OK Falls is that of our ability to fight a possible fire there. It would be unreasonable to expect that the expense for different and much more expensive equipment would be borne because of one complex in town. This is absolutely a development sometime down the road for OK Falls but not NOW

Thank you for your time and consideration I respectfully request a response to this letter

Randy Galbreath



Virus-free. www.avast.com

The Sun & Sand RV Park on the lakefront between Lions and Kenyon park is for sale, but it is dependent on several conditions being met. They are:

1. a bylaw amendment changing the existing zoning from CT2 (Campground Commercial) to OTFC (Okanagan Falls Town Centre) to allow for residential development
2. the approval of a Development Variance Permit allowing them to build two 32.88 m (78'-4") tall, six-storey buildings which exceed the maximum allowable 3 storeys or 15 m (49'-2") by almost 30'
3. the approval of a Development Variance Permit to reduce the required setback to 2.5 m (8'-2") from 4.5 m (14'-9") allowing larger buildings to be built closer to the property lines
4. the approval of a Development Variance Permit to increase the number of units on the site (from 56 to 60) above the maximum allowable for Medium Density zoning
5. the approval of a Development Variance Permit to reduce the number of parking stalls from 1.7 to 1.56 per unit which will dramatically increase traffic and force more street parking on Railway Lane and 8th Avenue

The developers design proposal does not follow the Okanagan Falls Official Community Plan (OCP) guidelines recommending buildings higher than 3 floors have the 4th and any higher floors stepped back a minimum of 2.1 m (6'-10") to reduce the apparent height and bulk. They are also not following the OCP guidelines for a building orientation of north to south to increase lakeshore visibility, theirs is east to west.

There was a public hearing on November 4th where numerous questions were raised but many weren't answered. Questions about existing infrastructure, not having enough water pressure to meet the minimum requirements set by the fire department, sewage systems running at maximum capacity, water treatment not able to meet government quality standards for drinking water, and inadequate storm water drainage were not answered.

The Okanagan Falls fire department doesn't have equipment capable of dealing with fires on buildings over 3 storeys, nor do they have the appropriate six-month training for buildings of that height. In spite of all this, on November 9th, 2021 the RDOS Chief Administrative Officer, Bill Newell and his planning staff, sent an Administrative Report to the RDOS Advisory Planning Commission (ACP) recommending the RDOS Directors approve the development application.

This proposal blocks the lake view for neighbours to the west by pushing one of the two six-storey building as far forward as possible on the lot. This will most likely reduce their property values.

There must be better options which have less negative aspects on the community and don't require so many concessions be made solely to increase the profits of a developer. There is plenty of space in Okanagan Falls to be developed and there are many developers applying for permits right now. Not one of them takes away Okanagan Falls lakefront. There is only so much lakefront available and once a building is placed on it, it is gone forever. We should look at increasing our lakefront parks instead of using the land for residential buildings.

The lake and beach area are a couple of the most promising assets of Okanagan Falls. Let's find a way to keep them as park land and encourage tourism so many families can enjoy this area for years to come.

Send your letters of concern to:

- (1) The RDOS at info@rdos.bc.ca
- (2) planning@rdos.bc.ca
- (3) Area D RDOS Director, Ron Oberik roberik@rdoa.bc.ca
- (4) Chris Garrish - Planning Manager - cgarrish@rdos.bc.ca
- (5) Area D RDOS Okanagan Falls Parks & Recreation Commission - okfallsrec@rdos.bc.ca and Parks - parks@rdos.bc.ca
- (6) Okanagan Falls Community Association okanaganfallscommunity@gmail.com

Also ask the RDOS that your letters be forwarded to:

- (1) Advisory Planning Commission Area D

Christopher Garrish

From: Tim Galbreath
Sent: November 27, 2021 3:42 PM
To:
Cc:
Subject: Re: Sun & Sand RV Park
Email Sun & Sand.docx
Attachments:

As an owner of unit #XX 750 Railway Lane I echo the sentiments of Randy Galbreath. Rushing through this process would be an extremely big mistake.

Our opinion is based mainly on the community infrastructure impacts that would come at the expense of the taxpayers - where solutions or perceived solutions to infrastructure issues will not have been properly addressed in a coordinated manner. Many of the issues mentioned have been issues for many years and nothing has changed. Building another large structure such as this would only stress an already inadequate infrastructure system.

We are not against development but we are against poorly planned development.

Respectfully

Tim T. Galbreath

Sent from my iPhone