

Date:

01/08/24

To: The Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen
planners@rdos.bc.ca

From:

PATRICK J. COULTER

Address:

NARAMATA

Thank you for the opportunity to present feedback on the latest version of the OCP.

There are 4 areas of specific concern that I would like to address as feedback for the RDOS.

- 1) Growth Section of the OCP
- 2) Sewer or Liquid Waste Management Plant
- 3) Vacation Rentals
- 4) Hillside Development

1) Growth Section:

- I support keeping Lower Naramata as a Rural Residential low growth area versus the proposed OCP version that classifies Lower Naramata as a Growth area.
- The Growth Containment Boundaries (OCP) and the Village Settlement Area (VSA) from the proposed RGS amendment are virtually the same. 97% of the community rejected the Village Settlement Area in a previous survey with clear direction to not densify Lower Naramata beyond what is permitted with Low Density Rural Residential growth. Please remove any reference to support for densifying Lower Naramata with multi-family residential development.
- The Growth containment Boundaries (A, B, & C) have not been agreed upon by the community and should be deleted in the OCP.

2) Sewer or Liquid Waste Management Plant

- I do not support the Sewer or LWMP and am in favor of maintaining the septic systems that are currently in effect. References in the latest version of the OCP indicating community support of a Sewer or LWMP should be removed.

3) Vacation Rentals

- The latest draft version of the OCP does not address the community's view or the level of concern for Vacation Rentals. The OCP needs to be strengthened to include requiring business licensing, full time owner or caretaker on site for all short-term rentals, meaningful fines/penalties for non compliance and proper enforcement.


4) Hillside Development



- There needs to be stronger language concerning Hillside Development to prevent landslide, drainage, and run-off issues regardless of the development size. Fines for noncompliance must be increased to a meaningful number with enhanced enforcement. A bond should be posted that is reflective of the size of the development with applicable fines being applied against it.

The OCP is an important document and it's very important that the Regional District reflect the wishes of the community.

Signed
by:



Feedback Form

Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen

101 Martin Street, Penticton, BC, V2A-5J9

Tel: 250-492-0237 / Email: planning@rdos.bc.ca

TO: Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen FILE NO.: E2021.027-ZONE

FROM: Name: Grahame & Catherine Baker
(please print)

Street Address: Naramata

Date: Jan 10th 2024

RE: Electoral Area "E" Official Community Plan (OCP) Bylaw No. 3010, 2023

RECEIVED
Regional District

My comments / concerns are:

JAN 11 2024

I do support the proposed OCP Bylaw.


I do not support the proposed OCP Bylaw.

101 Martin Street
Penticton BC V2A 5J9

Please provide any comments you wish the Board to consider.
Written submissions will be considered by the Regional District Board
prior to a decision being made on this project.

We do not believe a 'vibrant village' needs a sewer system, what the village needs is houses being lived in & occupied year round not as short term rentals & second homes. We were misled as to the RDOS's interpretation of a 'vibrant village' on its survey. We do NOT support village core densification.
Regarding the hillside above Naramata the OCP needs stronger wording to protect it from developers wanting to change current zoning.

Feedback Forms must be completed and returned to the Regional District prior to the closure of the public hearing.



Feedback Form

Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen

101 Martin Street, Penticton, BC, V2A-5J9

Tel: 250-492-0237 / Email: planning@rdos.bc.ca

TO: Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen FILE NO.: E2021.027-ZONE

FROM: Name: BERNADETTE + Nicholas GAMMER
(please print)

Street Address: _____

Date: JANUARY 7, 2024

RE: Electoral Area "E" Official Community Plan (OCP) Bylaw No. 3010, 2023

My comments / concerns are:

I do support the proposed OCP Bylaw.

I do not support the proposed OCP Bylaw.

Please provide any comments you wish the Board to consider.
Written submissions will be considered by the Regional District Board
prior to a decision being made on this project.

Please see attached "Feedback Form" (4 pages)

Feedback Forms must be completed and returned to the Regional District
prior to the closure of the public hearing.

Protecting your personal information is an obligation the Regional District of Okanagan-Similkameen takes seriously. Our practices have been designed to ensure compliance with the privacy provisions of the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* (British Columbia) ("FIPPA"). Any personal or proprietary information you provide to us is collected, used and disclosed in accordance with FIPPA. Should you have any questions about the collection, use or disclosure of this information please contact: Manager of Legislative Services, RDOS, 101 Martin Street, Penticton, BC V2A 5J9, 250-492-0237.

Feedback Form (Attachment)

File No: E2021.027-ZONE. January 7, 2024

Re: Electoral Area "E" Official Community Plan (OCP) Bylaw No. 3010, 2023

*We do not support the proposed (OCP) Bylaw No.3010, 2023

Comments:

There are some key points proposed (or absent) in the bylaw and the presentation by the RDOS reps at the meeting in Naramata on January 7, 2024 that the RDOS needs to address more effectively:

#1. The first key point I'd like to raise is on the Hillside Development section. The language needs to be MUCH STRONGER to prevent future development problems/environmental disasters in the hillside area. The bar needs to be set much higher and the fines much greater for those who don't follow the rules. Rather than providing more options (loop holes) for developers/builders, there should be fewer options and stricter standards. In the past in the in the hillside area of Naramata we've already experienced the costly ravages and dangers of wild fires. In other (interface) areas of the Okanagan this last summer the RDOs must be aware of the real and immediate dangers of wildfires. Should this not be a clear signal for regulators, like the RDOS, to put on hold or stop all further developments in interface areas? Simply speaking a more thorough review and closer implementation of development proposals must be put into place, with much better and more transparent consultation mechanisms established with provincial authorities where required. Much stronger fines for transgressors are necessary. Developers should be required to be bonded relative to the size of the development. The Hillside issue has been raised and brought before the RDOS a number of times before the completion of the proposed Bylaw 3010. And yet, reference to Hillside development in the bylaw remains weak and certainly does not reflect the wishes of the citizens of Naramata.

#2 .On the subject of Vacation rentals. It is important that the bylaw reflect a better balance between all the benefits of well-regulated vacation rentals and the need to eliminate some of the more problematic aspects associated with vacation rentals. Let us remember that two industries - tourism and agriculture/wineries – have put Naramata on the map for all the right reasons. Yes there have been noteworthy problems with a small number of vacation rentals. They have been well

publicised. At the same time, a simple survey of the many wineries on the Naramata Bench underlines the interdependence they have with the various vacation rentals and Airbnb's that complement what is usually the great experience that their customers/our guests enjoy when they come to Naramata ... especially when far more expensive hotel accommodations are not even available. It is important to remember that properly managed vacation rentals and Airbnb's have provided a great experience for guests, numerous economic spin-offs for locals, and a modest supplementary income for many owner residents in Naramata who take great pride in presenting the wonderful side of our community. Context is important when the OCP outlines its findings. We have heard the argument that the further restriction/reduction of "vacation rentals" will somehow improve the long-term rental market for renters in our area. While politically attractive, there has been little objective evidence that this sort of provincially-driven action will do much to improve the rental market. In actuality, this issue is the product of much larger supply/demand forces in BC and across Canada. Perhaps it's time for the RDOS Board to request the Provincial government to apply the "Speculation/Vacant Home" tax for "Electoral Area E"/Naramata.

There is a fairly simple solution that will go a long way to reducing most of the more serious problems associated with Vacation/Airbnb rentals. There have been a number of community meetings where there has been repeated, full support that there be a requirement that the owner/full-time custodian or long-term renter be on-site for all vacation rentals in the Naramata area.

The proposed OCP does not even mention the recommendation/requirement that either owners or caretakers be on-site. Why is this recommendation, widely accepted as a reasonable starting point, not have a place in this section of the OCP?

#3. There are a number of problems with the "Growth" section of the draft OCP. It appears that the draft does not recognize that there was no CAG or community agreement that the Lower Naramata area should be recognized as an area of growth which would allow for greater densification. Considerable support for the Lower Naramata area to move forward with its present designation as a "Rural" "Residential" area is clearly evident. The community continues to support primarily single family dwellings. Most residents of the Village and outlying areas want to retain the present character of the Naramata Village that will continue to rely on public consultation. Other/earlier organizational attempts to increase the

densification in the area have been clearly rejected by survey participants. There are sections of the OCP in support of densifying with multi-family homes in Lower Naramata that are not accurate.

#4. Having attended a number of community meetings that involved the issue of growth and density for Naramata, the OCP references in support of a Liquid Waste Management Plant/Sewer system seem to be questionable. Instead, the community expressed cautious interest in learning more amidst numerous concerns. In short the feasibility of a sewage system is an enormous issue that requires more input from the RDOS, and a variety of specialists. It is also not unreasonable to indicate that developers/builders will benefit greatly. Furthermore, increased density will do little to substantially increase the availability of affordable rentals and affordable dwellings. In fact, given the huge demand for dwellings in and around the pristine Village of Naramata, and given market forces, prices will likely go even higher. Builders/ developers will do very well and the Village as we know will lose the very priceless gem most of us admire and seek to protect.

The final concern with this section of the OCP is that it does not lay out a projected cost appraisal/estimate of a sewage system. It also does not outline (a) plan(s) for how that cost will be paid and by whom, not to speak of the absence in the OCP of any kind of clear blue-print to assist members of the community in following a decision-making process that needs to be much more understandable and transparent. In sum, it is very difficult to adequately measure public support for a sewage system, for example, without most of these afore-mentioned elements being presented in a clearer and more structured way by the OCP.

The RDOS, staffed with many knowledgeable and hard-working specialists/individuals is capable of doing good work and in the case of the proposed OCP Bylaw No. 3010, the tasks and responsibilities before it are enormous. As a resident of Naramata for over 60 years, it would not be an overstatement for me to observe that the proposed OCP bylaw will have an unprecedented effect on our community. With due diligence, a much tougher approach on development and a the presentation of a clearer, more coherent and better communicated approach by the RDOS and probably refurbished OCP, the citizens of Naramata will be able to retain and protect what has made our

community truly unique and special for over a 100 years. And that is priceless. If the RDOS, and various other bureaucratic entities that are here to reflect the wishes of the community and protect its beautiful environment, fail in this, then certain developers, realtors and weak-kneed politicians will have won.

Thank you.

Nicholas and Bernadette Gammer

Naramata, BC

Date: Jan 03/24

To: The Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen
planners@rdos.bc.ca

From: John Van Westen Jr

Address: _____

Thank you for the opportunity to present feedback on the latest version of the OCP.

There are 4 areas of specific concern that I would like to address as feedback for the RDOS.

- 1) Growth Section of the OCP
- 2) Sewer or Liquid Waste Management Plant
- 3) Vacation Rentals
- 4) Hillside Development

1) Growth Section:

- I support keeping Lower Naramata as a Rural Residential low growth area versus the proposed OCP version that classifies Lower Naramata as a Growth area.
- The Growth Containment Boundaries (OCP) and the Village Settlement Area (VSA) from the proposed RGS amendment are virtually the same. 97% of the community rejected the Village Settlement Area in a previous survey with clear direction to not densify Lower Naramata beyond what is permitted with Low Density Rural Residential growth. Please remove any reference to support for densifying Lower Naramata with multi-family residential development.
- The Growth containment Boundaries (A, B, & C) have not been agreed upon by the community and should be deleted in the OCP.

2) Sewer or Liquid Waste Management Plant

- I do not support the Sewer or LWMP and am in favor of maintaining the septic systems that are currently in effect. References in the latest version of the OCP indicating community support of a Sewer or LWMP should be removed.

3) Vacation Rentals

- The latest draft version of the OCP does not address the community's view or the level of concern for Vacation Rentals. The OCP needs to be strengthened to include requiring business licensing, full time owner or caretaker on site for all short-term rentals, meaningful fines/penalties for non compliance and proper enforcement.

4) Hillside Development

- There needs to be stronger language concerning Hillside Development to prevent landslide, drainage, and run-off issues regardless of the development size. Fines for



noncompliance must be increased to a meaningful number with enhanced enforcement. A bond should be posted that is reflective of the size of the development with applicable fines being applied against it.

The OCP is an important document and it's very important that the Regional District reflect the wishes of the community.

It's all about the developer. A sewage system would ~~be~~ mean free reign on development.

Naramata Road is already to busy.

Money has taken over ~~Our~~ beautiful Naramata.
Let's keep it beautiful.

Let's keep it a village, and not become a small city.

Lived here for 61 years and seen alot, but the next stage seems out of control.

Have you seen what they built in front of Wharf Park. That's what ruins a village.
Wharf Park is on Anna St.

Signed by: _____

Lauri Feindell

From: Jim Simpson <
Sent: January 11, 2024 1:11 PM
To: Planning
Subject: AREA E OCP Review - formal response

Some people who received this message don't often get email from

[n why this is important](#)

To whom it may concern

The following is to be lodged as a formal response from the hearings on the new OCP as proposed for Area E

While broadly in favour of the new OCP, we are opposed to the 6.7.13, 6.7.14, 10.6 and 11.6 for the following reasons:

The Naramata Citta Slow group is highly frustrated by the approach and decisions taken by the RDOS in this final version of the OCP being considered for adoption. Over the several years that this process has gone on, we have been consistent in raising with RDOS staff the key issues around lack of housing and disappearance of long term rental stock in favour of the short term rentals. We have seen the disappearance of small houses rented out to permanent residents which has forced families to move away which removes children from our school and staff from our local business.

This draft OCP takes no action indicating that this issue needs further study and so more affordable rental housing will disappear and more families will leave. Our association's mandate is around doing what we can to support and foster healthy communities and dialogue, embracing the value of the people, this land and the many attributes that make Naramata a valued and vibrant community. We feel this continued delay to deal with the housing issue has acted in the opposite way.

Naramata Citta Slow Board of Directors

Miranda Halliday
Jacquie Carlson
Rene Mehrer
Dawn Lennie
Dan Pederson
Gayle Grant
Jim Simpson
Jay Drysdale

Jim Simpson
'8

Lauri Feindell

From: [redacted]
Sent: January 11, 2024 2:24 PM
To: Planning
Cc: Adrienne Fedrigo
Subject: Public Hearing Submission on Area E OCP Review

Importance: High

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

To whom it may concern regarding the current version of the Area E OCP as of January 11, 2024 relating to Draft Bylaw No. 3010.

While there are a number of items and assumptions in the document that I disagree with, I do support moving forward by approving the current version of the Area E OCP document.

I also support the recommended "exploration of options for managing and regulating hillside development..." be given high priority and appropriate resources to be moved forward quickly, by the RDOS.

Additionally I support that RDOS resources be allocated now to a properly researched, reviewed and workable policy regarding vacation/short-term rentals in both Area E and throughout the RDOS.

Yours,

Hugh McClelland

Naramata, BC V0H1N1

Mauri Feindell

From: Tina Baird
Sent: January 11, 2024 2:57 PM
To: Planning
Cc: Adrienne Fedrigo
Subject: Public Hearing Submission on Area E OCP Review

Importance: High

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

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

To whom it may concern regarding the current version of the Area E OCP as of January 11, 2024 relating to Draft Bylaw No. 3010.

While there are a number of items and assumptions in the document that I disagree with, I do support moving forward by approving the current version of the Area E OCP document.


I also support the recommended "exploration of options for managing and regulating hillside development..." be given high priority and appropriate resources to be moved forward quickly, by the RDOS.

Additionally, I support that RDOS resources be allocated now to a properly researched, reviewed and workable policy regarding vacation/short-term rentals in both Area E and throughout the RDOS.

Yours,

Tina Baird

Naramata, BC V0H1N1



Feedback Form

Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen
101 Martin Street, Penticton, BC, V2A-5J9
Tel: 250-492-0237 / Email: planning@rdos.bc.ca

TO: Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen FILE NO.: E2021.027-ZONE

FROM: Name: Nic HACKWORTH
(please print)

Street Address: _____

Date: ~~#~~ Naramata Jan 10/24.

RE: Electoral Area "E" Official Community Plan (OCP) Bylaw No. 3010, 2023

My comments / concerns are:

- I do support the proposed OCP Bylaw.
- I do not support the proposed OCP Bylaw.

Please provide any comments you wish the Board to consider.
Written submissions will be considered by the Regional District Board
prior to a decision being made on this project.

Please see attached.

Feedback Forms must be completed and returned to the Regional District
prior to the closure of the public hearing.

Protecting your personal information is an obligation the Regional District of Okanagan-Similkameen takes seriously. Our practices have been designed to ensure compliance with the privacy provisions of the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* (British Columbia) ("FIPPA"). Any personal or proprietary information you provide to us is collected, used and disclosed in accordance with FIPPA. Should you have any questions about the collection, use or disclosure of this information please contact: Manager of Legislative Services, RDOS, 101 Martin Street, Penticton, BC V2A 5J9, 250-492-0237.

N. Hackworth –

I support the new OCP – with the exception of the areas, points listed below.

5.2.10

In addition to collaboration with the Penticton Indian Band ADD: 'and other communities within the Okanagan Basin' This would initiate our commitment to participate in the Okanagan Collaborative Conservation Alliance. The Central Okanagan Conservation Alliance already has the support of all levels of government city, regional, provincial and federal. We can collaborate and capitalize on all the amazing work that has been thus far.

6.7.13

Needs updating – the Province has now come out with Short Term Rental Legislation and Area E should opt in immediately. The Province has done the heavy lifting here and taken over the enforcement and registration of Short Term Rentals on residential properties as well. Think of all the staff time & energy and tax dollars that will be saved (not to mention eliminating all the white TUP signs that end up in the land fill) by simply opting in for Area E. Please don't spend more taxpayer money on yet another another study on this topic. The Permanent Resident requirement in the legislation will quickly add affordable housing to the rental and purchasing pool, help to reduce empty house syndrome and contribute to our 'vibrant village' without building a single house. The solution is clear on this item.

6.7.14

I disagree with this item altogether. Do we need a study on this? There was already a housing needs report completed in March 2021 (from section 6.4 of this OCP) If RDOS takes care of opting in to the Provincial Vacation Rental Rules and finally dealing with our Vacation Rental policy issues (see above item) - we will organically have much more of the affordable housing our community needs put back into the market.

7.3.8

Needs stronger language than 'will consider'. This should say 'prohibit future hillside development' and 'will explore options and implement regulations under the Local Government Act to also prohibit tree cutting, blasting, soil removal and recontouring of private unmanaged land within regional boundaries in order to protect the unique and endangered ecosystems on the hillsides of Naramata'

8.2.3

In relation to preserving wildlife corridors we should mention here our intent to join the Okanagan Collaborative Conservation Alliance and capitalize on all of the great work already being done by this group. Currently it stops at Okanagan Mountain Park – we should join and bring it right through along the Naramata Bench.

8.3.13

Remove Micro Cannabis facilities. This type of activity should be limited to industrial areas.

9.3.16

Remove Micro Cannabis facilities. This type of activity should be limited to industrial areas.

10.3.9

Remove Micro Cannabis facilities. This type of activity should be limited to industrial areas.

10.6

Vacation Rentals – needs update to new Provincial Regulations

11.6

Vacation Rentals – needs update to new Provincial Regulations

24.3.2.1

This should say 'prohibit future hillside development' and 'will explore options and implement regulations under the Local Government Act to also prohibit tree cutting, blasting, soil removal and recontouring of private unmanaged land within regional boundaries in order to protect the unique and endangered ecosystems on the hillsides of Naramata'

24.3.2.2

We don't need another housing study. Fix the vacation rental rules – fix much of our housing issues. We do need more seniors housing but we don't need a study to tell us that. The waiting list for seniors housing already tells the story.

24.3.3.1

This item is now out of date – Provincial regulations are now in place – let's opt in for Area E!

Lauri Feindell

From: Lila Tauzer
Sent: January 11, 2024 3:20 PM
To: Planning; Adrienne Fedrigo
Subject: RDOS Electoral Area "E" OCP Review

Some people who received this message don't often get email from l...

[why this is important](#)

Hello.

My name is Lila Tauzer, and I live at [redacted] Naramata. Although there clearly has been a lot of work done and are valuable sections within, I have strong objections to this version of the Naramata Official Community Plan.

I particularly appreciated the inclusion of the PIB statement and the figures and stats re. the change in population demographics over time. That said, my main reasons for rejecting this draft are that it does not accurately reflect the community's views or wishes. My main issues are as below:

1) It clearly states that we, as a community, support a sewage treatment plant and this is just NOT true. The community support is referenced in numerous places, including but not limited to pg. 19 (Section 5.2 Infrastructure) and pg. 29 (7.2.1). As of yet, an active, informative discussion about a sewage treatment plant in Naramata hasn't happened so it is misleading to leave the wording as is. Change it!

Similarly, wording about new parcels being connected to a community water system and community sanitary sewer system should be changed so that they are allowed IF an adequate waste disposal system (e.g. small sewage treatment systems or larger septic systems) is installed.

2) The language around subdividing lots and future development is weak and needs to be strengthened to verbalize our strong objections towards larger developments (particularly uphill). I understand that the planning department doesn't want to bind future boards with their statements but time and time again, we have been told that this community plan has no real teeth and is only acting as a guiding document. Strengthen the wording to reflect the overwhelming outrage of the community!! At the very least, change "discourage" to "will generally not support" re. rezoning and/or subdivisions.

3) It is stated clearly that we are interested in maintaining the environment and natural ecosystems yet there is very little reference throughout to the native habitats and animals that use our lands. In my opinion, a single statement that all amendments or subdivision requests should follow rigid environmental regulations could be added to every section. Any development or change (regardless of size or necessity) affects the animals and plants on that land, and we should also be considering the cumulative, long-term effects related to large, spatial disturbances (e.g. Vista development) and repetitive invasive events (e.g. blasting rock). So many of us are horrified that this kind of unchecked development that we are seeing uphill can proceed in the 2020's.

Environmental controls should be stronger to prevent such absolute destruction. (Who, if not you, has control over this????) The statement that the board "will consider exploring bylaw options for managing and regulating hillside development, such as tree cutting, development permits, runoff and drainage" is disturbing because it doesn't give a timeline or any real solution to what we all consider a

real problem. Lots of good examples from other jurisdictions exist re. amount of existing forest retained within lots for slope stability etc. Find and adopt them!

3) The language around vacation rental and housing availability is too weak, and these sections (10.6 and 22.0) are shockingly lacking. This is probably the biggest issue facing all Naramata residents, even those of us that live here full time. A very significant number of houses sit empty yet there is no housing for workers, or rentals available for younger families or people without tremendous capital needed to invest. This document should at least highlight that this is a major concern, and that many have vocalized a need for more regulations. I personally think the RDOS could really use this moment to opt in to the provincial short-term rental act. We desperately need bigger fines and more enforcement. (These 2 work together perfectly, don't you think? Hire someone to do the enforcement with the extra money...)

Finally, following the meeting on January 7th, it became suddenly clear to me how much weight the planning department put onto that initial community vision survey. For the record, I want to say that I believe this to be faulty given that so many of us found the survey misleading and confusing at the onset, and that the APC unanimously rejected this survey following its conclusion.

Even within this draft it is unclear what exactly is meant by the term "vibrant community". For example, on p.19, under 'Vision' , it states that "Naramata village is a **vibrant** place with a diversity of families that supports year-round businesses and respects the history and quaint character of the area." This is the kind of "vibrant" that we were responding to -- an active, interesting, engaged community that supports each other and has community-based events, and I would argue that many of us feel like Naramata ALREADY is a vibrant community.

On the flip-side, on pg. 29 of this document, it states that "two thirds of the community supported a **more vibrant village**, which included more services, more commercial businesses, and more forms of housing." I'm not arguing with the results of that survey but don't think that 2/3's of us understood in that survey that answering "vibrant community" would be interpreted as greater growth. I wonder how different our responses would be now that we know what exactly was intended by "vibrant community"???

In summary, this is a good working document yet there are some glaring issues and it doesn't accurately reflect the community of Naramata's values. I encourage the board to reject the OCP in its current state, until the above issues are addressed.

Happy New Year and thank you for your time!
Lila Tauzer

Lauri Feindell

From: PATRICIA PICHERACK
Sent: January 11, 2024 3:33 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Area E Official Community Plan

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

Christopher Garrish,

I attended the community meeting last Sunday in person and appreciated your presentation. Although there may have some logistical problems (poor venue, no microphone) and a lack of common understanding of terms (such as policy, legislation, plan etc.) it seemed to be well received generally. The expressed frustration with provincial and federal policy and direction are legitimate but not helpful to the discussion. There are good people with smart ideas in Naramata and hopefully they will prevail. Ultimately the rift between those in favour of cautious and thoughtful development verses those who are anti development will have to be bridged in order for the community to be successful. I believe we have more in common than not if individuals can cut through the hyperbole.

I urge the Board and Area E Director to provide leadership, taking us in the direction most likely to lead to success while still being responsive to their constituents.

In conclusion I support the plan with the understanding it is only a plan and will need to re-examined in light of upcoming changes to provincial legislation and as new information comes to light.

Regards
Patricia Picherack

Trish Picherack

The impact of the Speculation and Vacancy tax on Naramata

(and possibly to all the RDOS regions if applied wholesale)

In my opinion, the proposed advocacy by the RDOS of the application of the:

- a) Speculation & Vacancy Tax along with
- b) new provincial Short Term Rentals Law & Regulations coming into effect May 1/24

are going to be an **unmitigated disaster for the tourism-based economy** of the region & in particular for Naramata, Area E.

The impact of the Speculation & Vacancy Tax

Based on the RDOS OCP numbers, Naramata has approx. **356 homes** registered to out-of-town addresses/owners out of a total 841 homes. What if **50% of those, or 178, decide to sell** rather than pay the S&V Tax of 0.5% of their property's assessed value every year on top of annual property taxes? The S&V Tax along with short term rental restrictions, will discourage homeownership in Naramata, and, as not every homeowner wants to rent out their spare bedrooms or suites, accommodations for rent to tourists & visitors will decline in a big way.

Result:

1. A potentially huge decline in RE values with 178 homes for sale when the normal inventory For Sale in Naramata is between approx. 16 and 40.
2. a much-reduced number of rentals available for tourists & visitors to the area.

The potential impact of short-term rental regulation changes

On the front page of yesterday's Vancouver Sun, Jan. 10/24, is the story of one short-term rental in Victoria that was listed for \$467000 and sold for \$167000 under the asking price or only \$300,000. That is approx. 35% below the asking price.

Result:

1. A potentially huge decline in RE values and
2. a much-reduced number of rentals available for tourists & visitors to the area.

Based on Electoral Area "E" (2021) OCP data - Naramata

OCP Section 3.6 Housing types

1. Single-Detached = 92.95%
2. Together, one and two person households account for 75.3% of households.
3. The total population of the Electoral Area "E" area is **2,015** people.

OCP Section 6.3 Shadow Population p. 22, (based on a GIS analysis)

1. Findings - of the 841 parcels (based on RDOS OCP numbers)
2. 57.6% were Naramata owner addresses = 484.4 homes
3. 42.4% being out of town addresses – **356.58 homes.**

How the speculation and vacancy tax works

1. Applies to a secondary property that is not rented out on a long-term basis. Does not apply to an individual's principal residence.
2. Is based on the property assessment. For example, the 2024 S&V Tax would be based on the 2024 assessment dated July 1, 2023.
3. The tax rate varies, depending on the status of the owner.
 - a. Set at 0.5% for British Columbians and other Canadian citizens or permanent residents who are not members of a satellite family; and
 - b. 2% for foreign owners and satellite families.

A Sample Costing of the Speculation & Vacancy Tax

Assuming a typical house in Upper Naramata: Single Family Detached; built in 2014, with a total of 3,800 sq/ft. on a ½ acre lot with a 2024 assessment value of \$1,705,000.00 (as of July 1, 2023):

- The Speculation and Vacancy Tax to be paid in 2024 would be 0.5% of assessed value = **\$ 8,525.00**

And assuming the RDOS property tax for RDOS property tax for 2024 is like 2023,

- The Property Tax would be **\$ 6,597.00.**


This would result in the homeowner having to pay, yearly, a whopping **\$ 15,122.00!**

Now please consider that this “empty” home is likely currently a vacation home, and very likely a future **retirement** home for the owner, as so many are in the Naramata area.

Applying this “metropolitan area” solution for the current housing crisis in a rural area like the RDOS, is nothing short of outlandish. Moreover, it is guaranteed to have a profoundly negative impact on the local economy while solving nothing.

January 11, 2024.

Sincerely,
Cherry Bouton —



Feedback Form

Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen

101 Martin Street, Penticton, BC, V2A-5J9

Tel: 250-492-0237 / Email: planning@rdos.bc.ca

OKANAGAN-SIMILKAMEEN

TO: Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen **FILE NO.:** E2021.027-ZONE

FROM: Name: ROSS HACKWORTH
(please print)

Street Address: 101 NARAMATA

Date: 1/10/24

RE: Electoral Area "E" Official Community Plan (OCP) Bylaw No. 3010, 2023

My comments / concerns are:

I do support the proposed OCP Bylaw.

I do not support the proposed OCP Bylaw.

WITH EXCEPTIONS NOTED
IN THE ATTACHED FILE

Please provide any comments you wish the Board to consider.
Written submissions will be considered by the Regional District Board
prior to a decision being made on this project.

Feedback Forms must be completed and returned to the Regional District
prior to the closure of the public hearing.

Protecting your personal information is an obligation the Regional District of Okanagan-Similkameen takes seriously. Our practices have been designed to ensure compliance with the privacy provisions of the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* (British Columbia) ("FIPPA"). Any personal or proprietary information you provide to us is collected, used and disclosed in accordance with FIPPA. Should you have any questions about the collection, use or disclosure of this information please contact: Manager of Legislative Services, RDOS, 101 Martin Street, Penticton, BC V2A 5J9, 250-492-0237.

Ross Hackworth -

Naramata

I support the new OCP – with the exception of the areas/points listed below.

5.2.10

In addition to collaboration with the Penticton Indian Band ADD: 'and other communities within the Okanagan Basin' This would initiate our commitment to participate in the Okanagan Collaborative Conservation Alliance. The Central Okanagan Conservation Alliance already has the support of all levels of government city, regional, provincial and federal. We can collaborate and capitalize on all the amazing work that has been thus far.

6.7.13

Needs updating – the Province has now come out with Short Term Rental Legislation and Area E should opt in immediately. The Province has done the heavy lifting here and taken over the enforcement and registration of Short Term Rentals on residential properties as well. Think of all the staff time & energy and tax dollars that will be saved (not to mention eliminating all the white TUP signs that end up in the land fill) by simply **opting in** for Area E. Please don't spend more taxpayer money on yet another study on this topic. The Permanent Resident requirement in the legislation will quickly add affordable housing to the rental and purchasing pool, help to reduce empty house syndrome and contribute to our 'vibrant village' without building a single house. The solution is clear on this item.

6.7.14

I disagree with this item altogether. Do we need a study on this? There was already a housing needs report completed in March 2021 (from section 6.4 of this OCP) If RDOS takes care of opting in to the Provincial Vacation Rental Rules and finally dealing with our Vacation Rental policy issues (see above item) - we will organically have much more of the affordable housing our community needs put back into the market.

7.3.8

Needs stronger language than 'will consider'. This should say 'prohibit future hillside development' and 'will explore options and implement regulations under the Local Government Act to also prohibit tree cutting, blasting, soil removal and recontouring of private unmanaged land within regional boundaries in order to protect the unique and endangered ecosystems on the hillsides of Naramata'

8.2.3

In relation to preserving wildlife corridors we should mention here our intent to join the Okanagan Collaborative Conservation Alliance and capitalize on all of the great work already being done by this group. Currently it stops at Okanagan Mountain Park – we should join and bring it right through along the Naramata Bench.

8.3.13

Remove Micro Cannabis facilities. This type of activity should be limited to industrial areas.

9.3.16

Remove Micro Cannabis facilities. This type of activity should be limited to industrial areas.

10.3.9

Remove Micro Cannabis facilities. This type of activity should be limited to industrial areas.

10.6

Vacation Rentals – needs update to new Provincial Regulations

11.6

Vacation Rentals – needs update to new Provincial Regulations

24.3.2.1

This should say ‘prohibit future hillside development’ and ‘will explore options and implement regulations under the Local Government Act to also prohibit tree cutting, blasting, soil removal and recontouring of private unmanaged land within regional boundaries in order to protect the unique and endangered ecosystems on the hillsides of Naramata’

24.3.2.2

We don’t need another housing study. Fix the vacation rental rules – fix much of our housing issues. We do need more seniors housing but we don’t need a study to tell us that. The waiting list for seniors housing already tells the story.

24.3.3.1

This item is now out of date – Provincial regulations are now in place – let’s **opt in for Area E!**

Auri Feindell

From: Gordon Easton < >
Sent: January 11, 2024 12:01 PM
To: Planning; Adrienne Fedrigo
Subject: RDOS - Electoral Area E OCP

Some people who received this message don't often get email from

[learn why this is important](#)

Dear Director Fedrigo, Chris Garrish

I have been reviewing the new draft OCP for Area E and wish to offer the following comments. I moved to Naramata Village in summer 2021 and my wife and I live here year round. We have been coming to this area for over 25 years and finally bought our dream house in 2021. We are supportive of the local businesses and enjoy the small town vibe that Naramata offers. In understanding the community and the proposed changes in the OCP, we are very support of the densification of the Naramata Village Centre as this will contribute greatly to the vibrancy of the Village. The addition of businesses, residential units and the accompanying population will only strengthen those attributes of Naramata which some may fear losing. Before moving here, we lived in close proximity to Edgemont Village in North Vancouver which many would describe as a treasure with a combination of local and national retailers and professional services with a very strong community focus. Over the last 8 years Edgemont Village has experienced redevelopment /growth and I would argue the additional residential and retail opportunities have strengthened the core of the Village and offer alternative forms of housing from the traditional single family homes that predominate the area. While growth/change can be disruptive, it can also be positive.


I am supportive of additional commercial and residential growth, particularly forms of residential that may include townhomes, small lot single family and small scale multi family units as I believe the RDOS should be recognizing that they need to play a role in accommodating and attracting more affordable forms of housing that support new families, seniors and rental opportunities for service workers and others so they too can live in the communities they work or grew up in.

I am also supportive of a new sewer system in Naramata to accommodate these future land uses , however I would like to see mechanisms by which new development can be accommodated in the short term through a private septic system which could then be converted/connected to a new community system when that becomes available. If this new development is required to wait for the new sewer, it only just pushes the current challenges further into the future.

Thank you for your consideration

Gordon Easton

Naramata BC
VOH 1N0



Feedback Form

Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen

101 Martin Street, Penticton, BC, V2A-5J9

Tel: 250-492-0237 / Email: planning@rdos.bc.ca

TO: Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen

FILE NO.: E2021.027-ZONE

FROM: Name: Randy & Fiona Cleveland
(please print)

Street Address: _____

Date: January 7, 2024

RE: Electoral Area "E" Official Community Plan (OCP) Bylaw No. 3010, 2023

My comments / concerns are:

- I do support the proposed OCP Bylaw.
- I do not support the proposed OCP Bylaw.

Please provide any comments you wish the Board to consider.
Written submissions will be considered by the Regional District Board
prior to a decision being made on this project.

1. We DO NOT support further densification of the village _____
2. We DO NOT support any more subdivisions in Upper Naramata _____
3. We DO NOT support the waste management proposal _____
4. We are concerned about the impact increased development will have on the already congested Naramata Road. _____

Feedback Forms must be completed and returned to the Regional District
prior to the closure of the public hearing.

Protecting your personal information is an obligation the Regional District of Okanagan-Similkameen takes seriously. Our practices have been designed to ensure compliance with the privacy provisions of the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* (British Columbia) ("FIPPA"). Any personal or proprietary information you provide to us is collected, used and disclosed in accordance with FIPPA. Should you have any questions about the collection, use or disclosure of this information please contact: Manager of Legislative Services, RDOS, 101 Martin Street, Penticton, BC V2A 5J9, 250-492-0237.

Jan 11, 2024

Dear Planners,

Please add these comments to our previously submitted comments.

We do not support the proposed OCP for Area E as currently written.

1. **The proposed OCP is drafted to reflect perceived community support for “Vibrant Village”. This is a term defined in the original RDOS survey in the spring of 2022. That survey was confusing, leading, misleading and should not be considered as valid. That survey’s results should be disregarded in favour of subsequent clear letters submitted by residents of Naramata.**
 - i. **Survey was too confusing, misleading and poorly designed by the drafters and the programmers.**
 - a. There were five terms defined at the outset of the survey with fine print that was difficult to remember and parse out.
 - b. There were many questions asking for preference of “Vibrant Village” or “Housing Focused Village Growth”. These questions were actually very tricky because the survey taker has to consider the definitions each time.
 - c. It was difficult to remember the definitions as one completed the survey.
 - d. We don’t believe that you could scroll back to refresh your memory on the definitions. We recall that there was a glitch in the program related to scrolling back.
 - e. If you had to take a break before completing the survey it was even more difficult to remember the definitions.
 - f. Each definition may have had items that you agreed with and items that you did not. We would like to point out that none of the definitions included a community sewer or LWMP.
 - g. Some of the definitions were more attractive sounding than others to most Naramatians.
 - h. Most residents of Naramata identify with the sound of Vibrant Village as we believe that we live in a vibrant village. We have a sense of community due to our many community groups and the fact that we know many residents of our village. We find vibrancy in our social groups, sports groups, our beautiful agricultural lands and the natural beauty of our surroundings.
 - ii. **The results of the survey would have been valid if residents of Area E were asked directly about the parameters of the definitions.** For example, do you support a community sewer system for Lower Naramata? Do you support densification of Lower Naramata with multi-family townhouses and apartments? Clear specific questions would provide accurate results.

- iii. **The above-noted concerns regarding the initial survey are widespread in Naramata. We haven't spoken to a single resident who felt the survey was fair or valid.**
 - a. In August 2022 the Community Advisory Group (CAG) of the OCP had its best attended meeting. There were approximately 30 people in attendance (Adrienne Fedrigo was in attendance). **The CAG unanimously rejected the initial survey and it was agreed that our rejection of the initial survey be communicated to the RDOS.** We believe that was done by our chairperson, Stefanie Gale.
- 2. **A better reflection of community opinion about sewer and densification of Lower Naramata were contained in the written feedback forms completed by concerned residents after the initial survey.**
 - A. **Regional Growth Strategy (RGS) Feedback in September 2022 – The RGS proposed amendment read very similarly to the proposed OCP.** The proposed amendment to the RGS for Area E proposed designating Lower Naramata as a Village Settlement Area (VSA). In the proposed RGS document densification of the VSA with multi-family homes was put forth, subject to servicing requirements. 157 Naramata residents wrote feedback about the proposed RGS amendments. **97% of the respondents opposed the RGS changes. The Naramata community did not support sewer or densification of Lower Naramata. On August 3, 2023 the RDOS Board followed the wishes of the community and voted to designate Area E as Rural Residential.**
 - B. **OCP Feedback in August 2023**

Again the survey was confusing to the respondents and lead them to supporting concepts that were not clearly defined. Many, many residents commented on this fact. They felt that the questions were leading and misleading. However the written comments were clear. 225 written responses were received identifying four areas of concern.
 - i. **Growth Containment Areas and Densification of Lower Naramata**
 - ii. **Sewer or LWMP in Lower Naramata**
 - iii. **Short Term Rentals**
 - iv. **Hillside Development**

We have provided our comments on these items in our previous feedback.

Conclusion – The fact that hundreds of letters (in the form of written feedback) oppose the critical points such as densification in Growth Containment Areas, sewer, short term rentals and hillside development provisions in the proposed OCP proves that the initial survey was

invalid and should not be a foundation for the new OCP. The written feedback is clear and unequivocal. The community of Naramata does not support the OCP as proposed.


As the OCP is meant to reflect the wishes of the community, please amend it to reflect the concerns expressed and bring the amended document before the community for comment.

Sincerely,

Matt and Cheryl Berry

— Naramata, BC

(Please count this as two responses)



Feedback Form

Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen

101 Martin Street, Penticton, BC, V2A-5J9

Tel: 250-492-0237 / Email: planning@rdos.bc.ca

TO: Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen **FILE NO.:** E2021.027-ZONE

FROM: Name: Sue Kirschmann
(please print)

Street Address: _____

Date: January 10, 2024

RE: Electoral Area "E" Official Community Plan (OCP) Bylaw No. 3010, 2023

My comments / concerns are:

I do support the proposed OCP Bylaw.

I do not support the proposed OCP Bylaw.

Please provide any comments you wish the Board to consider.
Written submissions will be considered by the Regional District Board
prior to a decision being made on this project.

See attached

Feedback Forms must be completed and returned to the Regional District prior to the closure of the public hearing.

Protecting your personal information is an obligation the Regional District of Okanagan-Similkameen takes seriously. Our practices have been designed to ensure compliance with the privacy provisions of the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* (British Columbia) ("FIPPA"). Any personal or proprietary information you provide to us is collected, used and disclosed in accordance with FIPPA. Should you have any questions about the collection, use or disclosure of this information please contact: Manager of Legislative Services, RDOS, 101 Martin Street, Penticton, BC V2A 5J9, 250-492-0237.

RE: Electoral Area “E” Official Community Plan (OCP) Bylaw No. 3010, 2023

My concerns with the proposed OCP Bylaw are as follows:

1. The OCP should not reflect support for a sewer system that the community has not yet received any detail about, nor had an opportunity to provide input on. Please remove any reference to RDOS or community support for sewer from the OCP.

Please also remove the Growth Containment maps B & C. If in the future the community decides it wants a sewer system, phased areas (such as B) can be determined and added to the OCP then. Area C is beyond the scope of an OCP. An OCP is a 10-20 year document and should not be making 50+ year projections.

2. I would like to see any higher density growth confined to the current Village Center Zone with the remainder of lower Naramata remain as a rural residential area with low density residential development. We don't need urban type density to have a vibrant village. What we need is residents who live in the community year-round (rent or own), enrolling their children in Naramata's school and supporting our local businesses throughout the year. We are far more likely to achieve this by addressing the issues of vacant houses and vacation rentals than by building to a higher density. Please change Growth Containment map A to match the current Village Center Zone and remove policies supporting densification outside this zone.
3. I believe the survey results could be skewed as a result of some questions being unclear or unintentionally biased. For example, in questions 4 and 5 of the August 2023 survey, mentioning proposed sewer Phases 1 and 2 infers that sewer is a foregone conclusion which could have influenced how people answered those questions. The fact that 225 people felt it necessary to add comments to that survey is a strong indicator that the survey questions missed the mark. I feel that the written comments express the community's wishes more accurately than do the survey question responses. I hope the key themes of the comments will be incorporated into the OCP before it is accepted by the board.
4. Please strengthen the wording regarding hillside development, for example 7.3.1.8 could say "Will explore" instead of "Will consider exploring".
5. There are numerous typos which I hope will be corrected. A few examples are:
 - 15.5.2.3 ?"nitration" (do you mean "integration"?)
 - 17.5.1 "Osoyoos Lake" (I assume you mean "Okanagan Lake"?)
 - 21.3.11 delete "consider" (not needed as the sentence already begins with "Encourage")
 - 21.3.6 and 21.3.9 are redundant. Could simplify with 1 sentence, e.g. "Encourages builders to meet or exceed the energy-efficiency and carbon performance requirements of the BC Building Code."

Thank you for this opportunity to give input on the OCP. I appreciate staff holding the hearing in 3 stages to enable as many citizens as possible to participate.

Sincerely,

Sue Kirschmann

..., Naramata

Lauri Feindell

From: Alan Nixon
Sent: January 10, 2024 7:29 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Area E OCP

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I attended the meeting on Sunday and thank Chris for his input also. What became clear on Sunday were several things:

1. The term 'vital village' means such events as our Mayday celebration, weekly summer markets and Christmas market to the residents.

However the planner suggested that it means increased density and more density people in the village.

2. The feeling of the residents is that the TDOS planners have plans for the village which exclude resident input as something to be acted upon. Rightly or wrongly residents feel that their input is simply an anodyne rather than a consideration.

3. Naramata has been designated a 'growth area' So, where are the jobs, infrastructure, transportation etc? Or are the new developments to be dark hoses?

There is only one road in and out of Naramata. In the event of a fire how will evacuation take place if there are many more residents?

4. My understanding of the sewer question is that a) most septics are reaching their allotted lifespan and b) there is a high phosphate level in the lake around the village area.

I also understand that by the installation of an ionising gadget in tanks this could be eliminated.

Thank you for your time.

Respectfully, Alan J. Nixon

Lauri Feindell

From: Darren Rettie
Sent: January 10, 2024 7:19 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Fwd: RDOS OCP review

Some people who received this message don't often get email from

[learn why this is important](#)

To: RDOS regarding the Area E – OCP Review January 10, 2024

We reject densification of the Lower area Village outside of the “core”. Lower Naramata Area B must be designated Rural Residential with low density residential development. We reject the notion that a sewer system be installed in areas A and B. The OCP should not reflect support for a sewer system before the community has had an opportunity to provide input on this issue and costs must be clearly disclosed ahead of time. The reference in the OCP indicating support for a community sanitary sewer system must be deleted.

We do not believe that more housing (even townhouses) will create attainable or affordable housing. Builders seem only to pursue the luxury market as that is where the profit is. Without first revising vacation home rules and speculation/secondary residence taxes, increased construction will not provide housing for full time residents and merely create more vacation homes. Currently 42.4% of Naramata homes have “out-of-town” owner addresses. These people are away much of the year and do not help our school’s enrollment and they do not contribute as much to the community as full-time residents.

Densification would only create more traffic going into Penticton to get services we do not have here, which is the opposite of what we should be doing to reduce consumption of fossil fuels. Naramata Road was not built to handle greatly increased traffic and would increase risk to cyclists. Current traffic jams at Haven Hill will only increase. We also believe most residents wish to keep the small town character that Naramata has.

Any new townhouses should be limited to areas in the core of the village (Area A) and those developers should be responsible for the installation of their own systems to handle their waste and not place this burden on other homeowners to facilitate this construction.

Rules must be put in place to eliminate or reduce stand-alone Vacation Rentals (without the owner on-site) as they can be disruptive to neighbours who have a right to peaceful enjoyment of their year-round residence. Those homes could then be annual rentals, helping the housing shortage and allowing families with children to move here. Speculation taxes should be in place to deter speculation.

Please listen to the people of Naramata before making changes that would create monumental alterations to our little village that none of us want.

Respectfully yours,

Darren and Lisa Rettie

Naramata BC

V0h1n1

Sent from my iPhone

Simmerling, Karen

From: Simmerling, Karen
Sent: Wednesday, January 10, 2024 1:02 PM
To: 'karensimmerling@icloud.com'
Subject: Electoral "E" Official Community Plan Bylaw No 3010, 2023

Dear Planning Committee Re Naramata Official Community Plan (OCP),
10, 2024

Jan

My name is Karen Simmerling , I live at [redacted] , Naramata BC V)H 1N1. I am a 34 year resident of Naramata BC.

This letter has three notations about the proposed OCP put forward by your committee.

1. **Keep it Rural Residential:** It is my strong feeling that the majority of Naramations do not support densification in Lower Naramata. There is very strong support that Naramata village continue it's development as RURAL RESIDENTIAL. I support development of already available single lots into single family homes. We do not need more high end condos that end up being vacation rentals. We need affordable family homes that people who want to be part of this community can live her year round can live in.
I am asking that all references of support for densification of Lower Naramata be removed from the proposed revision to the OCP.
2. **Keep Liquid waste management out of this version of the OCP:** The proposed OCP states there is support for a Liquid waste Management plan. This is too soon to say whether there is support or not. We have barely begun discussion, we do not know the proposed plan, the who, what, where or how much it will cost as it relates to Naramata.
I ask you remove any references to Liquid waste management from the proposed revised OCP.
3. **Strong Vacation Rentals language needed in the OCP.** Vacation rentals number in Naramata could wildly increase due to changes in Penticton and Summerland vacation rental rules. Also, Vacation rentals that do not have a representative or owner staying on the property when the rental is occurring can be noisy and unruly and disturb the neighbourhood. Additionally there are a lot of empty homes in Naramata (estimated 42% non full time live in owners)
I ask that the revised OCP add strong language to:
 - 1)add additional high taxes on unoccupied homes in Naramata,
 - 2) ensure that that there is a definite limit to how many vacation rentals Naramata can have for now and in the future, and
 - 3) that all vacation rentals need an owner or representative living on site when being rented.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input to the revised OCP for Electoral area "E" Bylaw No. 3010 2023.

January 7, 2024

To: Planning@rdos.bc.ca

Re: Electoral Area "E" OCP Bylaw No. 3010, 2023

After participating for more than the past 2 years as a member of the CAG, I do not agree with some of the language in the Draft OCP. In my opinion, the Draft OCP is misleading, non-representative of the communities' views and sometimes even untrue. It appears to promote an agenda that continually defies and ignores some prevalent agreements within the CAG as well as the general population.

I do not understand how this document can be presented back to us in a public hearing when no evident adjustments have been made even after the last public survey and input. There were 225 written submissions at the time, most expressing a rejection of the concepts of 1) village densification and 2) alleged support for a community sewer system.

What is the purpose of this process if nothing changes?

In the RDOS's definition, "An Official Community Plan (OCP) is the vision a community has for its future. It contains goals and policies that will shape future land use in a way that reflects the community's vision". Let's not forget that the OCP is intended to be the VISION of the people of Area E.

There are several sections that need revision before the Area E citizens accept this document as our official Community Plan:

1. I am asking that all references of support for densification in Lower Naramata be removed

[Sections 6.5, 6.6.1, 6.7.1, 6.7.3, 7.2.1.1, and 7.2.12]

There is not agreement or widespread support that Lower Naramata be designated as a growth area, allowing densification and multifamily development. There is a strong support for Naramata Village to continue developing with its' current designation as Rural Residential. We generally support infill and primarily

single-family homes. According to the RDOS, Within Area E, there are currently around 1700 lots that could be available for infill without any changes in our growth designation.

And related to that, Growth Containment Boundaries A, B and C (pages 24, 25 and 26 of the OCP) were never discussed or agreed upon by the CAG. These boundaries are a creation of the RDOS planners and were not part of any discussion at any time in the CAG or community meetings.

I am asking that any reference to these Growth Containment Boundaries be removed.

2. Remove any reference of support for the LWMP!

[\[7.2.1.6\]](#)

References to any support for LWMP is misleading and untrue. It is far from being accepted by the community. Only recently (July 10, 2023) was the proposal first presented in the early conceptual stage of planning- without even with the design and cost worked out.

3. Add clear, strong wording stating Area E's support for enforceable limitations on present and future Vacation Rentals (Such as, All Vacation Rentals require a permanent, full-time resident in the facility,)

[\(Section 6.7.13\)](#)

There was strong (unanimous Support) at community meetings for additional strong language and legislation to limit/ control Vacation Rentals in Naramata. The language in the draft OCP is weak and unrepresentative of our local view.

Naramata's housing problem is extreme and unique in the Regional District and language needs to support action on this- specifically for Area E- and not some general note supporting a Provincial Government review, etc...

4. **Add clear, strong wording stating that the Regional Board supports Area E's housing concerns and makes an urgent request for a Speculation Tax on empty homes.**

(Section 6.7.12)

There is support for a Speculation tax being imposed on Empty Homes. Again, Naramata has an extreme and unique situation (42+% of our homes have owners with an out-of-town address). It is too vague and broad to suggest asking that the Province impose a Speculation Tax on all areas of the RDOS.

As a general comment, I also suggest that there be a careful and thorough editing of the entire OCP. There are misspelled words and incorrect data that need correcting.

Two examples are:

1. Two Missing beach access points on the Trails and Recreation Map. (Robinson point between Lot 25 & Lot 35, and the south end of 3rd street between Lot 3180 and Lot 3189, 3rd street).
2. Misspelled words such as "tress" instead of "trees" on page 28 in section 7.2.

This is a legal document that needs to be written more carefully and accurately.

In conclusion,

This is the disconnect. More houses do not create attainable housing. My concern is that the proposed densification in the village area would very likely encourage additional "vacation" homes- apartments and condominiums. And do nothing to further development of housing for full time residents.

This is a very possible, undesirable outcome of the proposed 'densification' if the OCP doesn't first support full time, occupied homes. Without the regulations in place for controlling vacation rentals in Naramata, and without a speculation tax in Area E, the push for more densification does little to guarantee the type of housing that the community wants.

This OCP has put the 'cart before the horse' and will fail to solve one major issue that we, as a unified voice, have consistently and loudly been calling for. The draft OCP fails to strengthen this type of housing.

Some will argue that densification will provide attainable housing for families, but that is not borne out by the pricing and purchasing trends in Naramata. We know from observation that many Naramata homes are vacant in the off-season and many are used for vacation rentals in the summer and shoulder seasons. The Regional District has advised that as of last year 42.4% of home owners in Naramata have "out of town" addresses. 42.4% !

There is no reason to believe that this trend of summer residents purchasing the housing inventory in Naramata will change. Non-resident home owners do not enroll children in our school or contribute as much to the community fabric.

Let's not forget that the OCP is intended to be the VISION of the people of Area E and will be used as a primary guiding reference for all future development.

Respectfully submitted,

David R Tauzer

Naramata

Lauri Feindell

From: Carey Doberstein <>
Sent: January 7, 2024 9:15 PM
To: Planning
Subject: OCP feedback for Electoral area E (Naramata)

Some people who received this message don't often get email from

[Learn why this is important](#)

Hello,


I'm writing to provide feedback with regards to the OCP review for Electoral Area E (Naramata), in which I am a homeowner.

I understand that development, housing, and economic vitality of the Naramata village are polarized issues these days. I think reasonable, evidence-informed decisions can be taken to respond effectively to people's concerns and hopes for the community.

Yet I do not think the homeowners in Naramata who offer short term rental accommodations should be prohibited from doing so thorough changes to the OCP or by opting in to the new provincial system. I am not renting out my home as a short term rental, but I know the importance of this to sustain the area as a tourism destination. The community needs to continue to offer accommodation options to house visitors for what is primarily a tourism based economy, one that sustains many jobs in the area that contribute to the vitality of the village that everyone wants to bolster. To restrict short term rentals in Naramata would knee-cap the local economy without adding any new long term housing options for the people opponents purport to be worried about.

Thank you

Carey Doberstein



Feedback Form

Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen

101 Martin Street, Penticton, BC, V2A-5J9

Tel: 250-492-0237 / Email: planning@rdos.bc.ca

TO: Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen FILE NO.: E2021.027-ZONE

FROM: Name: Mindy Rollins
(please print)

Street Address: Naramata BC

Date: January 8th, 2024 VOH/NI

RE: Electoral Area "E" Official Community Plan (OCP) Bylaw No. 3010, 2023

My comments / concerns are:

- I do support the proposed OCP Bylaw.
- I do not support the proposed OCP Bylaw.

Please provide any comments you wish the Board to consider.
Written submissions will be considered by the Regional District Board prior to a decision being made on this project.


I do not want a sewer system - put this to referendum
I do not support designation of density
develop for the village + hillsides areas, keep rural
meat every where in Naramata
do not support site specific licensing
I do not support growth of wineries / alcohol products
I do not want incorporation of Naramata
I do not support TLEP / vacation rental as stated in ocp
Restrict vacation rentals + increase tax on them
I do support dark sky designation
I do support full research on impacts of opting
in to provincial rules for vacation rentals

Feedback Forms must be completed and returned to the Regional District prior to the closure of the public hearing.

I do not support major developments in Naramata
I do not support OCP used as tool to get sewer.

Protecting your personal information is an obligation the Regional District of Okanagan-Similkameen takes seriously. Our practices have been designed to ensure compliance with the privacy provisions of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (British Columbia) ("FIPPA"). Any personal or proprietary information you provide to us is collected, used and disclosed in accordance with FIPPA. Should you have any questions about the collection, use or disclosure of this information please contact: Manager of Legislative Services, RDOS, 101 Martin Street, Penticton, BC V2A 5J9, 250-492-0237.

Thank you for hosting 3 public meetings.
No density development



Feedback Form

Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen

101 Martin Street, Penticton, BC, V2A-5J9

Tel: 250-492-0237 / Email: planning@rdos.bc.ca

TO: Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen FILE NO.: E2021.027-ZONE

FROM: Name: JAMES HIBBERT
(please print)

Street Address: _____

Date: JAN 8 / 2024

RE: Electoral Area "E" Official Community Plan (OCP) Bylaw No. 3010, 2023

My comments / concerns are:


- I do support the proposed OCP Bylaw.
- I do not support the proposed OCP Bylaw.

Please provide any comments you wish the Board to consider.
Written submissions will be considered by the Regional District Board prior to a decision being made on this project.

I am not in favour of a Sewer System or high density designation

T.U.P. and Site Specific Permits create alot of issues, Land use Zoning questions, Affordable housing? noise issues, ect.
NOT IN FAVOUR OF THIS AS IT STANDS

Feedback Forms must be completed and returned to the Regional District prior to the closure of the public hearing.



Feedback Form

Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen

101 Martin Street, Penticton, BC, V2A-5J9

Tel: 250-492-0237 / Email: planning@rdos.bc.ca

TO: Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen **FILE NO.:** E2021.027-ZONE

FROM: Name: Brenda Lende
(please print)

Street Address: _____ KE1

Date: Jan 07 24

RE: Electoral Area "E" Official Community Plan (OCP) Bylaw No. 3010, 2023

My comments / concerns are:


I do support the proposed OCP Bylaw.
I do not support the proposed OCP Bylaw.

Please provide any comments you wish the Board to consider.
Written submissions will be considered by the Regional District Board prior to a decision being made on this project.

- I do not support sewer system.
- I do not support the village as a primary growth area.
- I do not support vacation T.U.P.s as is

Feedback Forms must be completed and returned to the Regional District prior to the closure of the public hearing.

Protecting your personal information is an obligation the Regional District of Okanagan-Similkameen takes seriously. Our practices have been designed to ensure compliance with the privacy provisions of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (British Columbia) ("FIPPA"). Any personal or proprietary information you provide to us is collected, used and disclosed in accordance with FIPPA. Should you have any questions about the collection, use or disclosure of this information please contact: Manager of Legislative Services, RDOS, 101 Martin Street, Penticton, BC V2A 5J9, 250-492-0237.



Feedback Form

Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen
101 Martin Street, Penticton, BC, V2A-5J9
Tel: 250-492-0237 / Email: planning@rdos.bc.ca

TO: Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen FILE NO.: E2021.027-ZONE

FROM: Name: EARL ROULSTON
(please print)

Street Address: _____

Date: NARAMATA JAN 7, 2024

RE: Electoral Area "E" Official Community Plan (OCP) Bylaw No. 3010, 2023

My comments / concerns are:

- I do support the proposed OCP Bylaw.
- I do not support the proposed OCP Bylaw.

Please provide any comments you wish the Board to consider.
Written submissions will be considered by the Regional District Board
prior to a decision being made on this project.

I DO NOT SUPPORT THE OCP AS IT
CURRENTLY IS I DO NOT SUPPORT THE
COMMUNITY GROWTH, VACATION RENTALS
AND SEWER

Feedback Forms must be completed and returned to the Regional District
prior to the closure of the public hearing.

Protecting your personal information is an obligation the Regional District of Okanagan-Similkameen takes seriously. Our practices have been designed to ensure compliance with the privacy provisions of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (British Columbia) ("FIPPA"). Any personal or proprietary information you provide to us is collected, used and disclosed in accordance with FIPPA. Should you have any questions about the collection, use or disclosure of this information please contact: Manager of Legislative Services, RDOS, 101 Martin Street, Penticton, BC V2A 5J9, 250-492-0237.

auri Feindell

From: Cliff Proudfoot
Sent: January 8, 2024 2:33 PM
To: Shannon Duong
Subject: RE: AREA E OCP COMMENTS

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

You don't often get email from

[Learn why this is important](#)

Thanks Shannon please forward my emails as a formal submission. I would note that the survey you forwarded noted 32 dislikes for empty or vacant homes out of 1228 dislike responses. Again this level of engagement and lack of support should not be the basis to propose the advocacy position for seeking the empty homes tax to be imposed in the entire RDOS.

Regards
Cliff

Clifford G. Proudfoot, K.C.* (he/him) | Managing Partner
Lawson Lundell LLP
D 604.631.9217 | F 604.694.2951
*Law Corporation

From: Shannon Duong <sduong@rdos.bc.ca>
Sent: Monday, January 8, 2024 2:26 PM
To: Cliff Proudfoot (3217) - [View in Outlook](#)
Subject: RE: AREA E OCP COMMENTS

[THIS MESSAGE ORIGINATED FROM OUTSIDE OUR FIRM]

Good afternoon Cliff,

Thanks for reaching out.

The final report for the Electoral Area "E" Official Community Plan Bylaw Review survey can be found here:
<https://rdosregionalconnections.ca/22758/widgets/109254/documents/85075>

The survey acted to inform the draft Official Community Plan, but is not necessarily the sole factor influencing the various statements with the draft document. I don't believe the survey specifically addressed the empty homes tax. That being said, the Regional District received other feedback as part of its public engagement process (e.g., Community Advisory Group).

Also, please let me know if you would like me to add your comments below as a formal submission to be included with the Regional District Board's applicable public meeting agenda for their consideration.

Regards,



Shannon Duong, MRM • Planner II
 Regional District of Okanagan-Similkameen
 101 Martin Street, Penticton, BC V2A 5J9
 p. 250-490-4384 • tf. 1.877-610-3737 • f. 250-492-0063
www.rdos.bc.ca • sduong@rdos.bc.ca

I acknowledge that I work within the traditional, unceded territory of the syilx people in the Okanagan Nation.

This Communication is intended for the use of the recipient to which it is addressed, and may contain confidential, personal and/or privileged information. Please contact the sender immediately if you are not the intended recipient of this communication and do not copy, distribute or take action relying on it. Any communication received in error, or subsequent reply, should be deleted or destroyed.

From: Cliff Proudfoot
Sent: Monday, January 8, 2024 9:38 AM
To: Planning <planning@rdos.bc.ca>
Subject: AREA E OCP COMMENTS

Some people who received this message don't often get email from

[Learn why this is important](#)

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed OCP Amendments.

My wife, Karen Dawson, and I are residents of _____ in Area E.

We are opposed to the Empty Homes tax being extended to Area E and the entire RDOS.

We also would ask for some clarification on the survey results that this proposal is based on. It appears that a small percentage of Area E residents that responded to the survey sought the inclusion of this position in the OCP. Indeed that number was far less than 50% of those surveyed and, based on this data alone, it is unreasonable to include this advocacy position into the OCP.

Kindly confirm how many people sought this inclusion into the OCP.

Regards
 Cliff




CLIFFORD G. PROUDFOOT, K.C.* (he/him) | Managing Partner
 D 604.631.9217 | F 604.694.2951 | E cproudfoot@lawsonlundell.com
LAWSON LUNDELL LLP 1600 - 925 West Georgia Street, Vancouver, BC V6C 3L2
 Vancouver | Calgary | Yellowknife | Kelowna
 *Law Corporation



Disclaimer

This email and any accompanying attachments contain confidential information that may be subject to solicitor-client privilege and are intended only for the named recipients. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender and destroy the email. Our e-mail terms of use can be found at <http://www.lawsonlundell.com/disclaimer.html>



Feedback Form

Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen

101 Martin Street, Penticton, BC, V2A-5J9

Tel: 250-492-0237 / Email: planning@rdos.bc.ca

TO: Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen

FILE NO.: Bylaw 3010, 2023

FROM: Name: Schalk van Heerden

(please print)

Street Address: _____

Date: January 8th, 2024

RE: Electoral Area "E" Official Community Plan, Bylaw No. 3010, 2023

My comments / concerns are:

- I do support the proposed Official Community Plan.
- I do support the proposed Official Community Plan, subject to the comments listed below.
- I do not support the proposed rezoning of the subject parcel.

Written submissions received from this information meeting will be considered by the Regional District Board prior to 1st reading of Amendment Bylaw No. 2459.39.

OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN (draft)

OCP Bylaw No. 3010, 2023 – Regional District of Okanagan-Similkameen

<https://rdosregionalconnections.ca/22758/widgets/154809/documents/106311>

The OCP appears in general fit-for-purpose, meaning that I am in support of the broad concepts in the draft document issued for review and comments (particularly regarding growth containment and sewerage treatment) and that most of the essentials are covered adequately.

Notwithstanding, final editing remains absolutely imperative prior to submission to the Board for approval and implementation.

Proposed crucial amendments attached.

Feedback Forms must be completed and returned to the Regional District prior to completion of Public Hearing.

OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN (draft)

OCP Bylaw No. 3010, 2023 – Regional District of Okanagan-Similkameen

<https://rdosregionalconnections.ca/22758/widgets/154809/documents/106311>

Proposed crucial amendments prior to submission for Board approval:

1. Growth Management

- a. Section 7.3.1.1 – introduce new wording to reflect the entire community’s unanimous desire:
“**Strongly discourages...**”, or “**Emphatically discourages...**”

2. Sewer Systems

- a. Section 7.2.1.6 – consider rewording:
“*Continue with the development and promotion of the Liquid Waste Management Plan for Naramata to the satisfaction of the community and key external stakeholders such as Interior Health and Okanagan Basin Water Board.*”
- b. Section 19.3 to have consistent and corresponding wording.

3. Naramata Centre

- a. Section 7.2 refers to the “*United Church*”, but 7.2.4 mentions “*Naramata Centre*”. The correct entity to be defined.
- b. Section 7.2.1.4 states “re-designating”.
 - i. presumably this infers “**rezoning**”, which would then require the ordinary public consultation processes?
If not, such *ad hoc* consideration is inappropriate.
 - ii. “*apartment buildings*” should be qualified as “**low-rise**”, or alternatively described limited by a “**height restriction**” commensurate with Naramata Village Settlement Area?

4. External Agencies

- a. **Ministry of Agriculture and Food** – 13 July 2023
 - i. A number of pertinent comments still need to be addressed (Sections 9.3.5, 9.3.13, 9.3.14, 9.3.15, 10.3.7, and particularly **21.3.2.h** and **23.3.8.7**)
- b. **Ministry of Forests** – 17 July 2023
 - i. Section 17.5.1 mentions “**Osoyoos Lake**”?
 - ii. Comments related to Sections 17.5.2.1, 17.5.2.5, and 17.5.2.6 need to be accommodated.

Mauri Feindell

From: Lorna Hancock <[\[redacted\]](#)>
Sent: January 9, 2024 9:23 AM
To: Planning
Subject: Regarding Naramata OCP - call for another survey

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Some people who received this message don't often get email from lorn

[n why this is important](#)

Tuesday, Jan 9, 2024

Planning Department
RDOS

A clear memory for me is last summer, receiving your initial survey. I turned to my husband and said 'Is this for real? Although this LOOKS like a survey, it is not actually. All answers were leading to a foregone conclusion, and did not invite comment. I found it impossible to answer even though I did. May I humbly suggest that you do another survey again and this time give ample room for comment?

I am of an age that I remember the Blackwell court case clearly and it was a nasty experience for all, especially those of us who did NOT have anything to do with mistakes made by others. Perhaps you could say that we should have learned our lesson at that time, and that is to dot all 'I's' and cross all 'T's' especially when it is obvious that so many people have something to say about this.

Please accept my letter as part of your deliberations, and circulate to any appropriate.

Sincerely,
Lorna J Hancock
Naramata

cc. Others

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

Lauri Feindell

From: Christopher Garrish
Sent: January 9, 2024 2:05 PM
To: Shannon Duong
Cc: Lauri Feindell
Subject: FW: Feedback to Area E Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 3010, 2023

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

FYI

From: David Enns
Sent: Tuesday, January 9, 2024 1:38 PM
To: Christopher Garrish <cgarrish@rdos.bc.ca>
Cc: David Enns <denns@rdos.bc.ca>; Adrienne Fedrigo <afedrigo@rdos.bc.ca>; Cynthia Enns <cenns@rdos.bc.ca>
Subject: Feedback to Area E Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 3010, 2023

You don't often get email from [why this is important](#)

Hi Chris,

As part of the public consultation process, below is our feedback and requests for change to the proposed OCP for Area E. Thanks for the consideration on this submission.

Regards
David and Cynthia Enns

Naramata BC

Naramata General Store
Naramata Wine Vault

Section 12.0 Naramata Village Center

12.3 Policies

-#3 and #4 conflict with each other in that we agree the continued intensification and growth of commercial activities are possible but with the simultaneous development of seniors housing, group care and community care housing, they would be better situated in a less busy, less traffic, less competitive part of the village.

- #7 Landscaping plans for Robinson between 1st street and 4th street should be removed as the trees that exist now are noted to not be invasive trees as indicated by Justin Shuttlecock of the RDOS Parks Board. See cut and paste of email in 2021

From: Justin Shuttleworth <jshuttleworth@rdos.bc.ca>
Date: Fri, Feb 26, 2021 at 8:55 AM

Subject: RE: Parks and rec follow up
To: Karla Kozakevich <kkozakevich@rdos.bc.ca>, Cynthia Enns <
CC: David Enns <

Good morning,

Many of the street trees in Naramata are American Elms (or a variety of) which are native to eastern Canada and not invasive. They do come with their own species specific issues but are a highly valuable street tree in many communities.

I am not overly familiar with treatments of the elm beetle but I am sure there is something. Most American elms including the ones in Naramata are susceptible to scale and aphids which creates the black film (sooty mold) over much of the bark.

It may be possible that a single treatment type may help manage all of these issues eliminating some of the nuisance issues and improve tree health. The street trees in Naramata are also in desperate need of a prune which would improve the look and again help with the pests.

The elms on the streets in Naramata are on MOTI land and the RDOS has not ability to maintain at this time. If there is a desire to look at enhanced maintenance of the street trees in Naramata we would need to look at a form of tenure from MOTI with budget through and appropriate service area.

Thanks



Justin Shuttleworth • Parks & Facilities Manager

Regional District of Okanagan-Similkameen

[101 Martin Street, Penticton, BC V2A 5J9](http://www.rdos.bc.ca)

13.3 Policies-General Commercial

#7 Where signage within provincial highway road dedications to comply with the Ministry of Transport and Infrastructure's policies; That the RDOS work with MoTI to police the sprawl of sign=signage that exist at the intersections of roads onto Naramata Road especially as one enters the village at the top of Robinson Road.

While we do not have a current “Welcome to Naramata” sign we do have many unwarranted business signs and sandwich boards that clutter the road sides.

22.0 Temporary Use Permits

In regards to the RDOS Board’s views on whether to opt into Provincial Vacation Rental Guidelines they suggested in the fall of 2023, I would like the RDOS Board to create their own guidelines for Area E and realize that many of the Short Term Rentals are large and expensive homes that will never be available for affordable housing but these homes do support the very large tourist/commercial industry that has grown up around and in Naramata Village. There is no other alternative vacation accommodation on the Naramata Bench so at minimum, a moratorium of 5 years to let the region develop some alternate commercial options (motels, boutique hotels, smaller Inns) should be considered.

A good example of a community that does allow vacation rentals, due to its commercial existence, is Osoyoos, where they have struck a balance between longterm residents and the flow of tourism through the seasonably warm months of the year.

Section 23.3 Environmentally Sensitive Development Permit (ESDP) Area –

The property of 800 Languedoc Road, Naramata (PID 010-308-032, Lot 2 District Lot 211 Similkameen Division Yale District Plan 5421) is indicated on Schedule I to be included in the Environmentally Sensitive area. As owner of this lot, we do not feel that it should be in this area as it is not materially different from the lot we own directly beside it at 4640 Mill Road (PID 010-308-024, Lot 1 District Lot 211 Similkameen Division Yale District Plan 5421). We have built a house and farmed on 4640 Mill Road since 2012.

A portion of Lot 2 has already been levelled and previously farmed and road access had been made from the previous owner from Languedoc. It is not logical to include this lot in the ESDP area. Please adjust your map.

23.5.6 Naramata Village Centre Development Permit Area - Guidelines

.1 c – The ground floor AND SECOND FLOOR of a building should not be set back from the parcel line, iii) a setback provides space for a porch or patio for a ground floor residential unit..

We feel that this should be reworded to be more flexible to change the iii) to be “a setback provides space for a porch or patio for a ground or **second floor** residential unit.

The logic being that if there is a requirement as stated in .4 “Private Outdoor Spaces - a) All residential units should have access to private or semi-private outdoor space or on balconies or roof decks.”, then why limit the ability to have a balcony on the front of the building?

.3 b – Ground floor window of 75% of total wall area is excessive. It will not align with goals to keep in historical character in design nor will it provide for more economical heating.

We request that the ground floor also be 50 – 75% as stated for the upper floor window areas.

Lauri Feindell

Subject: FW: Feedback to Area E Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 3010, 2023

From: David Enns <>
Sent: Tuesday, January 9, 2024 1:38 PM
To: Christopher Garrish <cgarrish@rdos.bc.ca>
Cc: David Enns <> Adrienne Fedrigo <afedrigo@rdos.bc.ca>; Cynthia Enns <cenns@rdos.bc.ca>
Subject: Feedback to Area E Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 3010, 2023

You don't often get email from [why this is important](#)

Hi Chris,

As part of the public consultation process, below is our feedback and requests for change to the proposed OCP for Area E. Thanks for the consideration on this submission.

Regards
David and Cynthia Enns

Naramata BC

Naramata General Store
Naramata Wine Vault

Section 12.0 Naramata Village Center

12.3 Policies

-#3 and #4 conflict with each other in that we agree the continued intensification and growth of commercial activities are possible but with the simultaneous development of seniors housing, group care and community care housing, they would be better situated in a less busy, less traffic, less competitive part of the village.

- #7 Landscaping plans for Robinson between 1st street and 4th street should be removed as the trees that exist now are noted to not be invasive trees as indicated by Justin Shuttlecock of the RDOS Parks Board. See cut and paste of email in 2021

From: Justin Shuttleworth <jshuttleworth@rdos.bc.ca>
Date: Fri, Feb 26, 2021 at 8:55 AM
Subject: RE: Parks and rec follow up
To: Karla Kozakevich <kkozakevich@rdos.bc.ca>, Cynthia Enns <>
CC: David Enns

Good morning,

Many of the street trees in Naramata are American Elms (or a variety of) which are native to eastern Canada and not invasive. They do come with their own species specific issues but are a highly valuable street tree in many communities.

I am not overly familiar with treatments of the elm beetle but I am sure there is something. Most American elms including the ones in Naramata are susceptible to scale and aphids which creates the black film (sooty mold) over much of the bark.

It may be possible that a single treatment type may help manage all of these issues eliminating some of the nuisance issues and improve tree health. The street trees in Naramata are also in desperate need of a prune which would improve the look and again help with the pests.

The elms on the streets in Naramata are on MOTI land and the RDOS has not ability to maintain at this time. If there is a desire to look at enhanced maintenance of the street trees in Naramata we would need to look at a form of tenure from MOTI with budget through and appropriate service area.

Thanks



Justin Shuttleworth • Parks & Facilities Manager

Regional District of Okanagan-Similkameen

[101 Martin Street, Penticton, BC V2A 5J9](http://www.rdos.bc.ca)

13.3 Policies-General Commercial

#7 Where signage within provincial highway road dedications to comply with the Ministry of Transport and Infrastructure's policies; That the RDOS work with MoTI to police the sprawl of sign=signage that exist at the intersections of roads onto Naramata Road especially as one enters the village at the top of Robinson Road. While we do not have a current "Welcome to Naramata" sign we do have many unwarranted business signs and sandwich boards that clutter the road sides.

22.0 Temporary Use Permits

In regards to the RDOS Board's views on whether to opt into Provincial Vacation Rental Guidelines they suggested in the fall of 2023, I would like the RDOS Board to create their own guidelines for Area E and realize that many of the Short Term Rentals are large and expensive homes that will never be available for affordable housing but these homes do support the very large tourist/commercial industry that has grown up

around and in Naramata Village. There is no other alternative vacation accommodation on the Naramata Bench so at minimum, a moratorium of 5 years to let the region develop some alternate commercial options (motels, boutique hotels, smaller Inns) should be considered.

A good example of a community that does allow vacation rentals, due to its commercial existence, is Osoyoos, where they have struck a balance between longterm residents and the flow of tourism through the seasonably warm months of the year.

Section 23.3 Environmentally Sensitive Development Permit (ESDP) Area –

The property of 800 Languedoc Road, Naramata (PID 010-308-032, Lot 2 District Lot 211 Similkameen Division Yale District Plan 5421) is indicated on Schedule I to be included in the Environmentally Sensitive area. As owner of this lot, we do not feel that it should be in this area as it is not materially different from the lot we own directly beside it at 4640 Mill Road (PID 010-308-024, Lot 1 District Lot 211 Similkameen Division Yale District Plan 5421). We have built a house and farmed on 4640 Mill Road since 2012.

A portion of Lot 2 has already been levelled and previously farmed and road access had been made from the previous owner from Languedoc. It is not logical to include this lot in the ESDP area. Please adjust your map.

23.5.6 Naramata Village Centre Development Permit Area - Guidelines

.1 c – The ground floor AND SECOND FLOOR of a building should not be set back from the parcel line, iii) a setback provides space for a porch or patio for a ground floor residential unit..

We feel that this should be reworded to be more flexible to change the iii) to be “a setback provides space for a porch or patio for a ground or **second floor** residential unit.

The logic being that if there is a requirement as stated in .4 “Private Outdoor Spaces - a) All residential units should have access to private or semi-private outdoor space or on balconies or roof decks.”, then why limit the ability to have a balcony on the front of the building?

.3 b – Ground floor window of 75% of total wall area is excessive. It will not align with goals to keep in historical character in design nor will it provide for more economical heating.

We request that the ground floor also be 50 – 75% as stated for the upper floor window areas.

Date: JUNE / 2024

To: The Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen
planners@rdos.bc.ca

From: FRAN CRAIG

Address: _____

Thank you for the opportunity to present feedback on the latest version of the OCP.

There are 4 areas of specific concern that I would like to address as feedback for the RDOS.

- 1) Growth Section of the OCP
- 2) Sewer or Liquid Waste Management Plant
- 3) Vacation Rentals
- 4) Hillside Development

1) Growth Section:

- I support keeping Lower Naramata as a Rural Residential low growth area versus the proposed OCP version that classifies Lower Naramata as a Growth area.
- The Growth Containment Boundaries (OCP) and the Village Settlement Area (VSA) from the proposed RGS amendment are virtually the same. 97% of the community rejected the Village Settlement Area in a previous survey with clear direction to not densify Lower Naramata beyond what is permitted with Low Density Rural Residential growth. Please remove any reference to support for densifying Lower Naramata with multi-family residential development.
- The Growth containment Boundaries (A, B, & C) have not been agreed upon by the community and should be deleted in the OCP.

2) Sewer or Liquid Waste Management Plant

- I do not support the Sewer or LWMP and am in favor of maintaining the septic systems that are currently in effect. References in the latest version of the OCP indicating community support of a Sewer or LWMP should be removed.

3) Vacation Rentals

- The latest draft version of the OCP does not address the community's view or the level of concern for Vacation Rentals. The OCP needs to be strengthened to include requiring business licensing, full time owner or caretaker on site for all short-term rentals, meaningful fines/penalties for non compliance and proper enforcement.

4) Hillside Development

- There needs to be stronger language concerning Hillside Development to prevent landslide, drainage, and run-off issues regardless of the development size. Fines for noncompliance must be increased to a meaningful number with enhanced enforcement. A bond should be posted that is reflective of the size of the development with applicable fines being applied against it.

The OCP is an important document and it's very important that the Regional District reflect the wishes of the community.

Signed by:

Date: Jan 9/2024

To: The Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen
planners@rdos.bc.ca

From: Art Craig

Address: _____

Thank you for the opportunity to present feedback on the latest version of the OCP.

There are 4 areas of specific concern that I would like to address as feedback for the RDOS.

- 1) Growth Section of the OCP
- 2) Sewer or Liquid Waste Management Plant
- 3) Vacation Rentals
- 4) Hillside Development

1) Growth Section:

- I support keeping Lower Naramata as a Rural Residential low growth area versus the proposed OCP version that classifies Lower Naramata as a Growth area.
- The Growth Containment Boundaries (OCP) and the Village Settlement Area (VSA) from the proposed RGS amendment are virtually the same. 97% of the community rejected the Village Settlement Area in a previous survey with clear direction to not densify Lower Naramata beyond what is permitted with Low Density Rural Residential growth. Please remove any reference to support for densifying Lower Naramata with multi-family residential development.
- The Growth containment Boundaries (A, B, & C) have not been agreed upon by the community and should be deleted in the OCP.

2) Sewer or Liquid Waste Management Plant

- I do not support the Sewer or LWMP and am in favor of maintaining the septic systems that are currently in effect. References in the latest version of the OCP indicating community support of a Sewer or LWMP should be removed.

3) Vacation Rentals

- The latest draft version of the OCP does not address the community's view or the level of concern for Vacation Rentals. The OCP needs to be strengthened to include requiring business licensing, full time owner or caretaker on site for all short-term rentals, meaningful fines/penalties for non compliance and proper enforcement.

4) Hillside Development

- There needs to be stronger language concerning Hillside Development to prevent landslide, drainage, and run-off issues regardless of the development size. Fines for noncompliance must be increased to a meaningful number with enhanced enforcement. A bond should be posted that is reflective of the size of the development with applicable fines being applied against it.

The OCP is an important document and it's very important that the Regional District reflect the wishes of the community.

Signed by:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'C. A.', is written over a horizontal line.

Electoral AREA "E" Official Community Plan BYLAW No:3010, 2023

January, 9th 2024

To whom it may concern:

Over all I support the new OCP- With the addition of these elements. The first two- hot topics, Vacation rental and Hillside development. The third and inclusive addition to our Broad Goals

1. It is crucial to address the issue of vacation rentals in this OCP, the Province has done the work, and we don't need to spend more money on a study. The province has taken care of it for us. If we address the vacation rental issue, we will likely achieve the vibrant village with out having to build more homes immediately. It will give us more time to do all of the more research for the sewers and deciding what more density we need. We know that 42 % are empty so you could argue a large portion are vacation rentals. So, between the speculation tax and the Vacation rental opt in we would be covered.
6.7.13 is no longer needed, remove it, the government has done this already, all we need to do is opt in.
6.7.14 can be removed as the gov has done this already.
2. Hillside development- we need a growth boundary in place
Second -we need a sensitive protection bylaw to protect the sensitive ecosystem. Like tree cutting, blasting, soil removal and recontouring bylaw- the RDOS should use all the tools in the local gov act to adopt bylaws that place restrictions on forest management activity on private unmanaged land within regional boundaries in order to protect the unique an endangered ecosystems on the hillsides of upper Naramata.
3. We need to add to our broad goal 5.2.10

Penticton Indian Band- improve and expand communications, consultation, and engagement with Penticton Indian band" AND OTHER COMMUNITIES WITHIN THE OKANAGAN BASIN".

The RDOS should adopt and participate in the Okanagan Collaborative Conservation Alliance. Our Central Okanagan neighbors are ahead of us, we can join their initiatives and collaborate and capitalise on all the amazing work that has been done.

The Central Okanagan Conservation Alliance already has the support of all levels of government city, regional, provincial and federal.

Sincerely, Nicole

Nicole Verpaelst

Naramata, BC
VOH 1N0

cm

auri Feindell

Subject: RE: Public hearing

From: leslie ford
Sent: Tuesday, January 9, 2024 3:47 PM
To: Shannon Duong <sduong@rdos.bc.ca>
Subject: Re: Public hearing

You don't often get email from: [y this is important](#)

Hi Shannon here are some of my concerns thanks for your prompt help

Vacations rentals/bed&breakfast

I see there are some of the usual people trying to use this NDP New legislation to stop all vacation rentals in Naramata - NDP has only done this because of housing shortage in populated areas. Previous recent RDOS polls show that they are still favorable towards these units as long as homeowners live on site for many reasons-these people trying to jump on the NDP WAGON are not going this because they want more housing but just to stop the growth of Naramata -i have a friend that had a 3 bed house for long term rent on beach in Naramata for a low price and there's been no takers - it took 4 months to get it rented so Naramata is not where the housing crisis is it's closer to the cities where the jobs are.

These rentals bring an enormous amount of much needed revenue into the areas. They bring in mostly couples or families wanting to enjoy our beautiful lake Okanagan. And they really spend while they are here -ask the stores - the wineries- the water sport rentals and of course all the restaurants and coffee shops - All these small businesses have been hit hard over the last several years with barely surviving Covid and costs of supplies raised so much making everything so much harder to compete with- just look at last year the local businesses all over the Okanagan got their busiest month August tourism destroyed by the NDP. As they put in very strict travel ban because of the fires -and then rescinded it because of BC tourism pushed them to stop the ban but it was too late! Everyone had cancelled so all the wineries and restaurants and shops and pubs and events ect need this summer tourism dollars and we saw a lot of real struggles - wineries had already been hit so hard because of the freeze the season before and a lot of them are for sale or closed their doors - I mean if the wineries have to close and sell some of these properties will go to development and Naramata will start to just be part of Penticton - Naramata has always been a town that had summer visitors. In the 21 years I've been coming here even before moving here permanently there have always been a good portion of homes that were secondary summer vacation places - that hasn't changed at all - and the owners of these homes still pay all the property taxes that are highly needed in our community and help with all the services that would be hard to live without - And the clear cut development's absolutely a problem - the last thing we need is another summerland landslide which isn't hard to avoid if they have to leave each lot with exciting trees on then just like they make them do all over in other cities

Sent from my iPad

Date: Jan 1, 2024

To: The Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen
planners@rdos.bc.ca

From: Breelyn Rauhainen

Address: Naramata BC

Thank you for the opportunity to present feedback on the latest version of the OCP.

There are 4 areas of specific concern that I would like to address as feedback for the RDOS.

- 1) Growth Section of the OCP
- 2) Sewer or Liquid Waste Management Plant
- 3) Vacation Rentals
- 4) Hillside Development

1) Growth Section:

- I support keeping Lower Naramata as a Rural Residential low growth area versus the proposed OCP version that classifies Lower Naramata as a Growth area.
- The Growth Containment Boundaries (OCP) and the Village Settlement Area (VSA) from the proposed RGS amendment are virtually the same. 97% of the community rejected the Village Settlement Area in a previous survey with clear direction to not densify Lower Naramata beyond what is permitted with Low Density Rural Residential growth. Please remove any reference to support for densifying Lower Naramata with multi-family residential development.
- The Growth containment Boundaries (A, B, & C) have not been agreed upon by the community and should be deleted in the OCP.

2) Sewer or Liquid Waste Management Plant

- I do not support the Sewer or LWMP and am in favor of maintaining the septic systems that are currently in effect. References in the latest version of the OCP indicating community support of a Sewer or LWMP should be removed.

3) Vacation Rentals

- The latest draft version of the OCP does not address the community's view or the level of concern for Vacation Rentals. The OCP needs to be strengthened to include requiring business licensing, full time owner or caretaker on site for all short-term rentals, meaningful fines/penalties for non compliance and proper enforcement.

4) Hillside Development

- There needs to be stronger language concerning Hillside Development to prevent landslide, drainage, and run-off issues regardless of the development size. Fines for noncompliance must be increased to a meaningful number with enhanced enforcement. A bond should be posted that is reflective of the size of the development with applicable fines being applied against it.

The OCP is an important document and it's very important that the Regional District reflect the wishes of the community.

Signed
by:

Electoral AREA "E" Official Community Plan BYLAW No:3010, 2023

January, 9th 2024

To whom it may concern:

Over all I support the new OCP- With the addition of these elements. The first two- hot topics, Vacation rental and Hillside development. The third and inclusive addition to our Broad Goals

1. It is crucial to address the issue of vacation rentals in this OCP, the Province has done the work, and we don't need to spend more money on a study. The province has taken care of it for us. If we address the vacation rental issue, we will likely achieve the vibrant village with out having to build more homes immediately. It will give us more time to do all of the more research for the sewers and deciding what more density we need. We know that 42 % are empty so you could argue a large portion are vacation rentals. So, between the speculation tax and the Vacation rental opt in we would be covered.
6.7.13 is no longer needed, remove it, the government has done this already, all we need to do is opt in.
6.7.14 can be removed as the gov has done this already.
2. Hillside development- we need a growth boundary in place
Second -we need a sensitive protection bylaw to protect the sensitive ecosystem. Like tree cutting, blasting, soil removal and recontouring bylaw- the RDOS should use all the tools in the local gov act to adopt bylaws that place restrictions on forest management activity on private unmanaged land within regional boundaries in order to protect the unique an endangered ecosystems on the hillsides of upper Naramata.
3. We need to add to our broad goal 5.2.10

Penticton Indian Band- improve and expand communications, consultation, and engagement with Penticton Indian band" AND OTHER COMMUNITIES WITHIN THE OKANAGAN BASIN".

The RDOS should adopt and participate in the Okanagan Collaborative Conservation Alliance. Our Central Okanagan neighbors are ahead of us, we can join their initiatives and collaborate and capitalise on all the amazing work that has been done.

The Central Okanagan Conservation Alliance already has the support of all levels of government city, regional, provincial and federal.

Sincerely,

Rita Terriff

Naramata, BC
VOH 1N1

Electoral AREA "E" Official Community Plan BYLAW No:3010, 2023

January, 9th 2024

To whom it may concern:

Over all I support the new OCP- With the addition of these elements. The first two- hot topics, Vacation rental and Hillside development. The third and inclusive addition to our Broad Goals

1. It is crucial to address the issue of vacation rentals in this OCP, the Province has done the work, and we don't need to spend more money on a study. The province has taken care of it for us. If we address the vacation rental issue, we will likely achieve the vibrant village with out having to build more homes immediately. It will give us more time to do all of the more research for the sewers and deciding what more density we need. We know that 42 % are empty so you could argue a large portion are vacation rentals. So, between the speculation tax and the Vacation rental opt in we would be covered.
6.7.13 is no longer needed, remove it, the government has done this already, all we need to do is opt in.
6.7.14 can be removed as the gov has done this already.
2. Hillside development- we need a growth boundary in place
Second -we need a sensitive protection bylaw to protect the sensitive ecosystem. Like tree cutting, blasting, soil removal and recontouring bylaw- the RDOS should use all the tools in the local gov act to adopt bylaws that place restrictions on forest management activity on private unmanaged land within regional boundaries in order to protect the unique an endangered ecosystems on the hillsides of upper Naramata.
3. We need to add to our broad goal 5.2.10

Penticton Indian Band- improve and expand communications, consultation, and engagement with Penticton Indian band" AND OTHER COMMUNITIES WITHIN THE OKANAGAN BASIN".

The RDOS should adopt and participate in the Okanagan Collaborative Conservation Alliance. Our Central Okanagan neighbors are ahead of us, we can join their initiatives and collaborate and capitalise on all the amazing work that has been done.

The Central Okanagan Conservation Alliance already has the support of all levels of government city, regional, provincial and federal.

Sincerely
Blake Terriff

ad

Naramata, BC
VOH 1N1

Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen
101 Martin Street
Penticton, B.C.
V2A 5J9
Attention: Planning Department

Dear Sirs:

My name is Alana Julie and I live at _____ in Naramata. I have been a resident of Naramata for over 10 years and have volunteered on a number of local boards including the Naramata Seniors Housing Society and Emergency Social Services.

I have reviewed the draft Official Community Plan and I have a number of concerns about it. Specifically:

The Proposed Community Sewer System:

I do not feel that the RDOS has appropriately consulted the community in the possibility of putting a community sewer system in the Village and I believe that the report by McElhanney Ltd. is flawed. I feel that it is premature to state that there is support by the community for a sewer system especially considering the number of concerns raised by residents at the meeting of July 10, 2023. Further community consultation is needed and the RDOS should hold a referendum on this important and impactful issue.

Vacation Rentals:

I feel that the RDOS has put the cart before the horse when it comes to addressing the attainable housing issue in Naramata. I do not believe that densification will address this issue unless strict and enforced by-laws are in place beforehand. Specifically, I support the requirement for the property owner or a full-time caretaker be on-site for all vacation rentals in Naramata. This by-law must be further supported by enforcement and penalties/fines with teeth to support it. Without this requirement, densification will only provide a greater inventory for vacation rentals and do nothing to provide housing for full-time residents especially in light of the new vacation rental legislation in Penticton.


Hillside Development:

RDOS should provide stronger language concerning hillside development permit areas. Significant fines and penalties should be imposed for non-compliance. The current \$500 fine is meaningless and laughable. A bond that is reflective of the size of the development taking place should be posted by the developer prior to development with applicable fines being applied against it. The bond should be held for a period of time until well after the development is completed.

I hope you will take my concerns into consideration. As you state in your document, the Official Community Plan is a blueprint and map of the community's future and should therefore, reflect the community's vision. The draft OCP as it stands now does not do this.

Sincerely,

Alana L. Julie



Feedback Form

Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen
101 Martin Street, Penticton, BC, V2A-5J9
Tel: 250-492-0237 / Email: planning@rdos.bc.ca

TO: Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen FILE NO.: E2021.027-ZONE

FROM: Name: SCOTT BLOWN
(please print)

Street Address: [REDACTED]

Date: JAN

RE: Electoral Area "E" Official Community Plan (OCP) Bylaw No. 3010, 2023

My comments / concerns are:

- I do support the proposed OCP Bylaw.
- I do not support the proposed OCP Bylaw.

Please provide any comments you wish the Board to consider.
Written submissions will be considered by the Regional District Board
prior to a decision being made on this project.

Feedback Forms must be completed and returned to the Regional District
prior to the closure of the public hearing.

Protecting your personal information is an obligation the Regional District of Okanagan-Similkameen takes seriously. Our practices have been designed to ensure compliance with the privacy provisions of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (British Columbia) (FIPPA). Any personal or proprietary information you provide to us is collected, used and disclosed in accordance with FIPPA. Should you have any questions about the collection, use or disclosure of this information please contact: Manager of Legislative Services, RDOS, 101 Martin Street, Penticton, BC V2A 5J9, 250-492-0237.

Auri Feindell

From: kh
Sent: January 10, 2024 10:57 AM
To: Planning
Subject: ByLaw No. 3010,2023

Some people who received this message don't often get email from

[and why this is important](#)

Electoral AREA "E" Official Community Plan BYLAW No:3010, 2023

January, 10th 2024

Dear RDOS,

Overall I support the new OCP- With the addition of these elements. The first two- hot topics, Vacation rental and Hillside development. The third and inclusive addition to our Broad Goals

1. It is crucial to address the issue of vacation rentals in this OCP, the Province has done the work, and we don't need to spend more money on a study. The province has taken care of it for us. If we address the vacation rental issue, we will likely achieve the vibrant village without having to build more homes immediately. It will give us more time to do all of the more research for the sewers and decide what more density we need. We know that 42 % are empty so you could argue a large portion are vacation rentals. So, between the speculation tax and the Vacation rental opt in we would be covered.

6.7.13 is no longer needed, remove it, the government has done this already, all we need to do is opt in.

6.7.14 can be removed as the gov has done this already.

2. Hillside development- we need a growth boundary in place

Second -we need a sensitive protection bylaw to protect the sensitive ecosystem. Like tree cutting, blasting, soil removal and recontouring bylaw- the RDOS should use all the tools in the local gov act to adopt bylaws that place restrictions on forest management activity on private unmanaged land within regional boundaries in order to protect the unique an endangered ecosystems on the hillsides of upper Naramata.

3. We need to add to our broad goal 5.2.10

Penticton Indian Band- improve and expand communications, consultation, and engagement with Penticton Indian band" AND OTHER COMMUNITIES WITHIN THE OKANAGAN BASIN".


The RDOS should adopt and participate in the Okanagan Collaborative Conservation Alliance.

Our Central Okanagan neighbors are ahead of us, we can join their initiatives and collaborate and capitalise on all the amazing work that has been done.

The Central Okanagan Conservation Alliance already has the support of all levels of government city, regional, provincial and federal.

Sincerely, Kathy Lau

Naramata, BC



Feedback Form

Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen
373 Main Street, Penticton, BC, V2A 5S8
Tel: 250-493-6237 / Email: feedback@rdos.bc.ca

TO: Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen FILE NO: E3025.027-2024

FROM: Name: Dawn Leonie

Street Address: [REDACTED]

Date: Jan 10 / 24

RE: Electoral Area "G" Official Community Plan (OCP) Bylaw No. X058, 2023

My comments / concerns are:

- I do support the proposed OCP Bylaw.
- I do not support the proposed OCP Bylaw.

Thank you for any comments you wish to provide. Your comments will be reviewed by the Regional District Board prior to a decision being made on this proposal.

I support the proposed OCP Bylaw with the attached changes

Feedback forms must be completed and returned to the Regional District prior to the closure of the public hearing.

Protecting your personal information is an obligation the Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen takes seriously. Our practices have been designed to ensure compliance with the privacy provisions of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FIPPA) (Canada) and PIPEDA. For personal or business information the proceeds to us in either a hard and digital or soft form with PIPPA. Should you have any questions about the collection, use

Dawn Lennie –

I support the new OCP Bylaw – except for the areas/points listed below.

5.2.10

In addition to collaboration with the Penticton Indian Band ADD: ‘and other communities within the Okanagan Basin’ This would show our commitment to participate in the Okanagan Collaborative Conservation Alliance. The Central Okanagan Conservation Alliance already has the support of all levels of government city, regional, provincial, and federal. We can collaborate and capitalize on all the amazing work that has been thus far.

6.7.13

Needs updating – the province has now come out with Short Term Rental Legislation and Area E should opt in immediately. The province has done the heavy lifting here and taken over the enforcement and registration of Short Term Rentals on residential properties as well. Think of all the RDOS staff time & energy and tax dollars that will be saved (not to mention eliminating all the white TUP signs that end up in the land fill) by simply **opting in for Area E**. Please don't spend more taxpayer money on yet another study on this topic. The Permanent Resident requirement in the legislation will quickly add affordable housing to the rental and purchasing pool, help to reduce empty house syndrome and contribute to our ‘vibrant village’ without building a single house. The solution is clear on this item and the community has spoken loud and clear on this for years.

6.7.14

I disagree with this item altogether. Do we really need a study on this? There was already a housing needs report completed in March 2021 (from section 6.4 of this OCP) If RDOS takes care of opting into the Provincial Vacation Rental Rules and finally dealing with our Vacation Rental policy issues (see above item) - we will have much more of the affordable housing our community needs put back into the market.

7.3.8

Needs stronger language than ‘will consider’. This should say ‘will prohibit future hillside development’ and ‘will explore options and implement regulations under the Local Government Act to prohibit tree cutting, blasting, soil removal and recontouring of private unmanaged land within regional boundaries in order to protect the unique and endangered ecosystems on the hillsides of Naramata’

8.2.3

In relation to preserving wildlife corridors we should mention here our intent to join the Okanagan Collaborative Conservation Alliance and capitalize on all the great work already being done by this group. Currently it stops at Okanagan Mountain Park – we should join and bring it right through along the Naramata Bench.

8.3.13

Remove Micro Cannabis facilities. This type of activity should be limited to industrial areas.

9.3.16

Remove Micro Cannabis facilities. This type of activity should be limited to industrial areas.

10.3.9

Remove Micro Cannabis facilities. This type of activity should be limited to industrial areas.

10.6

Vacation Rentals – needs update to new Provincial Regulations

11.6

Vacation Rentals – needs update to new Provincial Regulations

24.3.2.1

This should say 'prohibit future hillside development' and 'will explore options and implement regulations under the Local Government Act to prohibit tree cutting, blasting, soil removal and recontouring of private unmanaged land within regional boundaries in order to protect the unique and endangered ecosystems on the hillsides of Naramata'

24.3.2.2

We don't need another housing study. Fix the vacation rental rules – fix much of our housing issues. We do need more seniors housing, but we don't need a study to tell us that. The waiting list for seniors housing already tells the story.

24.3.3.1

This item is now out of date – Provincial regulations are now in place – let's **opt in for Area E!**

Electoral AREA "E" Official Community Plan BYLAW No:3010, 2023

January 10, 2024

To whom it may concern:

Overall, I support the new OCP Plan with the addition of these three elements. The first two are hot topics: vacation rentals and hillside development. The third is an inclusive addition to our broad goals

1. It is crucial to address the issue of vacation rentals in this OCP. The province has done the work, and we don't need to spend more on a study. The province has taken care of it for us. If we address the vacation rental issue, we will likely achieve a vibrant village without building more homes immediately. It will give us more time to research the sewers and decide our needed density. We know that 42% of the homes are empty, so you could argue a significant portion are vacation rentals. We would be covered between the speculation tax and the vacation rental opt-in.

Items 6.7.13 and 6.7.14 are no longer needed. The government has done this already; all we need to do is opt in.

2. First, we need a growth boundary in place for hillside development.

Second, we need a sensitive protection bylaw to protect the sensitive ecosystem, like tree cutting, blasting, soil removal and recontouring bylaw. The RDOS should use all the tools in the local government act to adopt bylaws that restrict forest activity on private unmanaged land within regional boundaries to protect the unique and endangered ecosystems on the hillsides of upper Naramata.

3. We need to add to our broad goal 5.2.10

First, improve communications, consultation, and engagement with the Penticton Indian band "AND OTHER COMMUNITIES WITHIN THE OKANAGAN BASIN."

Second, the RDOS should adopt and participate in the Okanagan Collaborative Conservation Alliance. Our Central Okanagan neighbours are ahead of us; we can join their initiatives, collaborate, and capitalize on all the fantastic work that has been done.

The Central Okanagan Conservation Alliance already has the support of all levels of government: city, regional, provincial and federal.

Sincerely,

Alyce Karr

Naramata, B.C. V0H1N0

auri Feindell

From: The popes
Sent: January 10, 2024 4:11 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Opposition to Naramata Area OCP proposals

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Some people who received this message don't often get email from

[n why this is important](#)

To: RDOS regarding the Area E – OCP Review January 10, 2024

As 40- year residents, we have completed every survey RDOS has sent out regarding the Area E OCP. In our opinion, the surveys were poorly constructed, vague and likely to have elicited unintended answers because of the wording. The questions could have been skewed to achieve predetermined results of increased densification and the installation of a sewer system in the village area of Naramata. It is clear that the RDOS is not listening to residents' wishes. We have "in every survey" conveyed our rejection of RDOS proposals. We understand the RGS supersedes the OCP, so language in both documents must not conflict.

We reject densification of the Lower area Village outside of the "core". Lower Naramata Area B must be designated Rural Residential with low density residential development. We reject the notion that a sewer system be installed in areas A and B. The OCP should not reflect support for a sewer system before the community has had an opportunity to provide input on this issue and costs must be clearly disclosed ahead of time. The reference in the OCP indicating support for a community sanitary sewer system must be deleted. We feel railroaded.

We do not believe that more housing (even townhouses) will create attainable or affordable housing. Builders seem only to pursue the luxury market as that is where the profit is. Without first revising vacation home rules and speculation/secondary residence taxes, increased construction will not provide housing for full time residents and merely create more vacation homes. Currently 42.4% of Naramata homes have "out-of-town" owner addresses. These people are away much of the year and do not help our school's enrollment and they do not contribute as much to the community as full-time residents.

Densification would only create more traffic going into Penticton to get services we do not have here, which is the opposite of what we should be doing to reduce consumption of fossil fuels. Naramata Road was not built to handle greatly increased traffic and would increase risk to cyclists. Current traffic jams at Haven Hill will only increase. We also believe most residents wish to keep the small town character that Naramata has.

Any new townhouses should be limited to areas in the core of the village (Area A) and those developers should be responsible for the installation of their own systems to handle their waste and not place this burden on other homeowners to facilitate this construction.

Rules must be put in place to eliminate or reduce stand-alone Vacation Rentals (without the owner on-site) as they can be disruptive to neighbours who have a right to peaceful enjoyment of their year-round residence. Those homes could then be annual rentals, helping the housing shortage and allowing families with children to move here. Speculation taxes should be in place to deter speculation.

Please listen to the people of Naramata before making changes that would create monumental alterations to our little village that none of us want.

Bob and Lynda Pope, Naramata, BC

Date: 1/10/2024

To: The Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen
planners@rdos.bc.ca

From: Parker Berry

Address: Naramata BC

Thank you for the opportunity to present feedback on the latest version of the OCP.

There are 4 areas of specific concern that I would like to address as feedback for the RDOS.

- 1) Growth Section of the OCP
- 2) Sewer or Liquid Waste Management Plant
- 3) Vacation Rentals
- 4) Hillside Development

1) Growth Section:

- I support keeping Lower Naramata as a Rural Residential low growth area versus the proposed OCP version that classifies Lower Naramata as a Growth area.
- The Growth Containment Boundaries (OCP) and the Village Settlement Area (VSA) from the proposed RGS amendment are virtually the same. 97% of the community rejected the Village Settlement Area in a previous survey with clear direction to not densify Lower Naramata beyond what is permitted with Low Density Rural Residential growth. Please remove any reference to support for densifying Lower Naramata with multi-family residential development.
- The Growth containment Boundaries (A, B, & C) have not been agreed upon by the community and should be deleted in the OCP.

2) Sewer or Liquid Waste Management Plant

- I do not support the Sewer or LWMP and am in favor of maintaining the septic systems that are currently in effect. References in the latest version of the OCP indicating community support of a Sewer or LWMP should be removed.

3) Vacation Rentals

- The latest draft version of the OCP does not address the community's view or the level of concern for Vacation Rentals. The OCP needs to be strengthened to include requiring business licensing, full time owner or caretaker on site for all short-term rentals, meaningful fines/penalties for non compliance and proper enforcement.

4) Hillside Development

- There needs to be stronger language concerning Hillside Development to prevent landslide, drainage, and run-off issues regardless of the development size. Fines for noncompliance must be increased to a meaningful number with enhanced enforcement. A bond should be posted that is reflective of the size of the development with applicable fines being applied against it.

The OCP is an important document and it's very important that the Regional District reflect the wishes of the community.

Signed
by: _____

✓

Date: JAN 3 / 24

To: The Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen
planners@rdos.bc.ca

From: MARK BERRY

Address: NARAMATA B.C VOH-1N1

Thank you for the opportunity to present feedback on the latest version of the OCP.

There are 4 areas of specific concern that I would like to address as feedback for the RDOS.

- 1) Growth Section of the OCP
- 2) Sewer or Liquid Waste Management Plant
- 3) Vacation Rentals
- 4) Hillside Development

1) Growth Section:

- I support keeping Lower Naramata as a Rural Residential low growth area versus the proposed OCP version that classifies Lower Naramata as a Growth area.
- The Growth Containment Boundaries (OCP) and the Village Settlement Area (VSA) from the proposed RGS amendment are virtually the same. 97% of the community rejected the Village Settlement Area in a previous survey with clear direction to not densify Lower Naramata beyond what is permitted with Low Density Rural Residential growth. Please remove any reference to support for densifying Lower Naramata with multi-family residential development.
- The Growth containment Boundaries (A, B, & C) have not been agreed upon by the community and should be deleted in the OCP.

2) Sewer or Liquid Waste Management Plant

- I do not support the Sewer or LWMP and am in favor of maintaining the septic systems that are currently in effect. References in the latest version of the OCP indicating community support of a Sewer or LWMP should be removed.

3) Vacation Rentals

- The latest draft version of the OCP does not address the community's view or the level of concern for Vacation Rentals. The OCP needs to be strengthened to include requiring business licensing, full time owner or caretaker on site for all short-term rentals, meaningful fines/penalties for non compliance and proper enforcement.

4) Hillside Development

- There needs to be stronger language concerning Hillside Development to prevent landslide, drainage, and run-off issues regardless of the development size. Fines for

noncompliance must be increased to a meaningful number with enhanced enforcement. A bond should be posted that is reflective of the size of the development with applicable fines being applied against it.

The OCP is an important document and it's very important that the Regional District reflect the wishes of the community.

WATER - IN MY 67 YEARS IN NARAMATA I HAVE NEVER SEEN THE LAKES SO LOW, THIS INCLUDES THE MOUNTAIN LAKES AS WELL AS OKANAGAN LAKE, WITH 2024 LOOKING TO BE VERY DRY THIS DOES NOT BODE WELL FOR EXTRA HOUSING IN THIS AREA.

DEVELOPERS ARE ON THE SIDELINES WAITING FOR A SEWER SYSTEM OR EVEN NATURAL GAS TO BE CONNECTED TO AREA'S NORTH OF THE VILLAGE. IT ALL COMES DOWN TO PROFIT FOR A FEW WHICH I AM TOTALLY AGAINST.

Signed by:

_____ / _____

Date: Jan 2/24

To: The Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen
planners@rdos.bc.ca

From: Martin Gibbs

Address: _____

Thank you for the opportunity to present feedback on the latest version of the OCP.

There are 4 areas of specific concern that I would like to address as feedback for the RDOS.

- 1) Growth Section of the OCP
- 2) Sewer or Liquid Waste Management Plant
- 3) Vacation Rentals
- 4) Hillside Development

1) Growth Section:

- I support keeping Lower Naramata as a Rural Residential low growth area versus the proposed OCP version that classifies Lower Naramata as a Growth area.
- The Growth Containment Boundaries (OCP) and the Village Settlement Area (VSA) from the proposed RGS amendment are virtually the same. 97% of the community rejected the Village Settlement Area in a previous survey with clear direction to not densify Lower Naramata beyond what is permitted with Low Density Rural Residential growth. Please remove any reference to support for densifying Lower Naramata with multi-family residential development.
- The Growth containment Boundaries (A, B, & C) have not been agreed upon by the community and should be deleted in the OCP.

2) Sewer or Liquid Waste Management Plant

- I do not support the Sewer or LWMP and am in favor of maintaining the septic systems that are currently in effect. References in the latest version of the OCP indicating community support of a Sewer or LWMP should be removed.

3) Vacation Rentals

- The latest draft version of the OCP does not address the community's view or the level of concern for Vacation Rentals. The OCP needs to be strengthened to include requiring business licensing, full time owner or caretaker on site for all short-term rentals, meaningful fines/penalties for non compliance and proper enforcement.

4) Hillside Development

- There needs to be stronger language concerning Hillside Development to prevent landslide, drainage, and run-off issues regardless of the development size. Fines for noncompliance must be increased to a meaningful number with enhanced enforcement. A bond should be posted that is reflective of the size of the development with applicable fines being applied against it.

The OCP is an important document and it's very important that the Regional District reflect the wishes of the community.

Signed
by: _____

/

January 9, 2024

To: The Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen :

Thank you for the opportunity to present feedback on the latest version of the proposed OCP for Area E (Naramata) .

I do not support the revised OCP regarding the proposed future growth strategy and the possibility of a waste water treatment plant. I also have some comments re: vacation rentals and hillside development.

1) Growth Section:

- I strongly question the assertion in OCP Section 3.5 that Naramata's population grew by 5.9% between 2016 and 2021. In fact, Statistics Canada reported in the 2021 census that Naramata's population actually decreased by 2.9% from 2016 to 2021 with the community's population dropping to 1,628 residents from 1,676. (I've attached a copy of the Census Profile table for Naramata).
Even if the RDOS figures for Area E include Falcon Ridge and Indian Rock, I doubt population growth over 5 years amounted to 5.9%. (Where did the RDOS get its figures?)
Therefore to suggest that Naramata should plan for a growth rate of up to 1.5% per year (OCP Section 6.2) seems bizarre at best.
- I support keeping Lower Naramata as a Rural Residential low growth area versus the proposed OCP version that classifies Lower Naramata as a Growth area. Much of the new housing in the community in recent years has been purchased by non-residents for summer homes or vacation rentals. This is reflected by the decrease in population and skyrocketing property values which make it very difficult for young families to live in our community.
- The Growth Containment Boundaries (OCP) and the Village Settlement Area (VSA) from the proposed RGS amendment are virtually the same. 97% of the community rejected the Village Settlement Area in a previous survey with clear direction to not densify Lower Naramata beyond what is permitted with Low Density Rural Residential growth. Please remove any reference to support for densifying Lower Naramata with multi-family residential development.
- The Growth containment Boundaries (A, B, & C) have not been agreed upon by the community and should not be deleted in the OCP.

2) Sewer or Liquid Waste Management Plant

- I do not support the Sewer or LWMP and am in favour of maintaining the septic systems that are currently in effect. References in the latest version of the OCP indicating community support of a Sewer or LWMP should be removed.



3) Vacation Rentals

- The latest draft version of the OCP does not address the community's view or the level of concern for Vacation Rentals. The OCP needs to be strengthened to include requiring business licensing, full time owner or caretaker on site for all short-term rentals, meaningful fines/penalties for non compliance and proper enforcement.

4) Hillside Development

- There needs to be stronger language concerning Hillside Development to prevent landslide, drainage, and run-off issues regardless of the development size. Fines for noncompliance must be increased to a meaningful number with enhanced enforcement. A bond should be posted that is reflective of the size of the development with applicable fines being applied against it.

The OCP is an important document and it's very important that the Regional District reflect the wishes of the community.

Yours sincerely,

John Moorhouse

Naramata



Census Profile, 2021 Census of Population

Profile table

| Naramata, Unincorporated place (UNP) ⓘ | |
|--|--------------|
| British Columbia | |
| [Designated place] | |
| Counts | |
| Characteristic | Total |
| Population and dwellings | |
| Population, 2021 ¹ | 1,628 |
| Population, 2016 ¹ | 1,676 |
| Population percentage change, 2016 to 2021 | - 2.9 |
| Total private dwellings ² | 886 |
| Private dwellings occupied by usual residents ³ | 730 |
| Population density per square kilometre | 200.7 |
| Land area in square kilometres | 8.11 |

Date: Jan 9, 2024

To: The Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen
planners@rdos.bc.ca

From: Melvin Bottaro

Address: _____

Thank you for the opportunity to present feedback on the latest version of the OCP.

There are 4 areas of specific concern that I would like to address as feedback for the RDOS.

- 1) Growth Section of the OCP
- 2) Sewer or Liquid Waste Management Plant
- 3) Vacation Rentals
- 4) Hillside Development

1) Growth Section:

- I support keeping Lower Naramata as a Rural Residential low growth area versus the proposed OCP version that classifies Lower Naramata as a Growth area.
- The Growth Containment Boundaries (OCP) and the Village Settlement Area (VSA) from the proposed RGS amendment are virtually the same. 97% of the community rejected the Village Settlement Area in a previous survey with clear direction to not densify Lower Naramata beyond what is permitted with Low Density Rural Residential growth. Please remove any reference to support for densifying Lower Naramata with multi-family residential development.
- The Growth containment Boundaries (A, B, & C) have not been agreed upon by the community and should be deleted in the OCP.

2) Sewer or Liquid Waste Management Plant

- I do not support the Sewer or LWMP and am in favor of maintaining the septic systems that are currently in effect. References in the latest version of the OCP indicating community support of a Sewer or LWMP should be removed.

3) Vacation Rentals

- The latest draft version of the OCP does not address the community's view or the level of concern for Vacation Rentals. The OCP needs to be strengthened to include requiring business licensing, full time owner or caretaker on site for all short-term rentals, meaningful fines/penalties for non compliance and proper enforcement.

4) Hillside Development

- There needs to be stronger language concerning Hillside Development to prevent landslide, drainage, and run-off issues regardless of the development size. Fines for



noncompliance must be increased to a meaningful number with enhanced enforcement. A bond should be posted that is reflective of the size of the development with applicable fines being applied against it.

The OCP is an important document and it's very important that the Regional District reflect the wishes of the community.

Signed by:

Against community plan as it stands.

Date: Jan 9, 2024

To: The Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen
planners@rdos.bc.ca

From: Lynne Felton

Address: _____

Thank you for the opportunity to present feedback on the latest version of the OCP.

There are 4 areas of specific concern that I would like to address as feedback for the RDOS.

- 1) Growth Section of the OCP
- 2) Sewer or Liquid Waste Management Plant
- 3) Vacation Rentals
- 4) Hillside Development

1) Growth Section:

- I support keeping Lower Naramata as a Rural Residential low growth area versus the proposed OCP version that classifies Lower Naramata as a Growth area.
- The Growth Containment Boundaries (OCP) and the Village Settlement Area (VSA) from the proposed RGS amendment are virtually the same. 97% of the community rejected the Village Settlement Area in a previous survey with clear direction to not densify Lower Naramata beyond what is permitted with Low Density Rural Residential growth. Please remove any reference to support for densifying Lower Naramata with multi-family residential development.
- The Growth containment Boundaries (A, B, & C) have not been agreed upon by the community and should be deleted in the OCP.

2) Sewer or Liquid Waste Management Plant

- I do not support the Sewer or LWMP and am in favor of maintaining the septic systems that are currently in effect. References in the latest version of the OCP indicating community support of a Sewer or LWMP should be removed.

3) Vacation Rentals

- The latest draft version of the OCP does not address the community's view or the level of concern for Vacation Rentals. The OCP needs to be strengthened to include requiring business licensing, full time owner or caretaker on site for all short-term rentals, meaningful fines/penalties for non compliance and proper enforcement.

4) Hillside Development

- There needs to be stronger language concerning Hillside Development to prevent landslide, drainage, and run-off issues regardless of the development size. Fines for

noncompliance must be increased to a meaningful number with enhanced enforcement. A bond should be posted that is reflective of the size of the development with applicable fines being applied against it.

The OCP is an important document and it's very important that the Regional District reflect the wishes of the community.

Signed by:

Against OCP as it stands

Date: Jan. 8/2024

To: The Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen
planners@rdos.bc.ca

From: Bob Coulter BOB COULTER

Address: _____

Thank you for the opportunity to present feedback on the latest version of the OCP.

There are 4 areas of specific concern that I would like to address as feedback for the RDOS.

- 1) Growth Section of the OCP
- 2) Sewer or Liquid Waste Management Plant
- 3) Vacation Rentals
- 4) Hillside Development

1) Growth Section:

- I support keeping Lower Naramata as a Rural Residential low growth area versus the proposed OCP version that classifies Lower Naramata as a Growth area.
- The Growth Containment Boundaries (OCP) and the Village Settlement Area (VSA) from the proposed RGS amendment are virtually the same. 97% of the community rejected the Village Settlement Area in a previous survey with clear direction to not densify Lower Naramata beyond what is permitted with Low Density Rural Residential growth. Please remove any reference to support for densifying Lower Naramata with multi-family residential development.
- The Growth containment Boundaries (A, B, & C) have not been agreed upon by the community and should be deleted in the OCP.

2) Sewer or Liquid Waste Management Plant

- I do not support the Sewer or LWMP and am in favor of maintaining the septic systems that are currently in effect. References in the latest version of the OCP indicating community support of a Sewer or LWMP should be removed.

3) Vacation Rentals

- The latest draft version of the OCP does not address the community's view or the level of concern for Vacation Rentals. The OCP needs to be strengthened to include requiring business licensing, full time owner or caretaker on site for all short-term rentals, meaningful fines/penalties for non compliance and proper enforcement.

4) Hillside Development



- There needs to be stronger language concerning Hillside Development to prevent landslide, drainage, and run-off issues regardless of the development size. Fines for noncompliance must be increased to a meaningful number with enhanced enforcement. A bond should be posted that is reflective of the size of the development with applicable fines being applied against it.

The OCP is an important document and it's very important that the Regional District reflect the wishes of the community.

Signed
by:

Date: JAN. 8 / 2024

To: The Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen
planners@rdos.bc.ca

From: BEV COULTER

Address: _____

Thank you for the opportunity to present feedback on the latest version of the OCP.

There are 4 areas of specific concern that I would like to address as feedback for the RDOS.

- 1) Growth Section of the OCP
- 2) Sewer or Liquid Waste Management Plant
- 3) Vacation Rentals
- 4) Hillside Development

1) Growth Section:

- I support keeping Lower Naramata as a Rural Residential low growth area versus the proposed OCP version that classifies Lower Naramata as a Growth area.
- The Growth Containment Boundaries (OCP) and the Village Settlement Area (VSA) from the proposed RGS amendment are virtually the same. 97% of the community rejected the Village Settlement Area in a previous survey with clear direction to not densify Lower Naramata beyond what is permitted with Low Density Rural Residential growth. Please remove any reference to support for densifying Lower Naramata with multi-family residential development.
- The Growth containment Boundaries (A, B, & C) have not been agreed upon by the community and should be deleted in the OCP.

2) Sewer or Liquid Waste Management Plant

- I do not support the Sewer or LWMP and am in favor of maintaining the septic systems that are currently in effect. References in the latest version of the OCP indicating community support of a Sewer or LWMP should be removed.

3) Vacation Rentals

- The latest draft version of the OCP does not address the community's view or the level of concern for Vacation Rentals. The OCP needs to be strengthened to include requiring business licensing, full time owner or caretaker on site for all short-term rentals, meaningful fines/penalties for non compliance and proper enforcement.


4) Hillside Development



- There needs to be stronger language concerning Hillside Development to prevent landslide, drainage, and run-off issues regardless of the development size. Fines for noncompliance must be increased to a meaningful number with enhanced enforcement. A bond should be posted that is reflective of the size of the development with applicable fines being applied against it.

The OCP is an important document and it's very important that the Regional District reflect the wishes of the community.

Signed
by: _____



Feedback Form

RECEIVED
Regional District

JAN 10 2024

Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen

101 Martin Street, Penticton, BC, V2A-5J9

Tel: 250-492-0237 / Email: planning@rdos.bc.ca

101 Martin Street
Penticton BC V2A 5J9

TO: Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen

FILE NO.: E2021.027-ZONE

FROM: Name: CHRIS BLANN
(please print)

Street Address: _____

Date: DEC JAN 9 / 2024

RE: Electoral Area "E" Official Community Plan (OCP) Bylaw No. 3010, 2023

My comments / concerns are:

I do support the proposed OCP Bylaw.

I do not support the proposed OCP Bylaw.

Please provide any comments you wish the Board to consider.
Written submissions will be considered by the Regional District Board
prior to a decision being made on this project.

- IF THE 42% OF VACANT HOMES WERE LIVED IN YEAR ROUND, NARAMATA WOULD BE A MORE VIBRANT COMMUNITY
- NO TO A COSTLY SEWER SYSTEM THAT WOULD SMELL
- HILL SIDE DEVELOPMENT - ~~BE~~ URGE TO DEVELOP / BUILD TO CURRENT ZONING. NO DENSIFICATION ZONING.
- THE VACATION RENTAL LEGISLATION SHOULD INCLUDE NARAMATA AND BE IN THE OCP, NOT REGION WIDE AT A LATER DATE

Feedback Forms must be completed and returned to the Regional District prior to the closure of the public hearing.

- PUSH VICTORIA FOR NARAMATA TO BE INCLUDED IN THE

Protecting your personal information is an obligation the Regional District of Okanagan-Similkameen takes seriously. Our practices have been designed to ensure compliance with the privacy provisions of the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* (British Columbia) ("FIPPA"). Any personal or proprietary information you provide to us is collected, used and disclosed in accordance with FIPPA. Should you have any questions about the collection, use or disclosure of this information please contact: Manager of Legislative Services, RDOS, 101 Martin Street, Penticton, BC V2A 5J9, 250-492-0237.

VACANCY TAX CATCHMENT AREAS.

Date: Jan 11/2023

To: The Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen
planners@rdos.bc.ca

From: Peter Simonsen

Address: _____ Naramata

Thank you for the opportunity to present feedback on the latest version of the OCP.

There are 4 areas of specific concern that I would like to address as feedback for the RDOS.

- 1) Growth Section of the OCP
- 2) Sewer or Liquid Waste Management Plant
- 3) Vacation Rentals
- 4) Hillside Development

RECEIVED
Regional District

JAN 10 2024

101 Martin Street
Penticton BC V2A 5J9

1) **Growth Section:**

- I support keeping Lower Naramata as a Rural Residential low growth area versus the proposed OCP version that classifies Lower Naramata as a Growth area.
- The Growth Containment Boundaries (OCP) and the Village Settlement Area (VSA) from the proposed RGS amendment are virtually the same. 97% of the community rejected the Village Settlement Area in a previous survey with clear direction to not densify Lower Naramata beyond what is permitted with Low Density Rural Residential growth. Please remove any reference to support for densifying Lower Naramata with multi-family residential development.
- The Growth containment Boundaries (A, B, & C) have not been agreed upon by the community and should be deleted in the OCP.

2) **Sewer or Liquid Waste Management Plant**

- I do not support the Sewer or LWMP and am in favor of maintaining the septic systems that are currently in effect. References in the latest version of the OCP indicating community support of a Sewer or LWMP should be removed.

3) **Vacation Rentals**

- The latest draft version of the OCP does not address the community's view or the level of concern for Vacation Rentals. The OCP needs to be strengthened to include requiring business licensing, full time owner or caretaker on site for all short-term rentals, meaningful fines/penalties for non compliance and proper enforcement.

4) **Hillside Development**

- There needs to be stronger language concerning Hillside Development to prevent landslide, drainage, and run-off issues regardless of the development size. Fines for



noncompliance must be increased to a meaningful number with enhanced enforcement. A bond should be posted that is reflective of the size of the development with applicable fines being applied against it.

The OCP is an important document and it's very important that the Regional District reflect the wishes of the community.

Signed by:

Date: January 10 2024

To: The Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen
planners@rdos.bc.ca

From: Cynthia Salting

Address: Naramata BC

Thank you for the opportunity to present feedback on the latest version of the OCP.

There are 4 areas of specific concern that I would like to address as feedback for the RDOS.

- 1) Growth Section of the OCP
- 2) Sewer or Liquid Waste Management Plant
- 3) Vacation Rentals
- 4) Hillside Development

RECEIVED
Regional District

JAN 10 2024

101 Martin Street
Penticton BC V2A 5J9

1) **Growth Section:**

- I support keeping Lower Naramata as a Rural Residential low growth area versus the proposed OCP version that classifies Lower Naramata as a Growth area.
- The Growth Containment Boundaries (OCP) and the Village Settlement Area (VSA) from the proposed RGS amendment are virtually the same. 97% of the community rejected the Village Settlement Area in a previous survey with clear direction to not densify Lower Naramata beyond what is permitted with Low Density Rural Residential growth. Please remove any reference to support for densifying Lower Naramata with multi-family residential development.
- The Growth containment Boundaries (A, B, & C) have not been agreed upon by the community and should be deleted in the OCP.

2) **Sewer or Liquid Waste Management Plant**

- I do not support the Sewer or LWMP and am in favor of maintaining the septic systems that are currently in effect. References in the latest version of the OCP indicating community support of a Sewer or LWMP should be removed.

3) **Vacation Rentals**

- The latest draft version of the OCP does not address the community's view or the level of concern for Vacation Rentals. The OCP needs to be strengthened to include requiring business licensing, full time owner or caretaker on site for all short-term rentals, meaningful fines/penalties for non compliance and proper enforcement.

4) **Hillside Development**


- There needs to be stronger language concerning Hillside Development to prevent landslide, drainage, and run-off issues regardless of the development size. Fines for



noncompliance must be increased to a meaningful number with enhanced enforcement. A bond should be posted that is reflective of the size of the development with applicable fines being applied against it.

The OCP is an important document and it's very important that the Regional District reflect the wishes of the community.

Signed by:



Feedback Form

Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen

101 Martin Street, Penticton, BC, V2A-5J9

Tel: 250-492-0237 / Email: planning@rdos.bc.ca

TO: Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen FILE NO.: E2021.027-ZONE

FROM: Name: Bryan & Debra Hardman
(please print)

Street Address: _____

Date: January 10, 2024

RE: Electoral Area "E" Official Community Plan (OCP) Bylaw No. 3010, 2023

RECEIVED
Regional District

JAN 10 2024

101 Martin Street
Penticton BC V2A 5J9

My comments / concerns are:


- I do support the proposed OCP Bylaw.
- I do not support the proposed OCP Bylaw.

Please provide any comments you wish the Board to consider.
Written submissions will be considered by the Regional District Board
prior to a decision being made on this project.

We do not support a publicly funded
sewage system. Developers should provide
there own waste systems with the
ability for expansion.

Feedback Forms must be completed and returned to the Regional District prior to the closure of the public hearing.





Feedback Form

Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen

101 Martin Street, Penticton, BC, V2A-5J9

Tel: 250-492-0237 / Email: planning@rdos.bc.ca

TO: Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen

FILE NO.: Bylaw 3010, 2023

FROM: Name: Schalk van Heerden
(please print)

Street Address: Naramata, BC V0H 1N1

Date: January 8th, 2024

RE: Electoral Area "E" Official Community Plan, Bylaw No. 3010, 2023

My comments / concerns are:

- I do support the proposed Official Community Plan.
- I do support the proposed Official Community Plan, subject to the comments listed below.
- I do not support the proposed rezoning of the subject parcel.

Written submissions received from this information meeting will be considered by the Regional District Board prior to 1st reading of Amendment Bylaw No. 2459.39.

OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN (draft)

OCP Bylaw No. 3010, 2023 – Regional District of Okanagan-Similkameen

<https://rdosregionalconnections.ca/22758/widgets/154809/documents/106311>

The OCP appears in general fit-for-purpose, meaning that I am in support of the broad concepts in the draft document issued for review and comments (particularly regarding growth containment and sewerage treatment) and that most of the essentials are covered adequately.

Notwithstanding, final editing remains absolutely imperative prior to submission to the Board for approval and implementation.

Proposed crucial amendments attached.

Feedback Forms must be completed and returned to the Regional District prior to completion of Public Hearing.

OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN (draft)

OCP Bylaw No. 3010, 2023 – Regional District of Okanagan-Similkameen

<https://rdosregionalconnections.ca/22758/widgets/154809/documents/106311>

Proposed crucial amendments prior to submission for Board approval:

1. Growth Management

- a. Section 7.3.1.1 – introduce new wording to reflect the entire community’s unanimous desire:
“**Strongly discourages...**”, or “**Emphatically discourages...**”

2. Sewer Systems

- a. Section 7.2.1.6 – consider rewording:
“**Continue with the development and promotion of the Liquid Waste Management Plan for Naramata to the satisfaction of the community and key external stakeholders such as Interior Health and Okanagan Basin Water Board.**”
- b. Section 19.3 to have consistent and corresponding wording.

3. Naramata Centre

- a. Section 7.2 refers to the “*United Church*”, but 7.2.4 mentions “*Naramata Centre*”. The correct entity to be defined.
- b. Section 7.2.1.4 states “re-designating”.
 - i. presumably this infers “**rezoning**”, which would then require the ordinary public consultation processes?
If not, such *ad hoc* consideration is inappropriate.
 - ii. “*apartment buildings*” should be qualified as “**low-rise**”, or alternatively described limited by a “**height restriction**” commensurate with Naramata Village Settlement Area?

4. External Agencies

- a. **Ministry of Agriculture and Food** – 13 July 2023
 - i. A number of pertinent comments still need to be addressed (Sections 9.3.5, 9.3.13, 9.3.14, 9.3.15, 10.3.7, and particularly **21.3.2.h** and **23.3.8.7**)
- b. **Ministry of Forests** – 17 July 2023
 - i. Section 17.5.1 mentions “**Osoyoos Lake**”?
 - ii. Comments related to Sections 17.5.2.1, 17.5.2.5, and 17.5.2.6 need to be accommodated.

Lauri Feindell

From: Jesse Godwin
Sent: January 8, 2024 5:22 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Naramata

Some people who received this message don't often get email from

[Learn why this is important](#)

I hope this email finds you well.

I am a home owner in Naramta (electoral section E). I am writing to voice my opinion about the review of the community plan for Naramata.

Tourism is integral to the vibrancy and health of this community, buisnesses and wineries. I feel that hotel stock is not currently sufficient to meet the diverse needs of the clientele that frequent our lovely area. Banning short term rentals is unlikely to appreciably increase housing stock , but they do provide an important option for tourists that won't be easily replaced. I fear unintended economic consequences should short term rentals be restricted further.

Thank you for considering this point of view.

Jesse Godwin

Lauri Feindell

Subject: FW: Naramata OCP hearing
Attachments: kt=ocp hearing.docx

-----Original Message-----

From: David Tauzer
Sent: January 8, 2024 6:07 PM
To: Planning <planning@rdos.bc.ca>
Subject: Naramata OCP hearing

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

y this is important at

I attended the January 7, 2024 OCP Hearing in Naramata. Enclosed is my letter. I do not support adoption of this draft.

It is seriously flawed and does Not represent the majority of resident views. Changes are needed.

Respectfully submitted, Katherine Tomczuk


My name is Katherine Tomczuk and I live at _____ Naramata. I have lived at this address for 34 years. I DO NOT accept the OCP document as presented at the January 7, 2024 hearing.

Reasons;

- 1) The community has had numerous community and committee meeting for over 2 years. There are multiple contentious issues and divergent views. Nonetheless volunteers have worked hard to clarify the needs, goals and wishes of the residents. From the start, the regional planners came with an idea that Naramata needed more development and a sewer system to support growth/ densification.
- 2) A survey was presented and completed early in the OCP planning process. The majority of respondents saw the survey as faulty: leading questions with vague language. The summary results of this survey were unanimously rejected by the Community advisory group. Only at the January 7 meeting/ hearing did many residents realize that the final OCP document was fundamentally unchanged from the original and was based primarily on a survey that the community rejected. How can policies and our FUTURE (OCP) be based on this POOR SURVEY.
- 3) The RDOS staff have not and are not listening to the majority of people in Naramata. They came with a predetermined plan and refuse to make adjustments. They are in a hurry and are forcing this OCP upon us. Many agreed to a vibrant community. This language was misleading. We already have a VIBRANT community; densification will not improve our town. The OCP document is supposed to reflect the goals and vision of Naramata. The majority of residents Do not want a sewer, we do not want hillside development, more empty houses, or densification in lower Naramata. We want the RDOS to protect and support attainable housing, control the problem of vacation rentals/ empty house and growth on the hills.
- 4) This Planners choose to listen to a fraction of residents at the expense of the majority.

MAKE changes to this OCP- it is NOT REPRESENTATIVE of a large majority of Naramata residents.

I DO NOT SUPPORT THIS OCP DRAFT.



Feedback Form

Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen

101 Martin Street, Penticton, BC, V2A-5J9

Tel: 250-492-0237 / Email: planning@rdos.bc.ca

TO: Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen

FILE NO.: E2021.027-ZONE

FROM: Name: Kim Heath
(please print)

Street Address: _____

Date: JAN 07, 2024

RE: Electoral Area "E" Official Community Plan (OCP) Bylaw No. 3010, 2023

My comments / concerns are:

- I do support the proposed OCP Bylaw.
- I do not support the proposed OCP Bylaw.

Please provide any comments you wish the Board to consider.
Written submissions will be considered by the Regional District Board
prior to a decision being made on this project.

THE OCP DOES NOT INCLUDE A TOTAL
 & COMPLETE BAN OF ANY FURTHER NEW
 DEVELOPMENTS. WE CANNOT SUPPORT WHAT
 WE HAVE NOW ON A BASE 2 LANE NARAMATA
 ROAD!

INCORPORATION OF NARAMATA IS ESSENTIAL
 TO PREVENT DIRECTORS FROM OTHER AREAS
 MAKING DECISIONS ON OUR BEHALF.

Feedback Forms must be completed and returned to the Regional District prior to the closure of the public hearing.

2-11@rdos 2024-01-07

Date: Jan 7/24

To: The Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen
planners@rdos.bc.ca

From: Jennifer Moorhouse

Address: Naramata

Thank you for the opportunity to present feedback on the latest version of the OCP.

There are 4 areas of specific concern that I would like to address as feedback for the RDOS.

- 1) Growth Section of the OCP
- 2) Sewer or Liquid Waste Management Plant
- 3) Vacation Rentals
- 4) Hillside Development

1) Growth Section:

- I support keeping Lower Naramata as a Rural Residential low growth area versus the proposed OCP version that classifies Lower Naramata as a Growth area.
- The Growth Containment Boundaries (OCP) and the Village Settlement Area (VSA) from the proposed RGS amendment are virtually the same. 97% of the community rejected the Village Settlement Area in a previous survey with clear direction to not densify Lower Naramata beyond what is permitted with Low Density Rural Residential growth. Please remove any reference to support for densifying Lower Naramata with multi-family residential development.
- The Growth containment Boundaries (A, B, & C) have not been agreed upon by the community and should be deleted in the OCP.

2) Sewer or Liquid Waste Management Plant

- I do not support the Sewer or LWMP and am in favor of maintaining the septic systems that are currently in effect. References in the latest version of the OCP indicating community support of a Sewer or LWMP should be removed.

3) Vacation Rentals

- The latest draft version of the OCP does not address the community's view or the level of concern for Vacation Rentals. The OCP needs to be strengthened to include requiring business licensing, full time owner or caretaker on site for all short-term rentals, meaningful fines/penalties for non compliance and proper enforcement.

4) Hillside Development

- There needs to be stronger language concerning Hillside Development to prevent landslide, drainage, and run-off issues regardless of the development size. Fines for noncompliance must be increased to a meaningful number with enhanced enforcement. A bond should be posted that is reflective of the size of the development with applicable fines being applied against it.

The OCP is an important document and it's very important that the Regional District reflect the wishes of the community.

Signed
by:

 _____

 _____

Date: JAN 7 / 24

To: The Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen
planners@rdos.bc.ca

From:

JOE + TERRY HART

Address:

NARAMATA

Thank you for the opportunity to present feedback on the latest version of the OCP.

There are 4 areas of specific concern that I would like to address as feedback for the RDOS.

- 1) Growth Section of the OCP
- 2) Sewer or Liquid Waste Management Plant
- 3) Vacation Rentals
- 4) Hillside Development

1) Growth Section:

- I support keeping Lower Naramata as a Rural Residential low growth area versus the proposed OCP version that classifies Lower Naramata as a Growth area.
- The Growth Containment Boundaries (OCP) and the Village Settlement Area (VSA) from the proposed RGS amendment are virtually the same. 97% of the community rejected the Village Settlement Area in a previous survey with clear direction to not densify Lower Naramata beyond what is permitted with Low Density Rural Residential growth. Please remove any reference to support for densifying Lower Naramata

with multi-family residential development.

- The Growth containment Boundaries (A, B, & C) have not been agreed upon by the community and should be deleted in the OCP.

2) Sewer or Liquid Waste Management Plant

- I do not support the Sewer or LWMP and am in favor of maintaining the septic systems that are currently in effect. References in the latest version of the OCP indicating community support of a Sewer or LWMP should be removed.

3) Vacation Rentals

- The latest draft version of the OCP does not address the community's view or the level of concern for Vacation Rentals. The OCP needs to be strengthened to include requiring business licensing, full time owner or caretaker on site for all short-term rentals, meaningful fines/penalties for non compliance and proper enforcement.

4) Hillside Development

- There needs to be stronger language concerning Hillside Development to prevent landslide, drainage, and run-off issues regardless of the development size. Fines for noncompliance must be increased to a meaningful number with enhanced enforcement. A bond should be posted that is reflective of the size of the development with applicable fines being applied against it.

The OCP is an important document and it's very important that the Regional District reflect the wishes of the community.

Signed by:

Date: __January 2 2024

To: The Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen
planners@rdos.bc.ca

From: Kaolin Mallett
Address:

Thank you for the opportunity to present feedback on the latest version of the OCP.

There are 4 areas of specific concern that I would like to address as feedback for the RDOS.

- 1) Growth Section of the OCP
- 2) Sewer or Liquid Waste Management Plant
- 3) Vacation Rentals
- 4) Hillside Development

1) Growth Section:

- I support keeping Lower Naramata as a Rural Residential low growth area versus the proposed OCP version that classifies Lower Naramata as a Growth area.
- The Growth Containment Boundaries (OCP) and the Village Settlement Area (VSA) from the proposed RGS amendment are virtually the same. 97% of the community rejected the Village Settlement Area in a previous survey with clear direction to not densify Lower Naramata beyond what is permitted with Low Density Rural Residential growth. Please remove any reference to support for densifying Lower Naramata with multi-family residential development.
- The Growth containment Boundaries (A, B, & C) have not been agreed upon by the community and should be deleted in the OCP.
- Community engagement processes need to be just that and not used to try to push through developments that are not the wishes of the community.

2) Sewer or Liquid Waste Management Plant

- I do not support the Sewer or LWMP and am in favor of maintaining the septic systems that are currently in effect. References in the latest version of the OCP indicating community support of a Sewer or LWMP should be removed.

3) Vacation Rentals

- The latest draft version of the OCP does not address the community's view or the level of concern for Vacation Rentals. The OCP needs to be strengthened to include requiring business licensing, full time owner or caretaker on site for all short-term rentals, meaningful fines/penalties for non compliance and proper enforcement. This is a major issue that has been left out of planning for too long and is destroying our community. Immediate action is necessary.

4) Hillside Development

- There needs to be stronger language concerning Hillside Development to prevent landslide, drainage, and run-off issues regardless of the development size. Fines for noncompliance must be increased to a meaningful number with enhanced enforcement. A bond should be posted that is reflective of the size of the development with applicable fines being applied against it.

The OCP is an important document and it's very important that the Regional District reflect the wishes of the community.

Signed
by:
