

## **Introduction:**

Hi, my name is Derek Bellamy, and my wife Chelsea and I are the owners of 8475 Princeton-Summerland Rd. We started the rezoning process over 2 years ago and submitted our formal application in November 2020.

I am going to be taking some time to address the concerns expressed within the 4 letters received by the RDOS in lieu of attending the May 6 Public Hearing. I'd also like to take the time to be very transparent and feel that providing some background information about our intentions may be helpful.

When we started the rezoning process in September 2019, there was no Covid, and the real estate market pricing on homes and acreages was not like it is today. From the very beginning, the purpose of applying for rezoning has been to assist us in continuing to raise our children here and allow me to work locally, rather than having to leave my family and travel away for work.

We are not developers; we are a young family who has been raising our children in this home for the past 6 years. Rezoning, as well as subdividing, would provide us the financial stability to continue to live here, while at the same time, secure a portion of our property to hold onto for our children's futures.

## **Address Letters:**

When my wife and I started the process of rezoning our property in September of 2019, we knew it was possible we would get negative feedback from some of the neighbors in the area. However, when the initial public information meeting occurred on March 18<sup>th</sup>, not a single person showed up to address any potential concerns or opposition.

The APC reviewed our application on March 22, and gave their full support. We were happy, but not too surprised as we were told all along that ours is a simple and straightforward rezoning request and other neighboring rezoning requests had recently been given approval.

In late April/early May, four letters were received by the RDOS in lieu of attending the public hearing, two from neighbors and two from people over 10 km away from our residence. After getting the chance to review the letters, we feel there were little to no facts backing them up. I would like to now address each of the concerns raised.

- **People who want to subdivide for personal gain should move back to town where they can have close neighbors.**
  - ◆ I could empathize with this point if we were planning a small lot subdivision, but we are not. Each of these properties will be 2.5 acres in size, with two being adjacent to Princeton Summerland Road (one of those with our current home) and another lot located along Deans Road on a lower bench not visible from Princeton Summerland Road.
  - ◆ We have no plans to develop the proposed lot located along Princeton-Summerland Rd. This is the land we want to hold onto for our children.
- **They do not want anyone else “sucking off the aquifer.”**
  - ◆ We take this point very seriously, as we currently have a well rated for 2 gallons per minute which has been more than sufficient for our needs. We are a water

conscious family and take great pride in our water conservation efforts, so I have a hard time aligning myself with their statements and concerns.

- ◆ It is important to note that two of the letters that cited concerns about us impacting the aquifer have both wells and also have water licenses to pump water out of Trout Creek.
- ◆ After becoming aware of these facts, we have a hard time believing the water constraint issues these neighbours claim to endure.
- ◆ We must also stress that we are not proposing any significant changes, as we would only be adding 1 additional well. We already have 2 of 3 wells needed for the 3-lots, and believe the addition of a third well will not put a strain on the bedrock aquifer. The 3<sup>rd</sup> lot is for our children's future.
- **Allowing landowners in our area to subdivide will put more demand on water resources.**
  - ◆ I would just like to point out that since 2014, including ours, there have only been 5 rezoning applications submitted within the area outside of the Faulder Water System.
  - ◆ I believe that the Faulder area does not have a water supply problem, and instead, a water conservation problem. And rather than halting all future development, it seems like implementing water conservation strategies in the area would be the logical first step. For example, the installation of water meters, the addition of bylaws that would require new developments to employ low-flow fixtures and use dry-land landscaping, and the introduction of retrofit initiatives.
- **They also state that adding additional wells may cause the area to become subject to sinkholes.**
  - ◆ We were curious if this could be a legitimate concern and therefore consulted with a hydrogeologist on the matter. They explained that sinkholes are only a concern when dealing with multiple shallow wells. Our wells are both around 400 ft bedrock wells, making the possibility of sinkholes occurring near impossible.
- **They state that similar applications in the past have been denied.**
  - ◆ From what I've read on the RDOS website, it is quite the opposite. All of the rezoning applications in our immediate area have been approved. The reason we have spent the past two years, and most of our savings, pursuing our rezoning amendment, is because, like our neighbours, our request also fits the OCP bylaws.
    - Both approved applications were rezoned with new parcels not less than 1.0 ha in size. In this context, our proposal is consistent with the neighbouring area.
- **They state that they knew past owners who had water issues with our well.**
  - ◆ There were in fact past issues which have since been resolved, as they were due to equipment malfunctions rather than an actual problem with the well.
  - ◆ In April of this year, we had a pump test completed on our second well, in which water was proven.
- **They state that the area is dry.**
  - ◆ This is no secret. The properties on this bench are primarily privacy acreages. The land experiences relentless sun exposure. It is unfarmable as the ground consists of limitless boulders and gravel; consequently, these properties are not in the

ALR. Unfarmable land like ours, which has been kept in its natural state, requires less water than a city lot.

➤ **They state concerns about 2 extra wells and two extra septic fields being needed for the addition of the two lots.**

- ◆ We have had both a sewerage system feasibility report and a rapid environmental assessment report completed, both having favorable results for the additional septic systems and wells.
- ◆ As mentioned, we only need to add one additional well.

**Conclusion:**

- ◆ We have full RDOS staff and APC support of our application, as it complies with the OCP.
  - ◆ As stated in the administrative report for our rezoning amendment, given that the proposal is consistent with the Official Community Plan Bylaw for SH land use designation, Administration supports our proposed zoning bylaw amendment application and is recommending approval.
- ◆ Neighbouring properties on either side of us have recently been rezoned.
- ◆ As you know, we are not proposing to connect to the Faulder Water Service Area since we are over 1.5 km away.
  - ◆ We are proposing to provide well water, and two of the three potential lots already have wells that were drilled prior to us purchasing our property.
  - ◆ As also stated in the rezoning report for the approved application of 66 Deans Rd, “administration is aware of the water sustainability issues experienced at Faulder in recent years, (as well as recent upgrades undertaken to the water system), however, it is not aware of similar issues being experienced in the vicinity of Deans Road.”
- ◆ Simple application has been in the que for nearly a year, and there no technical reason for this not to be approved.
- ◆ From the beginning of our rezoning process back in September 2019, we have followed all RDOS guidelines and application requirements, with full staff support along the entire way.
- ◆ During the second Public Information Meeting held on October 13 of this year, we were very happy to find out we had full support from the neighbours in attendance and not one person at the meeting expressed opposition to our proposal.
- ◆ We hope that we’ve provided enough information and clarity to alleviate any concerns, and that you will look favourably upon our rezoning request.