

Attachment 1

City of Vernon Resident

From: Garry n MaryAnne HAAS <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, October 2, 2023 11:14 AM
To: Patti Bridal <PBridal@vernon.ca>; Mayor <Mayor@vernon.ca>
Cc: Akbal Mund <AMund@vernon.ca>; Brian Guy <BGuy@vernon.ca>; Brian Quiring <BQuiring@vernon.ca>; Kari Gares <KGares@vernon.ca>; Kelly Fehr <KFehr@vernon.ca>; Teresa Durning <TDurning@vernon.ca>
Subject: Foothills Housing

Use Caution - External Email

I am not adding this as a attachment as I suspect many do not read it

am writing this because it for two main reasons. First I believe this is wrong and many of my coffee friends also think this and wish me to write this. The second is that people in the foothills hills according to castanet (where this item was taken from) also disagree with you.

“A proposed project to build 57 strata units at the northeastern edge of Vernon is moving forward to a public open house.”

The reason for the letter is simple I have tried the public meetings and open house idea many times as find that they do not work. I have gone to five or six and have never had a question answered clearly, and written submissions well they do not get made public either online or are available at the meetings.

“The plan is to rezone a country residential property just outside the Silver Star foothills community to allow for 13 semi-detached buildings, one triplex, and seven quadruples.”

No where do you indicate whether these are going to be low cost or a market value for sale or rent.

“It received glowing praise from councillors and passed unanimously to the next step in the process.”

“This is a great project, exactly what we want,” said Coun. Brian Quiring. “This is exactly what the community needs.”

What criteria is Mr. Quiring using to make this statement

“He added the development would be close to schools and fire protection services.”

On elementary school any others schools are fifteen minutes or better from this area. Is the fire department volunteer or full time. If volunteer what effect would it have on making it full time and at what cost

“Located at 7025 Herbert Rd. and 7110 Bates Rd., the two-hectare parcel is located on land annexed from the Regional District of the North Okanagan in 2014.”

Lovely agricultural land

“It also borders Silver Star Road, but there would be no access points directly off it.”

But if built it will create a major traffic problem with all the cars and people turning.

“The project is in early stages, and now moves ahead to allow for public input as early as next month.

Coun. Kari Gares said she was “thrilled’ to see the project come to council.”

I too am excited to see a project like this come up but not with no information for the public to go to a p open house on

“She added it speaks to the housing needs of the community.”

What the community requires is low cost and small houses and apartments to be built so the regular public can afford to have a dry and clean place to live

“Housing needs and affordability have been an ongoing issue in Vernon and across B.C. as rental vacancies continue to hover near zero.”

This is true but you have to built smaller apartments with simpler apartments to keep all costs down and they must have a long term rent control on them so that in the future they turned into places for those with the money to stay or live.

City of Vernon Disclaimer: This transmission (including any attachments) may contain confidential information, privileged material (including material protected by the FOI act or other applicable privileges), or constitute non-public information. Any use of this information by anyone other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please immediately reply to the sender and delete this information from your system. Use, dissemination, distribution, or reproduction of this transmission by unintended recipients is not authorized and may be unlawful.

Barbara Everdene

From: Jeanie Fraser [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 6:35 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Concerns re OCP Amendment Application OCP00088

Hello,

I am writing this on behalf of my husband and myself. We just came from the Open House regarding the OCP00088 amendment application and we left feeling discouraged that our feedback, along with our neighbours's feedback, was not seriously considered, and so we are putting it in writing.

We recognize the need for additional housing in Vernon. Our concern is the safety and noise impact of increased traffic on the narrow local street of Manning Place with the addition of these 57 units. If it were guaranteed that none of these units would be using Manning Place to get to or from their home, and solely using Silver Star Rd. to access their homes, then we would not have issue with this application. We were told this development needs to have two exits in the event of emergency. The exit onto Herbert Rd is problematic as it will significantly increase traffic on Manning Place. A reasonable compromise could be gating that exit, with emergency staff having the ability to open the gate in the event of an emergency.

Manning Place currently is basically a single lane when cars are parked on the street, and very narrow, especially in the snowy season. Most units front the street so quality of life will be negatively impacted by dramatically increased traffic from an additional 57 units. With snow pile ups, visibility is reduced creating a problematic safety concern. Silver Star Rd has been designed to accommodate heavier levels of traffic, so traffic for this development needs to be routed via Silver Star Rd.

We hope staff and council will delay moving forward with this application until a viable solution is in place to ensure traffic moves solely via SilverStar Rd to access this development.

We trust you will take these concerns under serious consideration.

Jean Fraser and Daniel Jarvis

City of Vernon Disclaimer: This transmission (including any attachments) may contain confidential information, privileged material (including material protected by the FOI act or other applicable privileges), or constitute non-public information. Any use of this information by anyone other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please immediately reply to the sender and delete this information from your system. Use, dissemination, distribution, or reproduction of this transmission by unintended recipients is not authorized and may be unlawful.

Barbara Everdene

From: Cheri Faris [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, October 4, 2023 7:26 AM
To: Planning
Subject: Bates/Manning Project

Categories: Megan

Smaller more affordable housing is a good thing. I support this project.

Cheri Faris
Foothills Resident

City of Vernon Disclaimer: This transmission (including any attachments) may contain confidential information, privileged material (including material protected by the FOI act or other applicable privileges), or constitute non-public information. Any use of this information by anyone other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please immediately reply to the sender and delete this information from your system. Use, dissemination, distribution, or reproduction of this transmission by unintended recipients is not authorized and may be unlawful.

Barbara Everdene

From: Scott Graham [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, October 12, 2023 11:08 AM
To: Planning
Subject: OCP Amendment #00088 / Rezoning #00369 (7025 Herbert Road / 7110 Bates Road)

Hello

I am writing to express my opposition to this project. I live in the Foothill, on Blackcomb Crt and if this project were to go ahead, will be dealing with the consequences for decades. My opposition stems from the appropriate location of high density housing. While I agree for the need for high density, the location is dependent on its success. Two reasons why this project will not be successful are:

1. Lack of Transit. Due to the lack of transit, each household should be expected to have and use at least 2 vehicles, that adds a tremendous amount of traffic to a single road in and out. This will also increase Vernon's production of green house gas.
2. Lack of Services. High density is a fantastic tool to create community, however, with out services such as grocery stores, coffee shops and other community hubs, this community will just be a bedroom community having to access services away from home.

Keep high density projects close to services, not in rural low density areas.

Thank you for your time and the opportunity to comment.

Scott Graham
[REDACTED]

City of Vernon Disclaimer: This transmission (including any attachments) may contain confidential information, privileged material (including material protected by the FOI act or other applicable privileges), or constitute non-public information. Any use of this information by anyone other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please immediately reply to the sender and delete this information from your system. Use, dissemination, distribution, or reproduction of this transmission by unintended recipients is not authorized and may be unlawful.

Barbara Everdene

From: Eric-Judy STANG [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, October 15, 2023 1:05 PM
To: Planning; Eric-Judy STANG
Subject: OCP Amendment #00088 / Rezoning #00369 (7025 Herbert Road / 7110 Bates Road)

You have not provided a public input form to this amendment as shown on your City of Vernon Website so as the closing of public input will be at the end of the Public Hearing scheduled for October 17th at 7:00pm I am obliged to reach out in writing.

I am a resident of Manning Place and have seen over the past 6 months major changes to our neighborhood. I am not against an individual or business developing a property and like so many tax paying citizens, rely on the governance of City Hall to look after the community best interests. The increase in density to the above project is extreme. I am aware that the city is looking for increased housing capacity but this is not the location for it.

I would hope that common sense would prevail.

In principle, my objections are:

1. No public transportation to the Foothills neighborhood. How are families without multiple vehicles

to access amenities like groceries. Children, especially teenagers will have to rely on family for transportation to and from extra curricular activities outside of school bus operations.

2. There does not appear to be a designated playground area. One can only assume young children will require

outdoor space as there appears to be very little with this project and the proposed density.

3. Seven (7) fourplexes is not in keeping with what already exists in the Foothills neighborhood. Restricting the use

of four plexes to only three plex units and reducing the number from 7 to 6 would at least be a start to the congestion (reduced by 10 units).

4. Parking issues will always be a problem. Assuming at least one to one- and one-half vehicles per unit where are they all to park if not on the road. Even on a wide road like the existing Manning Place roadside vehicles are a concern on garbage collection days and what about winter snow removal. Have these issues really been considered?

5. And lastly, has anyone thought about the impact to the homeowners already on Herbert? Are they not entitled to some protection?

I leave you with these issues for your consideration. Don't take the easy way out and fall prey to the pressure all communities\ are under to increase their housing commitments.

Respectfully;

Judy Stang
[REDACTED] Manning Place



Virus-free. www.avast.com

City of Vernon Disclaimer: This transmission (including any attachments) may contain confidential information, privileged material (including material protected by the FOI act or other applicable privileges), or constitute non-public information. Any use of this information by anyone other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please immediately reply to the sender and delete this information from your system. Use, dissemination, distribution, or reproduction of this transmission by unintended recipients is not authorized and may be unlawful.

Barbara Everdene

From: Lucas Baldo [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 7:48 PM
To: Barbara Everdene; Planning
Subject: 7025 Herbert Road Questions and Comments

Dear Barbara and Planning Committee,

First off, thank you for the open house and the opportunity to discuss the growth in this area. As encouraged, please find below my concerns with the request to raise these to the Planning Committee and City Council. I would greatly appreciate brief feedback on these points via return email, if possible.

1. Please explore the potential for the establishment of a firm condition of completion of the roundabout at Bates / Silverstar / Phoenix to ensure safe access to Silverstar Road from Bates Road prior to commencement of Herbert Road development.

- Based on discussion at the open house, the plan is for 2025, but may be pushed as late as 2028, with no firm condition tied to the development of Herbert.
- I would strongly support a condition on the development timeline such that safe egress from Bates Road can be ensured during construction of the development, as well as during occupation when vehicle traffic will be increased.
- As is, it is currently unsafe to turn left from Star Road or Bates Road onto Silverstar with Silverstar traffic often travelling well in excess of the 60 kph limit. This situation will only be worsened by increasing the number of people coming and going.
- The plan already dictates the construction of this roundabout, so please consider the benefit of having this roundabout in place before area occupancy is quadrupled (from roughly 30 current units on Manning Place to approx. 120 units on new Manning and Herbert). I would strongly suggest proactive action to complete the roundabout prior to Herbert development, so Herbert construction vehicles (concrete trucks, semi-trucks carrying gravel, etc.) can safely enter Silverstar Road.
- The construction of the roundabout itself will be an unavoidable inconvenience, so building the roundabout prior to increasing occupancy and therefore traffic in the area is sensible.
- An added benefit is the immediate improvement of safety to Phoenix Road access to Silverstar and calming of Silverstar Road traffic.
- Make sure you put a ladder to get out of the pool before inviting people to try the diving board. Safe egress must be ensured prior to increasing vehicle traffic, not after.

2. No left turn onto Silverstar Road from Star Road.

- This notion was indicated, perhaps erroneously, from the Developer of Manning Place.
- I think this option should be explored. If the roundabout is being built at Bates / Silverstar as a safe means to access Silverstar Road, then its use should be encouraged.
- By placing a barrier across the centerline of Silverstar Road, left turning at Star Road would be discouraged and traffic would be encouraged to use the intended access.

3. Pedestrian Crossing at Silverstar Road

- This is currently an extremely unsafe crossing, requiring stepping over a tall barrier (impossible with a stroller) on the west side of the road, and essentially blind in both directions.
- Crossing at the existing Foothills Drive pedestrian crossing requires walking approximately 250m along the shoulder of Silverstar Road, which is unacceptable.
- Crossing at the proposed Phoenix Road roundabout is approximately 350m from the potential Manning Place crossing.
- Please consider a pedestrian crossing at Manning Place, or at least a safe means to travel Silverstar Road to access the Foothills Drive crossing.
- As of now, the only park in the area is at Whistler Place, approximately 950m from Manning Place. It is unrealistic to expect pedestrians to walk uphill approximately 350m to the new Phoenix Drive crossing, nearly doubling the distance to the park, so it is sensible to facilitate a safe crossing at Manning Place or a safe means to access the Foothills Drive crossing and avoid unsafe crossing.

4. Greenspace / Playground for Manning / Herbert / Bates

- With multi-family housing come families. As of right now, the only play structures are located on the other side of a dangerous Silverstar Road crossing, approximately 1.5 km from 7025 Herbert Road.
- While I see "amenity areas" are foreseen in the plans of 7025 Herbert, there is currently no indication of a play structure.
- Please consider a public play structure and greenspace on the east side of Silverstar Road to allow family access to play areas without use of a car or crossing Silverstar Road.

5. Manning Place Traffic Calming

- Is there a possibility of traffic calming means on Manning Place to discourage speeding?
- For example a small roundabout at the end of the existing Manning place, where the extension of Manning Place is currently underway, to slow uninterrupted speeding down the road and discourage shortcutting via Manning Place and keeping traffic on Silverstar Road.
- The road is not yet finished, so there is time to make this change yet.

6. Shared BX Trail Connection

- a "Shared BX Trail Connection" can be seen in Figure 3 of *7025 Herbert Rd Traffic Impact Assessment*
- Is there a plan to provide access to the BX Creek below via Manning Place or Herbert Road? Where is the access foreseen?

7. Access to 7025 Herbert Road

- As per Page 9 of *7025 Herbert Rd Traffic Impact Assessment* : "the main access could shift to Herbert Road."
- I suggest eliminating this potential. Silverstar to Bates Road offers direct access to 7025 Herbert Road with directing traffic needlessly onto Herbert Road.

Thank you for your time and consideration and looking forward to your feedback.

Lucas Baldo

Manning Place

Barbara Everdene

From: Todd Fitzpatrick [REDACTED] RDNO Resident
Sent: Thursday, October 12, 2023 2:51 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Public Input Session - Questions - OCP Amendment #00088 / Rezoning #00369 (7025 Herbert Road / 7110 Bates Road)

Use Caution - External Email

See questions below that I would like answered by the City of Vernon and/or developer at the Open House on Oct. 17, 2023:

1. What steps did the City of Vernon and RDNO take to gather input from Herbert Road residents when 7025 Herbert Road was annexed in 2014? Shouldn't there have been an opportunity to provide input in 2013/2014 on the annexation?
2. If this proposed rezoning and development moves forward is the City of Vernon and the developer prepared to compensate Herbert Road homeowners (that are directly impacted) for years of construction noise/traffic and devaluing of our country properties?
3. Is the City and/or developer prepared to buy our property above market value if this development moves forward?
4. As Herbert Road residents living directly across from the proposed complex, that have fulltime home offices, please explain what compensation the developer and/or City is prepared to offer when our home offices are vibrating from heavy construction that impacts our ability to run our home offices and earn an income?

Note: This is already having an impact because of the Manning Place development and Herbert Road connection.

5. Explain how adding 57 units (plus the additional 29 units on Manning Road) into Country Residential zoned area isn't *Urban Sprawl*?

Section 3, Page 3:

"In summary, Administration finds that this proposal is unlikely to encourage sprawl into the rural protection area. Given the close proximity of the subject property to the Foothills Neighborhood

Plan Area, services and the transportation network and the urgency of meeting the need for multi-family housing, Administration supports increased density on this parcel."

6. Provide details on proposed visual and sound barriers to reduce the impact on Herbert Road rural residents?

Section 1, Page #2:

"Given that this parcel is on the urban/rural fringe, a landscape buffer has been included in the design to limit visual impact to the rural large lot properties to the east in the Regional District of the North Okanagan (RDNO)."

7. The Foothills Neighborhood Plan, completed in 2013, but did not include the subject property (7025 Herbert Road). How do you now justify applying this plan to the subject property? It appears the document is suggesting it was *close enough* to be immersed into the plan.

Section 4, Page 3:

*The Foothills Neighborhood Plan Area (Plan Area) was endorsed by Council on October 2013. **The subject property was not included in the Plan** because it was not part of the City of Vernon during the planning process. However, as the subject property is on the immediate eastern boundary of the Plan Area (Figure 3). Given its proximity, Administration considered the Plan Area's policy objectives for residential development in the analysis of this application.*

Todd Fitzpatrick

City of Vernon Disclaimer: This transmission (including any attachments) may contain confidential information, privileged material (including material protected by the FOI act or other applicable privileges), or constitute non-public information. Any use of this information by anyone other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please immediately reply to the sender and delete this information from your system. Use, dissemination, distribution, or reproduction of this transmission by unintended recipients is not authorized and may be unlawful.

Barbara Everdene

From: Janet [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, October 15, 2023 5:00 PM
To: Planning
Subject: OCP Amendment #00088 / Rezoning #00369 (7025 Herbert Road / 7110 Bates Road)

Use Caution - External Email

Bates Road "Development"

As a non-resident of the City of Vernon, but a resident of Herbert Road, we have so many questions/comments about this development.

1) Why was this property annexed into the City of Vernon?

This property was part of a development created in the late 70's as "Country Residential". Meaning that unless that property was of a certain size only one residence was allowed – larger lots were allowed a second smaller residence.

2) Density of neighbouring properties.

The adjoining development on Manning Place has 29 residences. The Foothills area does not have high density. The properties on Herbert and Bates have low density. This proposal has 57!! Double its adjoining neighbour!

3) Silver Star Road

As per the traffic study – there "are in order of 10,000 vehicles per day" adding another 57 – 114 vehicles to the "Silver Star 500" is only adding to a road that is ill equipped to handle the existing volume. The proposed traffic circle, to be added in 2024-2025, will not alleviate the flow. And as a side note: How are the logging trucks and heavy equipment going to manoeuvre the traffic circle?

4) Amenities in this Area

There are none. No bus route. No retail. And the new Silver Star Pathway is so severely underused that it could be deemed a waste to money. The only mention of any recreation is the pathway on the southern end of this development. A pathway, that doesn't connect to anything, at this time. A pathway that is encouraging people to use it, but there is no allowance for vehicle parking for users. Will this be a "private" user's path?

5) The Proposed Design of the Development

The strata road entrance/exits are onto roads not maintained by the City of Vernon. The history of maintenance and snow removal on Herbert and Bates is slow (snow plowing can occur 2-3 days after a snow fall). The exit onto Bates is almost in a haphazard place – almost a blind corner.

There needs to be a rethink of this development. It is too dense and ill designed to the property and area.

Jack & Janet Mazereeuw

[REDACTED] Herbert Road

15 October 2023

City of Vernon Disclaimer: This transmission (including any attachments) may contain confidential information, privileged material (including material protected by the FOI act or other applicable privileges), or constitute non-public

Barbara Everdene

From: Esther Wolters [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, October 16, 2023 8:50 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Ref OCP00088/ZON00369
Attachments: Vernon Councillors you ask is this exactly what we want.docx

Use Caution - External Email

Please see attached document

Vernon Councillors you ask is this exactly what we want?

My answer is NO not at all!

The Bates and Herbert Rd "rural" acreage community have families that have lived on their properties for over 30 years. Newer residents to our neighborhood moved here for the rural country lifestyle. Rural being defined as those that reside in characteristic of the countryside rather than town. A whopping 52 unit strata does not scream rural living.

There is plentiful development happening in the neighboring areas. Above in the Phoenix Dr area as well as in the Foothills. According to council records the Foothills development is not even close to being finished which would create a substantially large amount of housing.

Also between Blackcomb way and Rugg Rd a very large portion has been clear cut for future development. Last but not least Manning Pl is now also under development for even more homes. Which by the way is encroaching on the Bates/Herbert Rd residents. Bates/Herbert Rd was once a "No thru Rd" unbeknownst to its residents unfortunately now receives more traffic due to the development of Manning Pl. As you can see there is ample development going on here. Herbert/Bates Rd does not need 52 more homes lining a developers pockets. While leaving long term Vernonites feeling unheard and unacknowledged, because let's face it that's what's really happening here. Ask yourself this, would you want 52 strata units added to your neighborhood? It has been stated that "52 units has medium environmental sensitivity impact." That is not to be taken lightly medium does not mean low impact. How is 52 units even considered low density zoning? I read the towns vision for the foothills area. Tell me how does clearing the area of vegetation and housing for animals protect the wildlife corridors? When the amount of people living in an area increases this will also bring in more noise and vehicles. This does not protect our wildlife. I am concerned about the noise pollution that will be created from the Bates/Herbert Rd proposed development. For those unaware noise pollution is defined as the environmental disturbance caused by noise. Examples being construction, increased traffic and neighborhood noise. It can impact not just the health of humans but it can affect wildlife and our livestock, causing them unwanted stress. The light pollution that will be created by this development is also a concern. Light pollution is the excessive or inappropriate use of outdoor artificial light. Which has a disruptive effect on natural cycles and inhibits the observation of stars and planets. It affects human health and wildlife behavior. Our neighborhood has already been dealing with these affects from the above Phoenix Dr, Apex and Nikiska Dr. Etc. developments. This has gone on for years. I am very proud of how low impact our rural neighborhood is on light pollution. As the town is already aware this area is a wildlife corridor for animals to go down to BX creek. We get bears, badgers, cougar, lynx, coyote, deer and owl to name just a few animals we peacefully share our neighborhood with. I cannot say the same for the other developments in the area. I have already noticed a decrease in wildlife in the four areas I previously mentioned. Another concern is the extra construction traffic this development would bring to the neighborhood. My kids walk down from the top of Bates Rd after school and I worry for their safety. The merging of Manning Pl has already brought safety issues. On three separate occasions I have almost been struck by truck drivers from said development cutting the corner at the bottom of Herbert Rd. I am sure other residents have had similar concerning experiences of what was once a quiet no thru rd. Also there is no need to create a new access trail for the BX creek trail system. There is already an accessible walking distance trail entry at the top of Star rd. across from Marmot Ct. There is no need to disrupt more vegetation and wildlife. I hope my concerns will not be taken lightly and hope that they will be acknowledged and considered for our small rural neighborhood. I leave my concerns with a beautiful photo of what this area once looked like. It was pristine in all its glory, sad to say it is not as charming as it once was. We request the property stay RDNO Country Residential. Let's keep some parts of Vernon Beautiful please.



Regards

-The Wolters and Randle family

Herbert Rd

Barbara Everdene

From: Brad Baker [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 10:50 AM
To: Brad Baker; [REDACTED]; Planning
Subject: Re: Public Input Session - Questions - OCP Amendment #00088 / Rezoning #00369 (7025 Herbert Road / 7110 Bates Road)

Pleased find below questions and concerns regarding the above mentioned proposed OCP Amendment and subsequent development:

Annexation

The property at 7025 Herbert Road was annexed into the City as a single property. It was explained to us (by a current City of Vernon Councilor) that under today's "rules", this may not be permitted and that a minimum of four properties would be required to be annexed as a group. Is this correct and what "rule" does this fall under (Provincial or municipal)?

Reviewing the North Okanagan Regional Growth Strategy (RGS), had the property (7025 Herbert/7110 Bates) NOT been annexed into the City would it had still been within the rural protection area under the RGS bylaw?

Growth Management – comments provided by RDNO/Laura Frank to CoV/Laurie Cordell upon review of the proposal:

"Growth Management – There do not appear to be any buffers to the adjacent properties, some of which currently have agricultural activities occurring (hobby farms)."

Fringe Area Planning

4.5.1 The Regional District encourages adjacent municipalities to consider the rural context and character of Electoral Areas "B" and "C" when reviewing development along the urban/rural fringe.

4.5.2 The Regional District requests that the adjacent municipalities adhere to best management practices regarding development along the Electoral Area "B" and "C" boundary, including participating in collaborative fringe management planning, limiting suburban density, requiring appropriate buffering and discouraging further suburban and urban sprawl into rural and agricultural areas."

- Please explain how the developer plans to respond to the above comments. We note that there is some proposed "vegetation buffer" noted on one of the illustrations, however we also note that the Traffic Impact

Assessment calls for vegetation adjacent accesses to be limited in height to 0.3 m. These seem to contradict each other, how will the buffer be handled?

- 30 units/hectare seems much greater than any neighboring properties and goes against RDNO's recommendation of "limiting suburban density." What is the current density of the Manning Place Development?

4.5.3 Regional District is committed to coordinating efforts with the neighboring municipalities to ensure that growth adjacent to Electoral Area "B" and "C" boundaries occurs in a planned and sustainable manner that reflects the unincorporated rural character valued by the residents of Electoral Area "B" and "C".

- Please explain how the City of Vernon is coordinating with RDNO on this planned development "reflects the unincorporated rural character valued by the residents of Electoral Area B and C?"

Please let it be known that we, Brad and Lori Baker, of [REDACTED] Herbert Road are concerned with the rezoning of the proposed rezoning of 7025 Herbert/7110 Bates from Country Residential. We purchased our property in good faith (well before the annexation of 7025 Herbert) based on the current CR zoning of all of the properties on Herbert/Bates. We feel that the proposed rezoning, and subsequent proposed development will lessen the enjoyment of our property and neighborhood, and potentially devalue the same. We ask that Vernon City Council NOT support the applications to amend the OCP and land use designation (OCP00088 and ZON00369) and that the prevailing zoning and land use designations of the subject properties remain.

Sincerely

Brad and Lori Baker

[REDACTED] [Herbert Road](#)

[Vernon BC.](#)

Barbara Everdene

From: Sue Evans [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 3:47 PM
To: Planning
Subject: RE: Questions - Public Input Session - Questions - OCP Amendment #00088 / Rezoning #00369 (7025 Herbert Road / 7110 Bates Road)

Importance: High

Good afternoon,

I reside on Herbert Road within very close proximity to the proposed 57-unit development, and for the record, I am completely opposed to the rezoning of 7025 Herbert Rd / 7110 Bates Rd from Country Residential to "R5 — Four-plex Housing Residential". How does the addition of 86 units (29 units to be built in the Manning Place subdivision currently under construction) fit in with the **RDNO Official Community Plan for Electoral Districts B and C** stating the following points - see **Fringe Area Planning Policies** - section 4.5.1 (page 42)?

"FRINGE AREA PLANNING POLICIES

- 4.5.1 The Regional District encourages adjacent municipalities to consider the rural context and character of Electoral Areas "B" and "C" when reviewing development along the urban/rural fringe.
- 4.5.2 The Regional District requests that the adjacent municipalities adhere to best management practices regarding development along the Electoral Area "B" and "C" boundary, including participating in collaborative fringe management planning, limiting suburban density, requiring appropriate buffering and discouraging further suburban and urban sprawl into rural and agricultural areas.
- 4.5.3 Regional District is committed to coordinate efforts with the neighboring municipalities to ensure that growth adjacent to Electoral Area "B" and "C" boundaries occurs in a planned and sustainable manner **that reflects the unincorporated rural character valued by the residents of Electoral Area "B" and "C" residents.**
- 4.5.4 Encourage inter-jurisdictional fringe area planning between the Regional District, District of Coldstream, Township of Spallumcheen and City of Vernon that is respectful and collaborative.
- 4.5.5 Encourage adjacent jurisdictions to provide referrals on applications and issues that relate to land use planning and management to the Regional District, especially along the rural-urban fringe.
- 4.5.6 Work with adjacent jurisdictions, the Ministry of Agriculture and Agricultural Land Commission to protect the Agricultural Land Reserve along the urban-rural fringe.
- 4.5.7 Refer to other agencies, all land use planning applications or issues which may affect another jurisdiction. All affected agencies or municipal Councils, which receive referrals from the Regional District, shall be encouraged to give due consideration and timely responses to referrals."

When 7025 Herbert Road was annexed into the City of Vernon, there was no opportunity for the residents of Herbert Road to provide input. It has also been noted that under current rules, this annexation may not have been permitted. That would be a question for this evening's public input session. Other key factors to be considered are the lack of public transit, lack of amenities in this area, increase in crime (already happening), noise and light pollution, road safety and the impact of heavy traffic and construction on not only the residents of this neighbourhood, but also on the wildlife in this area. Until the start of the Manning Place excavation and bulldozing, we used to see bears and deer (even the occasional lynx) on a regular basis on our property which sits right above the ravine and is part of the wildlife corridor. The ongoing vibrations and noise has not only had a negative impact on our mental and physical health, but I surmise has driven away the wildlife which we have peacefully co-existed with for the last ten years. We are relative newcomers to this beautiful neighbourhood (February 2014), but fiercely care about maintaining its rural charm. When we moved here, the fact that all the properties on Herbert Road had the same zoning made it a safe bet for us to have our "forever" home in the country. Now, not so much...

Please take all of these points under consideration, along with those of our concerned Herbert Road neighbours and friends.

Regards,

Sue Evans

[Redacted signature block]

[Redacted contact information]

City of Vernon Disclaimer: This transmission (including any attachments) may contain confidential information, privileged material (including material protected by the FOI act or other applicable privileges), or constitute non-public information. Any use of this information by anyone other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please immediately reply to the sender and delete this information from your system. Use, dissemination, distribution, or reproduction of this transmission by unintended recipients is not authorized and may be unlawful.

Barbara Everdene

From: Suz Singh [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, October 11, 2023 10:46 PM
To: Planning
Subject: OCP Amendment #00088 / Rezoning #00369 (7025 Herbert Road / 7110 Bates Road)

Use Caution - External Email

Dear Mayor Cumming and Council Members,

I am writing to you regarding OCP Amendment #00088 / Rezoning #00369 (7025 Herbert Road / 7110 Bates Road). I have 2 major concerns with the rezoning of this property for high density housing. With the City's commitment to reduce emissions we should be focusing future high density homes in the downtown to reduce gas vehicle emissions from transportation needs. Expanding high density housing at a distance (especially uphill) from downtown means more burning of fossil fuels as inhabitants drive to and from their homes. Furthermore, this proposed build site is on the edge of a densely forested area. Given our now regular wildfires, doesn't that place the new homes, and the already existing homes at a greater risk to forest fires? Keeping some distance between the dense forest and the homes in the Foothills seems prudent. Building 4 plex on this land could create a bridge for a forest fire to the existing homes in the Foothills. I urge you for both of these reasons to consider denying the rezoning of this land.

Sincerely,
Suzanna Singh

City of Vernon Disclaimer: This transmission (including any attachments) may contain confidential information, privileged material (including material protected by the FOI act or other applicable privileges), or constitute non-public information. Any use of this information by anyone other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please immediately reply to the sender and delete this information from your system. Use, dissemination, distribution, or reproduction of this transmission by unintended recipients is not authorized and may be unlawful.