

Lauri Feindell

Subject: FW: Deveopment Variance Permit Application No. E2022.027-DVP

From: Bob Hole
Sent: July 14, 2022 10:53 AM
To: Planning <planning@rdos.bc.ca>
Subject: Deveopment Variance Permit Application No. E2022.027-DVP

RDOS Planning Department,

Re: 3180 3rd Street, Naramata BC Electoral Area E

We, Robert and Maureen Hole, are the next door adjacent neighbour to the Gritten property, we appreciate the applicants attempts to build as far from the Riparian setback as possible, and fully support this Variance Application.

Regards,
Bob Hole

Feedback Form

TO: Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen

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

FROM: Lynette Bailie Farquharson,

RE: Development Variance Permit (DVP) Application 3180 3rd Street, Electoral Area "E"

FILE NO.: E2022.027-DVP

My comments / concerns are:

I do not support the proposed variances at **3180 3rd Street**.

The variance, if allowed, will not allow for the existing form and structure of the whole neighbourhood to be preserved. Nor does it adhere to the statutes of Naramata's Official Community Plan, specifically:

1. Ensure future development and growth are compatible with community values (e.g. scenic vistas, green space, privacy, quality of life, low population density, rural ambiance).
2. Protect and enhance public access along the foreshore of Okanagan Lake.
3. Maintain public access to parks and recreation areas, with new development required to provide green space and connectivity to public areas.

While the existing house has two existing non-conforming storage buildings, their height and stature are low, and small compared to the proposed change of use this DVP is seeking. It is unclear, if these storage structures should be grandfathered at all, let alone be used as justification to allow a variance that significantly changes the landscape and vistas of the neighbourhood, street, and RDOS park system (beach access). The current plan is also only proposing removing one of the non-conforming sheds, so in effect the proposal is requesting to not only have a 1.5 m variation, but also for the Board to grandfather in the non-conforming building which is right on the property line. The result, being significant encroachment on the Public Access Roadway. The fence, although not installed by the current owners, is also non-conforming, and completely inhibits the enjoyment and use of the public beach access by the community and public at large.

I would counter, by allowing the placement of the mass of the proposed building on the North Property line, with a 1.5 m Setback in variance, the bulk of this proposed house and additional

suite, are being placed within the exact area the 4.5 m allowance is meant to protect, allowing for a more community feel to the street. It will add a large imposing structure, at the end of the roadway, and right above the “unused road” aka Community Public Access to the Lake. A large structure, as proposed, will effectively block the neighbours behind the new build views of the lake, as well create an unwelcoming feeling to the public beach access site. Walking on the public access path, it is noteworthy, that even the north views of the Naramata Bench will be obstructed by the house, if the house is allowed to be weighted into the far north corner by allowance of this DVP.

Having a 42' – 2 Storey wall, right against the walkway does not allow for green space, which adds to rural aspect of the neighbourhood, or allow residents to feel connected to Okanagan Lake access, another key statute of RDOS, and Naramata specifically. This would be their right withing the 4.5 m allowance, however, to grant a variance that blocks three neighbours' vistas is highly problematic. Also, by placing the building so close, there will be significant shadows casted on the Public Land from the height of the proposed development.

The second story suite, pushed into the 1.5 m area adds a very urban feel into the community rather than “rural ambiance” as outlined in Naramata’s Official Community Plan. Allowance of this proposed variation will have the suite’s deck even closer to 3rd Street, and the adjacent properties backyard, reducing privacy for the owners behind the property. The extra 3 m the zoning standard not only ensures green space between the property line and residential property, but also ensures the vistas of the lake, surrounding mountains, and sight lines are maintained for all residents of Naramata.

For myself specifically, if this variance is allowed, I will lose a significant portion of lake/mountain vistas from my home and deck. The Lake Access and 4.5 m allowance offers significant views of the lake, which will be lost if this variance is granted. This will directly impact my property value and resale value, not to mention the simple enjoyment of my home, and the views it currently offers myself and family.

For these reasons above, I respectfully request the Board to deny this application, and have the applicants maintain their exciting new build within the current zoning regulations.

Kind Regards,

Lynette Bailie Farquharson

Lauri Feindell

Subject: FW: DVP application- 3180 3rd street Naramata

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

From: Loree Young Sent: August 4, 2022 10:02 PM
To: Planning <planning@rdos.bc.ca>
Subject: DVP application- 3180 3rd street Naramata

Good day. I am writing to express some concerns with the proposed variance.

1) The application mischaracterizes the property immediately to the north as an “unconstructed road” covered in mature vegetation when in fact it is public land that provides important beach access and recreational opportunities. This public land is used and enjoyed regularly by my family given its proximity to our home. We also transport various watercraft through the property to the beach, including by using wheeled carts for kayaks, SUPs etc. it is important to preserve the nature and character of this public land for all to enjoy. I suggest that a two story building close to the property line will adversely affect the public’s use and enjoyment by casting a continual shadow over the public land and by a significant reduction in privacy in this setting.

I note, coincidentally, that someone cut down a tree on this public property today -was this done with RDOS approval?

2) Safety: The proposed two storey building sitting within 1.5m of the property line and as far east as possible creates a potential safety hazard for my children and other family members as they cross from the public land east to the lane behind my house. Their sight line to (and ability to hear) cars emerging from the property would arguably be more obstructed by a two story building very close to the property line and close to 3rd Avenue.

3) Privacy: if I understand the plans correctly the applicants propose a balcony on the second story of the east side of the building. This balcony would be oriented to look directly into my backyard where my children play, which I consider to be an unnecessary invasion of privacy in the rural setting in which we live.

4) Building a two storey structure within 1.5m of the property line will negatively affect my lake view and therefore my use and enjoyment of my property.

I. Young

Lauri Feindell

Subject: FW: Information for DVP app and bylaw enforcement
Attachments: Feedback Form.RDOS^.docx

From: Lynette Bailie
Sent: August 4, 2022 9:26 PM
To: Danielle DeVries <ddevries@rdos.bc.ca>
Subject: Re: Information for DVP app and bylaw enforcement

Good Evening Danielle,

Thank you so much for answering all my questions with the variety of items I brought forward.

Attached I respectfully submit my feedback for the proposed DVP.

I noticed today, there was a private tree company that came in and removed/cut down trees on the RDOS Beach Access, which butted up against this property. May I ask if that was planned or known about?

I hope you have a lovely weekend, and look forward to hearing from you regarding the next steps in this process.

Best regards,
Lynette