



# Feedback Form

**Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen**

**OKANAGAN  
SIMILKAMEEN**

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

**TO:** Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen **FILE NO.:** E2022.010-DVP

**FROM:** Name: Cindy Burnett  
(please print)

Street Address: 2580 Winifred Rd, Naramata

**RE: Development Variance Permit (DVP) Application  
2573 Workman Place, Electoral Area "E"**

My comments / concerns are:

- I do support the proposed variances at 2573 Workman Place.
- I do support the proposed variances at 2573 Workman Place, subject to the comments listed below.
- I do not support the proposed variances at 2573 Workman Place.

All written submissions will be considered by the Regional District Board

*As a directly affected neighbor, we are opposed to the significant reduction to the west setback of this property bordering the KVR. The KVR is a major resource for Naramata and the present setbacks protect the trail and maintain the rural feel of the KVR as it runs through our community. To allow structures to butt almost right up to KVR land forever challenges the preservation of this important regional amenity and sets a dangerous precedent for all future construction in this, and future neighborhoods that border the KVR. Small variances required during construction are understandable but a variance request of over 25 ft. on a relatively small property is excessive. This type of encroachment was never contemplated in the development plan for this neighborhood, nor is it in keeping with the character of the rural community or the region's vision for the KVR.*

Feedback Forms must be submitted to the RDOS office prior to the Board meeting upon which this DVP application is considered.

All representations will be made public when they are included in the Board Agenda.

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.

## Nikita Kheterpal

---

**From:** Info E-Box  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 24, 2022 2:37 PM  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** FW: DVP Application E2022.010-DVP

---

**From:** Robert Ehman <bobehman@icloud.com>  
**Sent:** March 24, 2022 2:34 PM  
**To:** Nikita Kheterpal <nkheterpal@rdos.bc.ca>  
**Cc:** Info E-Box <info@rdos.bc.ca>  
**Subject:** DVP Application E2022.010-DVP

Good Afternoon Nikita Kheterpal and Karla Kozakevich

I am writing with concerns over the DVP Application E2022.010-DVP and the supporting rationale. Please advise if there is a different submission process other than forwarding to you.

After viewing the site it appears there is already a very large retaining wall system that takes up most of the rear yard area already -see photo attached, this is not shown on the applicants site map. This construction significantly raises the yard and would further raise this proposed deck height significantly off the ground. The applicant indicates he plans to build a "portable wooden deck". Given the height of the deck off the ground I suspect it would need engineering for supports and railings and not be 'portable' at all.

He further proposes to have a rear setback reduced from 10.5 to 2.47. This reduction provides a significant impact to neighbours below and the users of the KVR. The KVR is a local treasure and having a pool deck built right to its boundary would erode the beauty of the KVR. Has the RDOS consulted with other stakeholders of the KVR? The noise of the pool deck would also travel to users and other neighbours below. Pool decks also tend to create significantly more noise than other decks. The size and height of proposed pool deck will also infringe on the privacy of residents down slope more than adjacent lot mentioned in application.

The drainage pond was there long before the current property was being built and he should work with the developer to look for solutions if he considers it an eyesore.

I am not sure how cost is really a relevant issue as there is already a very large area created with large concrete retaining walls and fill. This seems like an attempt to enlarge and create a pool deck area above that which has already been built and presumably approved.

The suggestion that it would minimize erosion is also hard to understand. The land now appears to have a large raised backyard created with retaining walls to flatten the site and a daylight drainage pipe exiting near the rear and aimed towards the KVR just below. This area has been fraught with drainage issues in the past and collecting the water from the proposed deck and draining below would create a funnel effect similar to the area already constructed. Drainage should be managed on site and slopes should absorb water rather than allowing it to flow freely over top to the trail below.

Finally and most concerning I would suggest that allowing the removal of rear and side setbacks would create a very concerning precedent as others look to build on the hillside above the KVR affecting the use, enjoyment and water drainage of users and residents below. This is not an application for a couple of centimeters or inches but an extension and the effective elimination of the setback of over 8 metres to the rear and 3 metres to the side.

Bob Ehman  
Winifred RD resident



## Nikita Kheterpal

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 24, 2022 12:56 PM  
**To:** Nikita Kheterpal  
**Subject:** Variance Request 2573 Workman Place

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

Nikita,  
Re: Variance Request by Developers of Lot 2, Workman Place.

**We are not in favour of permitting the west side variance.**

A variance to provide deck construction would be quite unsightly from our property in particular and from the KVR in general.

Secondly, we do not wish to set a precedent of giving this and other developments the green light to enlarge their building footprints that would negatively impact the natural beauty of the KVR.

Also, as the property does back directly onto the KVR trail, we would like to see consideration given to requiring native seeding and/or plantings to cover the bare slopes.

Regards  
Susan and Steve Jasper





March 28, 2022

RDOS

Re: Development Variance Permit (DVP) No. E2022.010-DVP  
2573 Workman Place (Lot 2, Plan EPP71589, District Lot 207, SDYD)

I writing to the RDOS on this above-noted DVP application. I have reviewed the application information and wish to provide the following comments on the proposal.

The proposal requests substantial variations to both the required rear-yard and side-yard setbacks.

The design of the home and the location of the pool occupies the buildable footprint, to the full extreme of all the required setbacks, and did not take into consideration that access to their rear yard would be limited, particularly because of the location of the pool.

As a result, the applicant now seeks to remedy their design error by requesting a side yard setback to allow for access around the perimeter of their pool and further extend the proposed deck into the required rear yard significantly. As for the applicants' concern regarding the visual impact of the adjacent public parcel containing the overflow pond, the original design of the house and pool should have taken this into consideration.

As a nearby neighbour, noting that these required rear- and side-yard setback areas generally serve to provide privacy between private and public properties, as well as opportunities for soft landscape areas, they also serve to be part of the visual amenity of the neighbourhood and area. In addition, the requested setback variances for the proposed deck also affect the public views from the KVR pathway by creating a visual impact of overbuilding and oversight from/to the public pathway.

My suggestion is to minimize the impact on the neighbourhood and public areas, the requested rear yard variance by reducing it to a maximum of 6.5 M allowing for a maximum of 4 M of deck space within the rear yard setback. The lower portion of the deck should be screened and adequate landscaping should be provided between the deck and the remaining rear and side yards.

Thank you,

Neighbour  
Workman Place



Re: Development Variance Permit (DVP) No. E2022.010-DVP  
2573 Workman Place (Lot 2, Plan EPP71589, District Lot 207, SDYD)



Deck as per application



Reduced depth of deck into rear yard