

Eva Durance

Penticton, BC V2A 8Z6

October 20, 2021

To: Regional District Corporate Board and Development Services

Re application F2021.008.ZONE to rezone lands at 625 Highway 97, between Fitzpatrick Winery and Okanagan Lake Provincial Park, from Tourism Commercial (CT) to Medium Density Residential (MDR) to allow for construction of 106 housing units

I live on the West Bench. While the above proposal does not directly affect my property or way of life, it most certainly will affect the overall quality of life for all residents of our area. In this day and age, the construction of large residential developments in rural areas where residents must drive to access the basic services they require is simply adding to the climate change crisis. Emissions from cars and trucks constitute a very high percentage of the total annual totals - 50% in the Interior – and this continues to increase every year.

Have we not learned anything even at the local level from this summer's heat dome and wildfires, never mind similar events of the past two decades? In fact, the Greata Ranch itself was threatened by a wildfire a couple of years ago; a large residential development will only add to the increasing number of interface areas needing protection in the case of a wildfire, protection for which we all pay. The old adage very clearly applies to this proposal, that is, the definition of insanity is to do the same thing over and over and expect a different result. Or, in this case, it would seem, not genuinely take account of the result!

The proposed residential development does not mesh with Smart Growth Principles, the Provincial *Green Communities Legislation*, the intent of the Regional Growth Strategy, nor the RDOS Community Climate Action Plan.

To illustrate one need only look at the Regional Growth Strategy (2020). A quote from the Local Government Act clearly shows how the proposal contradicts even the extremely general mandate laid out there for an RGS: “The *Local Government Act (LGA)* establishes the purpose of a Regional Growth Strategy (RGS): “*to promote human settlement that is socially, economically and environmentally healthy and that makes efficient use of public facilities and services, land and other resources.*” The RGS itself reiterates much of this intent in stating that its underlying principles are to “holistically. . . promote human settlement that is socially, economically and environmentally healthy and that makes use of public facilities and services.

The proposed development is most certainly not environmentally healthy. I suspect it isn't socially healthy either given that it would be isolated from any genuine community. Economically, it will most certainly be profitable to the proponents, but it's hard to see how it would help the economy of the area given its isolation and upscale nature; social housing this ain't! As well, it clearly will not be making use of existing public facilities and services other than the highway and power lines.

While the Regional Growth Strategy has this area as a Rural Development Node, the former as well as the OCP and the current zoning give much greater support to activities there such as a winery operation and/ or camping. Both are much more appropriate for a rural area than housing on this scale.

*Green Communities Legislation* sets targets to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and direct development into urban centres. The proposed development makes a mockery of such targets. Smart Growth principals also strongly discourage such rural sprawl.

Aside from the above negative effects and issues, the proximity of the proposed development to a Provincial Park increases its undesirable characteristics. The wildlife that is protected in the Park would be disturbed even more than they are at present, which is mainly during the camping season. There would be greatly increased numbers of people using the Park all year round including, undoubtedly, to exercise their dogs, on, or more often, off, a leash.

There are many additional issues of concern regarding this proposal, water and sewage being only two. Reports addressing these matters raise serious concerns about how they will be dealt with in the long term. The overall view is that the systems would become the property of the RDOS and/or Summerland, again adding to what has been called the 'leapfrog' effect of such rural developments and additional costs to local government.

The proposal should be dismissed on the grounds of the numerous negative environmental effects, lack of adherence to basic principles laid out in the above-noted legislation and strategies, in particular those relating to climate change mitigation, the likely long-term fiscal effects, and for the message it sends regarding regional government's commitment to these principles and strategies.

Thank you for considering my concerns.

Eva Durance