

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: June 25 Council Consideration (Development of 6446 Renfrew Road)
Date: June 21, 2024 10:45:07 AM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [why this is important](#)

[REDACTED]
6457 Bulyea Avenue
Peachland BC

I am writing this based on the information available as of June 20 (the meeting agenda with details has not yet been posted on the District website). Some of the issues I mention may be addressed in the details of that proposal. I will assume the engineers/planners have already worked out that the basic infrastructure (sewer, water, roads, traffic, sidewalks, fire safety/emergency evacuation, etc.) have been evaluated and meet requirements.

Development of this parcel is inevitable. Peachland is growing, and we can't think a (mostly) gently sloped parcel with a great lake view will remain undeveloped. However, the southern section of the parcel also contains one of the few remaining natural (dry creek bed) environments in the District and borders parkland and the Elizabeth Warrendorf Trail.

The District website states, "During the course of finding history on Mrs. Warrendorf in our community, many recalled her as the "environmental conscience." Councillor Warrendorf was always interested in the implications council decisions would have on the environment, wildlife, and nature."

Therefore, it seems only fitting that the present Council give careful consideration to the natural environment currently existing in the ravine that runs through the property bearing her name. This not only includes protection of the living things that depend on this environment but also the unique topography. I encourage councillors to take a brief walk on the trail before the June 25 meeting and see it firsthand.

The site zoning is designated as both a terrestrial, and aquatic environmentally sensitive area (as defined by the OCP) and these designations require special permitting applications. Not just our ubiquitous deer are present, other visitors to use this natural corridor I have seen (or have been recorded) include moose, mountain lion, Black Bear, Pileated Woodpecker, Northern Pygmy Owl, Great Horned Owl, American Kestrel, Turkey Vulture, Bald Eagle, several species of hawk, weasels, Great Basin Gopher Snake, and many more including a species of toad/frog I cannot identify. The ravine is only a short distance away from Hardy Falls/Deep Creek Park.

The property is under the District's hillside development guidelines and the edge of the ravine

on the property is very well-defined. According to slope map 4 in the OCP, this edge consists largely of slopes (particularly on the upper/western edge) in the 20 to 30% range. Please be reminded that the OCP states on page 154 that the District (as represented by the current council) is committed to:

1. Protect in perpetuity natural features including rock outcroppings, ridgelines gulleys, ravines, escarpments, columns, cliff faces and talus slopes through registration of a covenant, park dedication or other means as approved by the District
2. Preserve the natural quality of ridgelines by avoiding significant changes to natural elevations along the length of the ridgeline. (page 154)

Given the topography, existing environmental protections, and the history behind this area, it would be extremely short-sighted to not use this opportunity to preserve this slice of nature and ask the developer to set aside (as is often done with larger development/subdivision in the District) 10% of the parcel to protect this natural environment. Any degradation of the existing ridgeline would also fly in the face of the OCP's intent. The ravine is also the least attractive and most difficult area to build from the developer's viewpoint, so it only makes sense to demand some concessions for this particular section of the parcel as part of the approval process.

Consideration of the existing resident's view is also critical as the rezoning is for RM3, which allows for a maximum height of 11 meters (versus the single detached dwelling height of 9.1 m in the existing RR1 zone). The flyer I received states a "ground-orientated" development, although I cannot find this language anywhere in the OCP.

I ask Council to please be explicit and exact when it comes to the allowable height for structures, and carefully consider the sight lines of existing residents. It is my understanding that site-specific height (and other setback restrictions) can be added, regardless of limits allowed by the zoning. RM3 setback restrictions are also slightly more generous than the current RR1 zoning and allow for an extra 1.5 meters in the front, and exterior side borders.

No view is guaranteed in perpetuity, but we can't change what is already there, so incorporating limits on the height/design of any new development is critical. Rooftop patios for example would be outrageous in my mind; no one else in the area has one, the noise drifts in every direction, and people like to erect all kinds of structures (sun shades, gazebos, etc.) on them and further limit sight lines.

To summarize, preservation of a unique natural environment and incorporating the layout, height, and design of the project/structures with the natural topography and existing resident's enjoyment of their property are the issues I ask Council to carefully consider.

Regards,



Resident/Owner
6457 Bulyea Avenue