

December 6, 2023

Re: Bylaw #2940 & 2941

To Whom It May Concern:

I'm writing to express my concern regarding the rezoning and potential development of the property at 150 Crossridge Road, Enderby, BC. My property is located at 142 Crossridge Road, directly adjacent to the subject property. My concerns are as follows:

1. Water consumption: My well is a significant concern in regard to the potential for loss of quantity of water should an additional 15 wells be drilled in the area adjacent to mine. Many of my neighbors have had significant issues with running out of water and this is an ongoing concern that mine will eventually run dry as well with just the current wells already existing in the area.
 - As per the local government act, Part 14, #458, it appears I have no recourse if the quantity of my well is significantly reduced with the drilling of these additional wells. I do not possess the funds to drill a new well if this occurs.
 - I also have a clause on my property title that the selling of water from the residence is prohibited, if the rezoning and development is considered, I would like the consideration for this to be a requirement on those properties as well.
2. New road construction:
 - With the construction of a new road, what are the stipulations for ensuring I will still have access to my property?
 - My driveway is on a slope, if the road construction requires digging into that hillside to construct it, what assurance do I have or what measures are required to ensure that slope stability into the future? Currently it is a natural, grassed slope; without the root system there and potential destabilization, there is no retaining wall currently there and I surely can't afford to construct one.
3. Emergency safety:
 - It was discussed at the public hearing that a secondary access would be installed to Helmcken Road but would be kept locked, what is the safety plan in the event of a forest fire or other neighborhood emergency to ensure that access is maintained in all seasons and to ensure it is promptly unlocked when access is needed?
 - To note: Our road is often not plowed after a snowfall for a few days and the road can become treacherous so increasing traffic substantially on the road will create a greater hazard for all residents.
 - A second main access to these residences should be mandatory in my opinion so there are 2 ways in and out.
4. Blasting:
 - This property is located directly beside Baird gravel pits where they conduct regular blasting that is felt throughout the entire area including in our homes. Is

there a risk of general slope instability in the area due to excessive digging, further blasting and erosion of the rock hillside that is currently in place?

- There is a clause on my property that no foundation can be built above a certain point of the rock hillside to maintain slope stabilization on my property, and I hope that is taken into consideration if these properties are subdivided and developed.

5. Run-off:

- During significant rainstorms and being on a hillside, the run-off can become excessive at times with rivers running down the hillside and driveway (path of least resistance). Again, if the development is given approval, I hope accounting for that is mandatory.

Based on the Local Government Act and the fact that my property is at significant risk for numerous complications directly related to this rezoning and development, along with the potential safety risks for myself and my family, I express that I'm 100% **NOT IN FAVOR** of this rezoning or development.

Sincerely,

Rachel Jordan

142 Crossridge Road

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Archived: Friday, January 5, 2024 3:05:34 PM

From: [Elaine Spearing](#)

Sent: Thursday, December 7, 2023 10:42:46 AM

To: [RDNO Public Hearing](#)

Subject: Public hearing OCP ammendment 7 December 2023

Sensitivity: Normal

*** External Email - Use Caution***

Regarding:

Electoral Area "F" Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 2940 which proposes to amend the Electoral Area "F" Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 2702, 2016 by changing the land use designation of the property legally described as The E ½ of the SE ¼ of Sec 10, Twp 19, R9, W6M, KDYD and located at 150 Crossridge Road, Electoral Area "F" from Non-Urban to Country Residential. Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 2941 proposes to rezone the same property from the Non-Urban (N.U) zone to the Country Residential (C.R) zone.

I object to the re-zoning as I do not think the housing proposed in this development outweighs the need for SMART GROWTH in the RDNO

I consider the re-zoning is not compatible with the RDNO Growth Strategy.

The [North Okanagan Regional Growth Strategy Bylaw No. 2500 \(Consolidated\)](#) was adopted by the RDNO Board of Directors on September 21, 2011.

A backgrounder on "Compact, Complete, communities" states

"Increased density in our communities is necessary to support public transit, reduce the costs of utilities, infrastructure and roads, provide a diversity of housing, options and allows for travel by foot and bicycle. Focusing development within our communities also reduces development pressure on our rural areas, allowing us to preserve agricultural, resource and low density rural residential lands. By concentrating growth in areas that are already serviced by water and sewer services, municipalities can reduce costs while diversifying and growing their economy .

Compact development in existing developed areas protect important values located outside of our communities, including ecologically sensitive areas, drinking water sources, and farm and forest lands.

The costs of sprawl include higher costs for public infrastructure, more vehicle miles traveled, less cost-efficient transit, and a variety of negative quality of life impacts.

- Sprawling development consumes agricultural lands, our hillsides, as well as environmentally sensitive areas.

- Sprawl forces an almost total reliance on the automobile when getting around our communities, increasing levels of obesity and associated health issues, as well as increasing greenhouse gas emissions.

The RGS may focus on the protection of our rural and agricultural lands from low, density, sprawling development by:

- directing development to existing communities and protecting rural lands by avoiding sprawl,
- promoting higher density infill and mixed use development,
- encouraging development to take place where adequate services and infrastructure exist"

In a backgrounder on Transportation, the following is stated:

"The Regional Growth Strategy (RGS) is looking at focusing development within our existing communities, reducing the cost of transportation, water and sewer infrastructure. As well, 'nodal' or compact development increased mobility for those who cannot drive or prefer not to drive. It is also important for the RGS to minimizing traffic congestion, by making other transportation choices other than the use of a car more viable. Higher average densities within our communities support more frequent transit service and better active transportation options. Residents who live near where they work, shop, or take part in other activities often can choose to use active transportation, transit and carpooling.

Land use patterns affect the costs of providing public infrastructure such as roads, water and sewer.

Various studies show that these costs tend to increase with sprawl, and can be reduced with compact developments within existing communities. More accurate pricing that recovers the cost of infrastructure can result in significantly more efficient land use, providing overall benefits to residents"

Elaine Spearing
Area F resident

138 West Enderby Rd
Enderby BC
V0E 1V1

Archived: Friday, January 5, 2024 3:17:45 PM

From: [Leslie Bowness](#)

Sent: Wednesday, January 3, 2024 7:17:44 PM

To: [Danica Kimberley](#)

Subject: Letter of concern re: Bylaw #2940 & 2941

Sensitivity: Normal

*** External Email - Use Caution***

RE: BYLAW #2940 & 2941

To Whom It May Concern:

I'm writing to express my concern regarding the rezoning and potential development of the property at 150 Crossridge Road, Enderby, BC. My property is located at 133 Crossridge Road.

My concern is as follows:

Water consumption: My well is a significant concern in regard to the potential for loss of quantity of water should an additional 15 wells be drilled in the area. Many of my neighbors have had significant issues with running out of water and this is an ongoing concern that mine will eventually run dry as well, with just the current wells already existing in the area, never mind with an additional 15.

- As per the local government act, Part 14, #458, it appears I have no recourse if the quantity of my well is significantly reduced with the drilling of these additional wells. I do not possess the funds to drill a new well if this occurs.
- If the rezoning and development is considered, I would like the consideration for selling of water from any of the residences on the properties to be prohibited.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,
Leslie Bowness
133 Crossridge Road
Enderby, BC
V0E 1V3

Sent from my iPad

From: Maryanne Jespersen and Ross McCulloch (owners/residents)
134 Crossridge Road, Enderby

As neighbouring residents to this proposed development we are in opposition to the application to Amendment Bylaw 2940 concerning the property located at 150 Crossridge Road.

We have listened to the property owner's proposal via an onsite tour and also at an initial public meeting in November, 2022. At these meetings the owner described his vision for the property and development and while it may sound great to them and financially a good investment for them, it is not realistic in scope as proposed with regard to a safe, sustainable and environmentally responsible addition to the area.

We have read all the reports submitted regarding geotechnical, hydrology, septic and forestry etc., and have many concerns contained within all these.

1. Fletcher Paine Geotechnical report:

Safety concerns to land stability in that there are several areas of oversteep gradients where no building should take place below or above.

This report also states that all their recommendations contained in sections 6-8 of their report be followed. If approval is given by you how can we be confident that all these recommendations would be strictly adhered to at all stages of development? If they are not who is going to be held to account for damages?

2. Ecoscape Environmental Hydrology report:

Perhaps of greatest concern and opposition is the effect on the area regarding water.

The report although appearing complete leaves much concern. It states that, they conducted a reconnaissance of the site and nearby surrounding area. We dispute that, in that they never came to our property nor have we heard of them going to any other neighbour's properties.

They state that from a table of "neighbouring well logs" the average well produces 4.9 USGPM. Sounds ok but not encouraging. But if you calculate the median yield of these wells it is only **2.5 USGPM**, which by volume is very little over the minimum legally required by the District. That is a more realistic number to talk about in real world terms than taking an average that includes the odd

well producing a high 20 gallons per min when all the rest are way under that. And these numbers are from well logs dating back over the last 30 years and we all know that water availability now is so much less than then.

This report states that there is not a BC ENV observation well near this site so no seasonal water level variation data is available. We submit that there is a complete consensus of neighbouring properties that our well yields are already decreasing substantially.

The report states that this area is located within Climate and Biogeoclimatic zones that have a significant soil moisture deficit.

Their recommendations include the phased development of no more than 8 lots initially with water level loggers installed on “select” wells for 1-2 years to monitor ground water level fluctuations. We submit that if the development was to be approved that well level loggers must be installed on all wells on site and also on surrounding neighbour’s wells and for a time not less than 10 years to appreciate the negative impact to ground water level here and in respect of allowing any future increase in developed lots after that time.

3. Landmark Solutions Wildfire Hazard Assessment report.

Their report states that once again moisture deficits here are common, and that The Provincial Strategic Threat Analysis for the general vicinity is 7-10 which is high to extreme. The report contains recommendations that trees have at least 1 crown width spacing and within 30 metres of a residence 3 crown widths spacing.

The owner expressed to us at the meetings that they wanted to keep the landscape natural and untouched for the development. So here is a complete contradiction of conditions, what will we have, no developed lots going on the site and trees left natural or sites going in with trees being thinned as recommended? And again who monitors this requirement and ensures it is followed and complied with?

Wildfire danger is obviously catastrophic when it happens, not if it happens, and we are very concerned by this risk. Their report echos the threat of human caused wildfire danger via the extreme risk from the human activity along a very busy Highway 97A and then rushing up the slope to the development directly above it. It is commonly acknowledged that the vast majority of wildfires at this time are human caused.

We would like to remind you that 20 years ago a similar development in scale and numbers was proposed to a property at 370 Glenmary Road. That property is only 300 metres west of this property at 150 Crossridge Road with correspondingly very similar terrain, vegetation, and water availability. The District did not approve that development then (we believe correctly) and given the worsening conditions since that time nor should approval be given to this development.

If the proposed development was to be approved by the District then we could only be in support if:

1. The development is constructed in phases, with both primary and secondary access roads in place and up to MOTI standards before any lot construction is undertaken.
2. The first phase of building is no more than 8 lots and that all the recommendations in the professional reports not just be suggestions / recommendations but **be implemented as mandatory and legal conditions** undertaken during all phases of development set out by covenant or some other legally binding means.
3. On completion of the initial phase all data gathered over 10 years regarding the water well level loggers installed on newly constructed wells and neighbouring existing wells be examined by professionals and deemed satisfactory to further phases in the development.
4. As per comments from the Protective Services Department, a system for collection and water storage should be in place for wildfire structural protection.

Sincerely,

Maryanne Jespersen and Ross McCulloch