

From: Ivor Norlin [REDACTED]

Date: June 27, 2021 at 9:59:47 PM PDT

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: June 28, 2021 Agenda Item 22.1 - development variance application

Hi Erin,

The above noted development variance application on the agenda for council tomorrow is for a development to the east of our home at 1210 16th Street NE. It appears that two of the requests may have direct implications for building along our property line:

1) Raising allowable building height: the package uses the terms '4 plex' and 'townhouse', so I am not certain if this variance is for the 3 story buildings along our property at the top of the proposed retaining wall. If they are requesting to allow these building to be higher, then I ask council to consider how privacy of neighbouring properties is a consideration/principle for this zoning. These homes will be looking down into our yards; any additional height will make it all the more difficult for us to adjust and manage site lines.

2) Raising allowable retaining wall height: I believe the application states that this wall will be professionally engineered, which I presume is necessary for safety. What is not clear from the package is what protections are required at the top of the wall to prevent materials (or people) from falling off into our property. I presume that if a wall is higher the requirements for the solid and secure barrier along the top will need to be enhanced as well.

Hopefully this is clear. I can try to attend the meeting and ask directly if that would help. I'd need to know when approximately the item will be heard so I could work around my schedule.

Thank you Erin.

J. Ivor Norlin

[REDACTED]

Salmon Arm, BC

[REDACTED]

From: Rod Keetch
Sent: Monday, June 28, 2021 8:01 AM
To: Caylee Simmons
Subject: DP 431 - Comments for City and council consideration.

To City and Council,

My name is Rod Keetch, and I am the owner and resident, along with my family at 1760, 11th Ave NE in Salmon Arm. I am a neighbour that lives across the street from this subject development permit. I wrote a letter in support of the re-zoning of this property when it went to council last year. I encouraged the thoughtful and considerate development of this parcel. Attached are my comments and opinion I wish to have registered on the proposed bylaw variance.

I don't see this proposed development as thoughtful, considerate, or really a benefit to Salmon Arm, to the extent it could be. It appears sub-standard compared to other recent developments of this size in these times. The failure to address any possible environmental impacts, or bring any green building and development principles is completely unacceptable as we are facing a man made global climate crisis that our Federal and Provincial governments recognize.

My concerns are similar to those raised by the design review panel,

- The size and location of the retaining wall. The lots below have already undercut the existing hill, and the wall has the potential to be much taller for the entire length of the western property line, extending the maximum height as far as 11th Ave
- Green space - there is very little room for it in the new development, and some of that space is proposed to be held in a covenant for future road development
- Preservation of the tree cover - There are a lot of mature trees that make up a really nice tree canopy here, they are proposed to be replaced with 19 trees that will be starting from only a few years old, and will never be able to reach the same level of maturity in this development.
- Impervious surfaces - The site currently has a maintained natural drainage pattern that includes a culvert under 11th Ave that delivers water in extreme storm events. I assume that this development will interrupt that, and likely remove a large amount of rainfall from entering the groundwater, instead being sent to the stormwater system.
- Wildlife that typically use this property including deer, pheasants, and the occasional bear will be forced onto the road, instead of having a greenspace corridor to use.
- Fencing - the fencing shown in the plans is not characteristic this neighbourhood, and installing it during initial construction is unneeded, and will increase the impact of the retaining wall
- The housing designs are not characteristic of the current neighbourhood.

I take a differing view of the comments of the planning department's recommendations.

- With the exception of some minor elements found at Copperview Court, and a peaked roof as seen in the properties being built out to the west, I was unable to find any existing construction buildings that are complementary to the style that is proposed here. I have

specifically scouted the area attempting to identify such recent construction, and I am having a very difficult time identifying any recent area developments that this plan is complementary too. Are they able to provide any specific area examples?

- I also don't understand how landscaping(will lessen the visual impact of a this unnecessarily tall retaining structure (liability)) if there is a fence at the top of the wall that will obscure the landscaping. The comments on screening from planning fail to address the massive amount of fencing that is proposed to be used so heavily in this development, including being shown at the top of the retaining walls. The fencing is not characteristic of the neighbourhood.
- The report comments fail to acknowledge that there is a good possibility that the wall will extend to a height of 5-6 blocks tall at the SW corner of the lot where it will have a far greater visual impact on 11th AVE, as this area has been undercut, almost as if it is already planned to extend whatever wall height allowance is made, across the entire west side of the property. This reality isn't represented in the drawings or the comments. I would like to know why this comment was not included in the report, as the SW corner of the lot has been undercut for more than a year, and there should have been adequate time to incorporate that information into the DP comments somewhere.

Generally this proposed development does not fit in here as this neighbourhood exists today. It isn't imaginative, or a creative use of space, and it certainly doesn't add anything to the neighbourhood, other than a lot of unnecessary water to the storm system, a lot of fencing, and some dollars to the tax money the city sees. It unfortunately detracts from what Salmon arm is known and loved for. The complete clearcutting of the mature stand of trees will impact the feeling of the neighbourhood to every surrounding property and visitors, and will have significant impacts on the view from each adjacent property in a significant way as well as having unknown impacts to the environment and biodiversity in the immediate area. Also this neighbourhood is planned in the OCP as a pedestrian accessed tourist/commercial area, and the development of this property will have lasting impacts on how these tourist/pedestrians experience our town. Right now, this stretch of sidewalk is either a pleasant walk that opens to an incredible view of the lake, or it is a relatively steep climb, with the opportunity to get some shade in the late afternoon (the bus stop gets some of that shade too). This development will significantly limit the view, remove the existing natural appeal and shade of the mature tree stand, and crowd the sidewalk with buildings and fencing.

If we are to lose so much from the appeal of our city, and potentially impacting the environment and the future planned use of this area, shouldn't we be doing our due diligence on the environmental front, and shouldn't we be getting paid? Why are we handing out variances to allow this property to be developed beyond current zoning, if they aren't doing all they can to bring financial prosperity to city coffers. There is no excuse for the developer not to come to the table with a development that has the allowable 34 units. The long term loss of money in tax income on these additional 4 units that the city would not be capitalizing on should not be ignored. This is a strata development, that means all internal infrastructure and connections will not be the concern or cost of the city, nor will any of the onsite infrastructure. For a tiny surplus on the services of the city infrastructure, we could tax an additional 4 properties, FOREVER.

I encourage the rejection of the development permit by the council until ONE of the below three conditions are met.

1. The developer works within the rules that everyone knows they can, and as laid out in the zoning bylaws and doesn't require variances for this boring, unimaginative, environmentally destructive development
2. The developer brings a more imaginative development that embraces something that is unique about our city, perhaps boasting the retention of some portion of the current mature and established site, or embracing a truly green approach to development and construction/building practices, and an attempt to fit the existing character of the neighbourhood while developing the property and thinking about our future.
3. Bring the MAXIMUM number of allowable units (34) to the property, so that we can prosper financially as a community from the taxes in the long term while selling out other important moral or environmental principles.

If we don't meet at least one of the above conditions, we are selling this city short without maximizing any of our benefits, or finding a good balance of them either. This development as proposed will significantly detract from the experience of pedestrian tourists that the area is planned for, as well as the existing neighbours that currently fill the neighbourhood. This is too much of a long term cost to the neighbourhood, environment and proposed use of the area. While the concept presented is cute and surely profitable for someone, it does nothing to build our neighbourhood, our community, our tourist appeal, the future planned use of the area, or retain any environmental integrity.

There is no absolute need to make these variances associated with this development permit. With some imagination, and planning, I'm sure anything could be achieved by the developers planning and design team. This appears to be easy money for a developer, at the cost of what makes Salmon Arm so appealing to everyone else. There is no 'marketability' argument that we should consider from private entities. It is up to the council to build the city, and if we allow a development like this to drag down the standard, the city should get compensated to the greatest extent. If we are satisfied that we want to sell that reputation, and shift the needle, then lets make it worth it financially in the long term. No excuse not to capitalize as much as possible on this property's sub-area-standard development as proposed. Lets hold this city to a higher standard and make the best of this development instead of accepting this mediocre proposal.

thank you for your time and consideration. in this matter

Sincerely,
Rod Keetch