

Dear Council

We have reviewed the proposed rezoning of 2621 - 17th St NE from R-1 Single Family to R-8 Residential Suite.

We are fully aware of the need for secondary suites in Salmon Arm and in general, support the rezoning of this property to R-8.

However, if we are understanding the bylaws correctly (Section 13.5), wouldn't it be prohibited to construct a detached suite given there is already an existing secondary suite within the main home? Are there provisions in place to ensure the existing suite is removed prior to approval of the building of a new detached suite? Given we share a private roadway (easement), we do have some liability and safety concerns (children and pets) with a potential increase in traffic across our property, especially if there is more than one rental suite.

Further, if the proposed detached suite does go ahead, can you confirm that a full geotechnical assessment would be required? As you have suggested in your letter from Oct 27 2021, the parcel is identified as a Potentially Hazardous Area and has close proximity to Cress Creek. Given the recent slides and instability in the area, we want to ensure that any new construction would be deemed safe, as changes to the neighbouring landscape could potentially have an impact on existing structures, including our home.

Sincerely

Darren and Susan Lorenz
2640 17th St NE
Salmon Arm BC
V1E 3X5

Mayor and Council

Re. Rezoning application 1222 and public hearing at 7 PM Nov. 22, 2021
Reference ZON-1222/Bylaw 4483

We have reviewed the rezoning application for carriage house and online documentation available. Our comments and concerns are set out below.

We do not oppose R8 zoning or normal secondary suites in Salmon Arm. The concern here is **we have reason to believe the applicant already added a secondary suite to the existing property** during latest major renovations. Before garage doors were installed, it appeared a significant portion of the garage was framed in to be part of a suite. This with other indications including traffic and the number of cars lead us to believe a secondary suite already exists at this property.

City staff already know, or should know a secondary suite already exists. The applicant constructed that suite for a reason so already has maximum benefits allowed by R8 zoning. Whether the suite was built for family or rental income, they already have that. Decommissioning a viable suite seems counterproductive and easily reversed leading to high probability of 3 residences at some point in time. R8 zoning only allows one secondary suite.

SECTION 13 - R-8 - RESIDENTIAL SUITE ZONE #3996

Purpose

13.1 The purpose of the R-8 Zone is to permit the use of a secondary suite contained within a single family dwelling or a detached suite contained within an accessory building.

Regulations

*13.2 On a parcel zoned R-8, **no building or structure shall be constructed, located or altered and no plan of subdivision approved which contravenes the regulations set out in the R-8 Zone or those regulations contained elsewhere in this Bylaw.***

Maximum Number of Secondary Suites

*13.5 **One (1) secondary suite or one (1) detached suite is permitted per parcel***

Since a secondary suite exists - whether “not rented”, “unused”, “future” or “an in-law suite”, it exists and is the one and only suite permitted. Sec. 13.2 states “**...no building or structure shall be constructed....**”. There are other considerations including access to further support leaving property as is.

The logical compromise is to approve R-8 zoning (to allow for compliance “as is”) but expressly prohibit construction of any carriage house for reasons set out above.

Roy and Bonnie Peterson
2670 17th St. NE