



July 8, 2019

Tracy Van de Wiel, Kris Belanger
Planning & Development
Regional District of East Kootenay

Dear Tracy and Kris:

RE: LWOCP Policy 5.3(3)(d)

The Windermere Community Association(WCA) has reviewed the LWOCP Draft and are very concerned about the above Policy - 5.3(3)(d).

RDEK hosted numerous public input options regarding storage, LI storage and rezoning of existing Residential and Commercial land as well as working towards completing an OCP that reflects the members of our community. At these meeting, which were well attended, the public voiced their concerns regarding storage units along our main corridors leading into the community and along the highway. The indication is that they do not wish any further development of this type in our community and suggested it be developed in industrial areas that are not visible both from the main corridors and residential homes.

We were given the impression that mini-storage, boat and RV storage would be removed for the list of permitted uses in the C-2, Service Commercial zone and now we see a new policy has be added that exempts this requirement. Why would this have changed? You have heard from many of the members of the community adamantly opposed to this. I believe the OCP is to protect our community from these very changes and to not disregard policy.

One of our (Windermere Community Association Board) goals for this and future years is the Beautification of our community. We have had many meetings discussing the options and needs our community requires. As well, we will be sending a proposal to the OCP of our community with our recommendations and suggestions and try and work with them to achieve these goals. A letter was sent to MOTI re our concerns with road conditions, possible walkways, better lighting and entrances into the community. We feel, because we are trying very hard to make our community the most natural, attractive, welcoming community along the highway, increasing commercial properties need to follow the guidelines of both the OCP, zoning and the bylaws.



Allowing Light Industrial or even Industrial (storage units) on C-2 or Service Commercial is contrary to public opinion.

We, as a Board that represents the membership of our community, would appreciate RDEK taking our concerns and comments seriously and consider not having any exemptions to the above Policy as per the opinions and concerns voiced by the public.

If you require further clarification, please feel free to contact me.

Windermere Community Association Board

Olga Bayliss
President

July 9, 2019

Comments Related to the Lake Windermere Official Community Plan

Thank you for reviewing the Lake Windermere OCP, and for the work involved in suggesting revisions and updates. I was pleased to see the following concepts identified as being important within the document:

- ensure the long-term sustainability and protection of District of Invermere community watershed.
- Support agriculture through the protection of agricultural resources and the promotion of opportunities for local food production, diversification and value added agricultural activities.
- Recognize the recreational and environmental importance of Lake Windermere by supporting public access opportunities and promoting environmental stewardship initiatives aimed at protecting water quality, fish and wildlife habitat and a naturally functioning shoreline.
- Maintain ecosystem functions and important natural systems and features such as riparian areas, grasslands, sensitive habitat and connectivity corridors by avoiding and mitigating development impacts in identified areas.

Reduce greenhouse gas emissions created within the plan area in order to mitigate impacts to climate change.

Section 4.1 states that “Throughout the planning process, residents and non-residents expressed a desire to see infill development or new construction adjacent to existing residential nodes. Infill housing options such as secondary suites are seen as one opportunity to potentially increase the availability of rental housing stock in the area without the need to develop and service bare land.”

Given the values in the plan that I have highlighted above and given the expressed desire of residents and non-residents to see infill development, I find it contradictory to then see the proposed further development of the westside of Lake Windermere. During the recent revisions to the Fairmont and Columbia Lake OCP the same arguments were used (residents desire to see infill development) to support increased residential development on the west side of Columbia Lake. I then questioned whether residents truly wanted to see the outcomes accredited to them and I once again ask that question – do we want to see increased urban sprawl that further stresses the landscape that we value? In the case of Columbia Lake, the protection of the east side of Columbia Lake will help temper the effects but Lake Windermere is already facing enormous developmental pressure. Can it handle more?

To truly achieve your stated goal of mitigating impacts to climate change, the eco-system must be protected and enhanced, and opportunities for local agriculture must be increased. The proposed increased human footprint on the valley bottom will not accomplish these objectives. Rather it will increase negative pressures on an already stressed ecosystem (wildlife habitats and corridors, watersheds, agricultural land use etc.). One of the most important things we can do to fight climate change is to preserve functioning, intact ecosystems and all future development should be done with zero ecosystem impact, preferably with a positive ecosystem restoration outcome.

The people of the Columbia valley are often seen as forward-thinking leaders in ecological stewardship. I believe this document, and future land use direction should reflect those aspirations and values. Now is the time to have our public policy documents reflect and support our desire, indeed our necessary imperative to protect our diverse ecosystems. Without supporting and protecting them, we are short-sightedly contributing to the factors that are accelerating the disastrous effects of climate change.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Fairmont Hot Springs, BC
VOB 1L2

**SUBMISSION TO RDEK Re: LWOCP Policy 5.3(3)(d)
July 9, 2019.**

I am submitting my concern regarding **LWOCP Policy 5.3(3)(d)** in the draft LWOCP.

Development of the LWOCP involved extensive public engagement and input as required by the RDEK. It is my understanding that the public has indicated that they are not in favor or supportive of **boat/RV/self storage facilities at the entrances to Windermere, Invermere and fronting Highway 93/95**. Storage facilities are zoned for industrial areas.

Policy 5.3(3)(d) allows yet more storage facilities at the entrance to Windermere on the parcel of land on North Street. This is contrary to public feedback. I am unaware a process that would allow for inclusion of Policy 5.5(3) d in the LWCOP. I am sure RDEK intends for transparency around decision making. Can you please provide me with the rationale and the process that allowed for inclusion of Policy 5.5(3) d.?

In the interest of the transparency and open communication I would like to formally request that this information be shared with all stakeholders who were involved in the development of the LWOCP.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Windermere, BC
V0B 2L2



Re: Comments regarding the Draft Lake Windermere OCP

July 10, 2019

Attention: Kris Belanger, Planner / Project Lead <kbelanger@rdek.bc.ca>

Cc: Susan Clovechok, RDEK Electoral Area F Director <director.clovechok@rdek.bc.ca>

The Columbia Wetlands Stewardship Partners (CWSP) is made up of a diverse group of community interests, First Nations and government agencies created to develop effective stewardship and management practices for the Columbia Wetlands and the Upper Columbia River. The partnership, acting on their vision statement, engages the general public and works with governments at all levels to implement a shared stewardship model for the management of the river and wetlands. We intend to take a positive, community and science-based approach to issues related to the contiguous wetlands ecosystem, including Lake Windermere. The formation of this group is, in effect, local people taking responsibility for a natural landscape that they care deeply about.

The Upper Columbia River and adjacent Columbia Wetlands are one of the largest intact wetlands in British Columbia and one of the largest floodplain systems in North America. The wetlands (including Lake Windermere) encompass over 26,000 hectares and are one of the few remaining intact portions of the Pacific Flyway for migrating birds. The CWSP is aware that Lake Windermere's residents recognize the significant environmental and biodiversity values in this region. For example, the number one priority of the 677 surveys received by the Columbia Valley Community Foundation's Vital Signs of 2018 was environment¹. The draft Lake Windermere Official Community Plan (OCP), states that, "[t]he goals and objectives identify the land use issues and community vision." Therefore, the CWSP believes that environmental values must be at the forefront of the Lake Windermere OCP. The OCP plan area encompasses overlapping values of high biodiversity, ecosystem services, and climate change adaptation and mitigation.

From recent breeding bird surveys, the south end of Lake Windermere appears to be a key breeding area for marsh birds such as red-necked grebe, pied-billed grebe and wood duck. In the area indicated as SL 163D in the plan area map, there are colonies of SARA (Species At Risk Act) listed bank swallows, as well as a colony of SARA listed Lewis's Woodpeckers. Through recent large-scale coordinated bird counts (Columbia Wetlands Waterbird Survey), the south end of Lake Windermere has been documented to be one of the most important staging

grounds for congregations of waterbirds in the Columbia Wetlands. For instance, 4,587 individual birds were counted during a single-day bird count lasting about one hour on September 29, 2017. In addition to the high food availability, large mixed waterbird flocks are present at the south end of Lake Windermere likely because there is less human disturbance due to limited access². Also, there is very little shoreline development and motor boats are unable to travel through the shallow waters given the high amounts of vegetative biomass; motors get clogged with aquatic plants. It is important to continue with the current habitat conditions found at the south end so that high habitat suitability for migrating birds can be maintained³. Given the documented importance of Lake Windermere as bird habitat, birds need to be strongly considered when making future land-use decisions for Lake Windermere and the riparian area. Due to the significant habitat provided to so many bird species, several of which are imperilled, the wetlands and riparian area between the Rushmere Community and Fairmont need to be protected from increased human development and activities (such as increased boating and marinas).

Furthermore, there will undoubtedly be more water shortages and droughts coming in the near future given climate change projections. There is a fair assumption that there will not be enough water in the future for current residents, far less for future developments and residents. Thus, the pace of urban/rural development should slow down unless there are some large efforts to deal with the water shortages to come.

The draft OCP takes great effort to describe Environmental Sensitive Areas, Species at Risk, Grasslands and one sensitive species – Mt. Goat, how important they are and that their presence within the OCP need to be protected and guarded. Yet when the OCP gets down to addressing how human activity and development should occur the above commitment to protect is **less than adequate**. Such terms as “development activities within or adjacent to wetlands is **discouraged**” or “compact development footprint **should be** utilized to minimize negative impact to existing grasslands”. The same weak type of wording “should be discouraged/avoided” appears as well for riparian areas, linkage corridors and even Mt. Goats concerning human encroachment and development. The point being made here is the OCP waffles in the end, placing human encroachment and development over the needs of the natural environment which has placed us with what we are experiencing today – climate change events such as drought conditions, unstable weather patterns, water shortage and the disappearance of many flora and fauna once common and abounding in this area. Increased development will threaten the status of the water quality in Lake Windermere since it is already near the threshold of becoming more nutrient rich with potential problems from algal blooms. With this in mind CWSP has the following recommendations.

Environmentally Sensitive Area's (ESA) in this OCP are listed as wetlands, riparian areas, grasslands, old growth forests, connectivity corridors, habitat for species at risk, mountain goat habitat. It is well-known that the number one threat to wildlife is habitat loss; therefore, the CWSP recommends that there should be no major developments (e.g. subdivisions) in Lake Windermere's ESAs. This will help to ensure that ecosystems and refuge are left for wildlife to persist in light of climate change, water shortages and continued human development

elsewhere. And it supports the values expressed in the surveys received by the Columbia Valley Community Foundation's Vital Signs of 2018.

There have been nearly 70 rare grassland plants found in Lake Windermere's surrounding grassland ecosystems, including 40 that are either red or blue-listed⁴. Regarding rare grassland ecosystems, the CWSP recommends that large development activities not occur given their uniqueness and high number of at-risk species. Furthermore, section 11.1(3)(a) states "*where intensive development is proposed in a wildlife corridor... measures to mitigate impacts of development on wildlife movement may be required.*" CWSP believes that developing in a wildlife corridor will lead to fragmentation of the existing uninterrupted habitats and wildlife corridors that are home to a variety of wildlife and plants. This current type of language in the draft OCP would allow developers to build in critical habitats and wildlife corridors. We strongly recommend that development in wildlife corridors not be allowed.

Sections 6.3- (1)- (j) "*Livestock and manure should be kept out of water bodies and watercourses to the greatest extent possible to avoid increased amounts of sediment and nutrient inputs to downstream water bodies.*" Rather, the CWSP strongly encourages the following language replace the preceding statement, "*Livestock and manure must be kept out of water bodies and watercourses to avoid increased amounts of sediment and nutrient inputs to downstream water bodies and the Columbia Wetlands.*"

Section 7(b)(i) reads, "*Human settlement and other land development activities within, or adjacent to wetlands is discouraged.*" CWSP recommends that no human settlement take place within wetlands.

Section 7 (b)(iii) reads, "*Locating road and utility corridors along or across wetland or riparian ecosystems should be avoided in order to maintain natural connectivity.*" The CWSP recommends that this language is not strong enough and proposes that the language change to state that these activities will not be considered.

Section 7 (b)(v) reads, "*[For] development proposals that involve disturbance within the riparian buffer, or the filling in of lakes, ponds, marshes, wetlands or riparian ecosystems, an Environmental Impact Assessment Report by a QEP must be completed to determine appropriate measures to protect wetland hydrology and ecological processes.*" However, the CWSP strongly suggests that this type of disturbance not be considered during development.

Under section 19.4 (4)(a)(ii) (DPA requirements), it states, "*For land located within Development Permit Area #3, an owner shall obtain a Development Permit prior to proceeding with any of the following: Alteration of land, including the removal of riparian or aquatic vegetation, site grading, deposition of fill, beach creation, or dredging.*" In order to help maintain the strong aquatic ecological values present in Lake Windermere, we recommend that removal of aquatic vegetation (with the exception of aquatic invasive plants), deposition of fill, and dredging not be allowed to occur.

There is much 'should be done' or 'unless a QEP approves it' language in this draft OCP, which is not encouraging for wildlife conservation efforts in the Lake Windermere plan area. Given climate change projections, numerous at-risk species in the region, at-risk ecosystems, and since the number one priority of the 677 surveys received by the Columbia Valley Community Foundation's Vital Signs of 2018 was environment, the CWSP strongly supports the incorporation of more ecological sound policies into the Lake Windermere OCP prior to adoption.

The board has reviewed these comments and respectfully submits it to the RDEK.

Sincerely,

The Board of the Columbia Wetlands Stewardship Partners:

Suzanne Bayley, President 

Rick Hoar, VP

Nola Alt, Treasurer

Tom Dance

Rachel Darvill

Paul Galbraith

Brian Gustafson

Ross MacDonald

Chad Parent

Mark Thomas

Gerry Wilkie

Table 1. Bird survey stations (out of 103 stations in total) with the highest abundance of birds as seen during bird migration (spring and fall). Data comes from the 2015-2019 Columbia Wetlands Waterbird Survey, a large scale coordinated bird count.

No.	Survey station (n=104)	Total # of Individual birds	Total # of bird species	Survey Date
1	Columbia NWA (Wilmer Unit) - Richies Point	4601	18	Oct 15/2016
2	South End Lake Windermere	4587	17	Sept 29/2017
3	Columbia NWA (Wilmer Unit) - Richies Point	3593	6	Oct 5/2015
4	Brisco Rd North	3488	18	Oct 15/2018
5	Brisco Rd North	3140	21	Apr 16/2018
6	South End Lake Windermere	2955	9	Oct 15/2017
7	Golden-Mulligans Slough	2728	7	Oct 15/2018
8	South End Lake Windermere	2582	23	Oct 5/2016
9	South End Lake Windermere	2505	20	Oct 5/2017
10	Columbia NWA (Wilmer Unit) - Richies Point	2372	13	Sept 29/2017
11	South End Lake Windermere	2302	17	Oct 15/2018
12	Columbia NWA (Wilmer Unit) - Richies Point	2299	14	Oct 5/2017
13	Fairmont--meadows	2144	13	Sept 29/2016
14	South End Lake Windermere	2120	15	Oct 5/2018
15	Columbia NWA (Wilmer Unit) - Richies Point	1983	11	Sept 29/2015

1. "2018 Columbia Valley Vital Signs Report Highlights." 2018 Columbia Valley's Vital Signs: Balancing Economic & Environmental Sustainability, Columbia Valley Community Foundation, 2018.

2. Kaiser, G.W., McHelvey, R.W., & D.W. Smith (1977). Preliminary report on aerial surveys in the Columbia Valley, British Columbia. Canadian Wildlife Services. In Pedology Consultants, 1983. Opportunities for Wildlife and Recreation Development in the Columbia River Wetlands. Prepared for Fish and Wildlife Branch, British Columbia Ministry of Environment, National Second Century Fund of British Columbia, Ducks Unlimited Canada and Canadian Wildlife Service.

3. Darvill, R. (2019). Insight into the Waterbirds of Lake Windermere. Prepared for Lake Windermere Ambassadors, Goldeneye Ecological Services.

4. Wikeem, Brian and Sandra Wikeem. "Grassland Ecosystems in British Columbia." The Grasslands of British Columbia, Grasslands Conservation Council of British Columbia, Kamloops, 2004.

FROM: [REDACTED]

The RDEK wants your feedback on the draft Lake Windermere OCP.

Please return this comment form by July 9, 2019. Forms can be mailed or dropped off at an RDEK office in Windermere or Cranbrook or email krisbelanger@rdek.bc.ca.

1. Are there specific policies in the OCP that you have concerns with? (please reference the section and policy number) (attach additional pages if necessary)

YES. OCP: SCHEDULE A #4 4.3 (5) WESTSIDE

MORE SPECIFICALLY: (5) WESTSIDE Pages 13, 14, 15, 16

BUT FIRST & FOREMOST SUBDIVISION Re FIGURE 8 Page 14 OCP document

2. What are your concerns with the policies noted above and what change could address your concerns? (attach additional pages if necessary)

① RE FIGURE 8 Page 14 OCP DOCUMENT

(A) PARCEL IN QUESTION SHOULD NOT BE CONSIDERED FOR SUBDIVISION. THAT THIS PARCEL IS BEING CONSIDERED FOR SUBDIVISION DOWN TO 1 ha PARCELS IS CONTRARY TO OCP VISION FOR WESTSIDE AS WELL AS CONTRARY TO PUBLIC OPINION (as that opinion relates to "WESTSIDE")

(B) THE RDEK NEEDS TO LISTEN TO THE PUBLIC / RESIDENTS / LOCAL INPUT REGARDING ALL SPRAWL SOUTH OF INVERMORE (WESTSIDE).

(C) SUBDIVISION / SPRAWL SOUTH OF INVERMORE (WESTSIDE) IS NOT WARRANTED, CASTLE ROCK, INVERMORE, etc NEEDS TO BE "INFILLED" LONG BEFORE IT NEEDS TO BE EXPANDED.

Kris Belanger (via email)
Susan Clovechok
Gerry Wilkie
RDEK Board

July 10, 2019

Lake Windermere OCP Draft 2019

At the start let me state that to a large degree the OCP Update effort has been well done. Unfortunately there are some major gaffes and some of the language is very troubling. On the one hand there are all kinds of motherhood statements about wildlife corridors, environmental protection, climate change, etc. and on the other hand there are distinct pathways set up to subvert that which ought to be protected.

In fact, one could fairly state that the draft is an 'enabling' document to allow specific benefit to certain entities. The most egregious being the specific Westside area set for subdivision into 1 ha parcels.

Equally troublesome is the plan for a community dock system at Rushmere, not unlike the RDEK push for a Pedley Heights Community Association marina in Baltac Bay. Rushmere, with its shallow water, fish habitat and red/orange zones should be discouraging power boats, not enabling more boats.

In regard to the Westside, the destructive bias is self-evident, and it is not my intention to focus the miscreants and get distracted but to try and set it right so that it does not plague the community until the next update rolls around, likely 10 years or more from now. However it needs to be said that the Advisory Committee was stacked by then Area F Director Wendy Booth. It was not a well-balanced choice for the public interest and seemed grossly weighted to look after some special interests relating to the Pedley Heights push for a marina at Baltac Bay, a larger dock facility at Rushmere and environmentally unsuitable development of the Westside.

The ad seeking Volunteers for the Lake Windermere OCP Advisory Group stated that 'We are looking for up to **10 individuals** representing diverse range of interests and expertise ..'. It is fair to state that this was not done. Just 8 volunteers were appointed, of which at least 3 were self-interests working to further marinas and larger docks on the lake, one of whom could not attend meetings due to illness. A much better job could have been done to form an effective Advisory Committee.

The problem started, in my opinion, with the constraints on the make-up of the Advisory Committee that steered the draft process. The Advisory Committee was not at all representative of the varied interests and affected parties but seemed to be hand-selected, in part, by the RDEK Director of the time. Some of us were deliberately kept off the Committee on grounds that we do not reside in Area F. Unfortunately this draft affects more than just Area F since it will have lasting effects on Lake Windermere and the surrounding communities including the District of Invermere and Area G. The notion that only residents would be allowed to be on the Committee, basically eliminated a huge pool of expertise and public interest. I can site a few examples. A Rushmere resident, well connected to Wendy Booth from my previous experience with Lake Windermere Ambassadors was ill and never attended a meeting. It is clear to me that Wendy Booth was in fact the proxy for Rushmere. Two others were there to promote the specific marina interest of Pedley Heights. My original application to be on the Committee and subsequent efforts to replace a non-performing Committee member were rejected by Wendy Booth even though I have property in Athalmer and the District of Invermere, as originally asked for by the Planner. My efforts over the years to preserve

wetlands and Lake Windermere are well known through my involvement for several decades in public processes and the Lake Windermere Ambassadors.

The Westside of Lake Windermere within Area F most certainly did not have fair and adequate public representation and the resulting document's deficiencies and contradictions can be blamed on the lack of proper input. In fact it is patently obvious to me that to a large extent the entire Westside plan is set up for the benefit of a single owner, that being Grizzly Ridge. In my opinion, it was championed by the previous Area F Director and the OCP Draft demonstrates her undue influence. Community input has been clearly ignored, but more to the point even after several earlier failed attempts (one just a year ago) for higher density development, subdivision of a key parcel has been imbedded in the draft. This is most egregious abuse of process, disrespectful and damaging to the community as a whole.

Undoubtedly there will be some much-needed public input by the July 10th deadline, but I would like to focus on one point which will illustrate the duplicity of the draft. It has to do with the property shown in Figure 8, which is somehow slated for subdivision into 1 ha parcels. A recent application for just such a subdivision was turned down so it is horrifying that a distinct pathway has been created specifically to enable said subdivision. It would be fair to say that this portion of the draft is really 'enabling a special private interest' rather than providing 'community and environmental protection'.

Allow me to point out one other of many contradictions in the plan, that involving of wastewater management. Map 4 of the Lake Windermere Management Plan shows the Soil Suitability for In-ground Sewage Disposal. For the area, Figure 8, proposed for 1 ha subdivision, the soil suitability is 'Poor'. Even if some portions were to be considered 'Good', sort of like Lakeview Meadows on the east side, septic fields cannot be permitted and development would require a new sewage handling system or connection to the existing system in the District of Invermere. The former option would likely cause effluent discharge into Lake Windermere and the latter would put a huge financial burden on the District of Invermere. Why should Invermere taxpayers subsidize such development which is not in the public interest? Has the past experience with Eastside septic leaching into the lake not been a lesson at all?

As an owner of significant commercial and residential properties in Athalmer and the District of Invermere I would be strongly opposed to the connection of Figure 8 1 ha subdivided lands into our sewer system. As it is, our system is inadequate for our needs, it discharges effluent into groundwater in Athalmer and at times directly into Toby Creek. Any private system with such operating parameters would never be permitted.

I have not addressed potable water simply because there is none available for that potential subdivision. Paddy Ryan lakes cannot be tapped further for such a subdivision or any others that follow in the future. In fact, due to the removal of protective fences which kept cattle away from Paddy Ryan lakes, our water supply has likely been compromised. Just because the municipal water supply can be super-chlorinated for health and safety reasons does not mean that wilful contamination ought to be ignored.

In conclusion, the Westside properties of Grizzly Ridge must not be given special privilege in the OCP Update. It is supposed to be a community plan, not something designed specifically to enable the enrichment of private rural interests, especially when the owner is an Alberta resident. As an Alberta resident my input was muzzled, so why such special treatment for Grizzly Ridge. Surely you can appreciate the obvious contradiction? One Alberta resident is denied constructive access while another is given a huge financial benefit. A point also needs to be made about the potential 'annexation' of Grizzly Ridge properties by the District of Invermere. That concept has been run up the proverbial flagpole and shot down previously. It seems that the OCP Update is doing a run-around with its language to support, or force,

annexation by the District. In other words, the RDEK is creating a new problem against the public interest and then off-loading its into our laps. We do not want it, but thanks for the consideration.

The inexorable growth of housing into large wild spaces is not a good thing from any perspective. The District of Invermere and Castle Rock have a plentiful supply of real estate to serve any realistic growth and housing demand for many decades into the future.

This OCP Update does not protect the public interest. To the contrary it seems to be carefully designed to further a few specific private interests. I would go so far as to say that an independent investigation of the clearly prejudicial process should be undertaken. More expeditious alternative would be for RDEK staff and management to fix the OCP Update of its own volition.

Sincerely,

Signed


Athalmer 
Invermere 



July 10, 2019

Tracy Van de Wiel, Kris Belanger
Planning & Development
Regional District of East Kootenay

Dear Tracy and Kris:

RE: Policy 5.3.1(i)

The Windermere Community Association(WCA) is pleased that the RDEK will not be allowing future storage in the commercial zoned area off North Street.

We are concerned that the RDEK Planning Manager, though the LWOCP recommends the RDEK remove Mini/Boat/RV permitted and accessory uses in C-2 zoning, feels that may not happen before 2020. This can create numerous future problems, as permits may be applied for and approved before the 2020 date, thus contravening the LWOCP policy.

We strongly believe that Policy 5.3.1(i) be implemented at the same time as the approval of the LWOCP or no more than 30 days after it is approved.

We appreciate your serious consideration of our recommendation.

Olga Bayliss
WCA President

To the members of the Lake Windermere OCP planning committee,

First, let me thank you for the time and concern you dedicate to this important work. As a member of the committee exploring and creating a solid waste plan for the Columbia Valley I am aware of how it can consume one's time.

Many of our full-time residents live with a bit of discord with regard to our visitors; we appreciate the economic benefits they bring, but worry about - even resent - the impact they have on the wild places we love. Nevertheless, I believe we have made clear in a variety of surveys and forums our desire to maintain these areas and protect them from the destruction that comes with development geared toward a transient and tourist economy. The top spot that economic growth has held for decades in so many planning decisions must be relinquished if we are to have even a fool's hope of beginning to repair the damage we have done.

Section 4.1 states that "Throughout the planning process, residents and non-residents expressed a desire to see infill development or new construction adjacent to existing residential nodes. Infill housing options such as secondary suites are seen as one opportunity to potentially increase the availability of rental housing stock in the area without the need to develop and service bare land." I find it contradictory to then see the proposed further development of the west side of Lake Windermere. Do we want to see increased urban sprawl that further stresses the landscape that we value? Lake Windermere is already facing enormous developmental pressure. Can it handle more?

To truly achieve your stated goal of mitigating impacts to climate change, the eco-system must be protected and enhanced, and opportunities for local agriculture must be increased. The proposed increased human footprint on the valley bottom will not accomplish these objectives. Rather it will increase negative pressures on an already stressed ecosystem (wildlife habitats and corridors, watersheds, agricultural land use etc.). One of the most important things we can do to fight climate change is to preserve functioning, intact ecosystems and all future development should be done with zero ecosystem impact, preferably with a positive ecosystem restoration outcome.

The people of the Columbia valley are often seen as forward-thinking leaders in ecological stewardship. I believe this document, and future land use direction should reflect those aspirations and values. Now is the time to have our public policy documents reflect and support our desire, indeed our necessary imperative to protect our diverse ecosystems. Without supporting and protecting them, we are short-sightedly contributing to the factors that are accelerating the disastrous effects of climate change.

Thank you again for your commitment to this important work and for considering the input of those concerned.


Brisco, BC

Kris Belanger

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: June 11, 2019 7:52 PM
To: Kris Belanger
Subject: Lake Windermere Plan

I am unable to register with your OCP. Please accept my comment that this lake is already crowded on summer weekends. Further lakefront development was not agreed to on previous plans and I see no reason that it is included in this plan other than to allow a developer to make money. [REDACTED]

Kris Belanger

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: June 18, 2019 10:42 AM
To: Susan Clovechok
Cc: Kris Belanger; [REDACTED]
Subject: Status of Windermere Hall in Lake Windermere OCP 2019 draft

Dear Director Clovechok,

Following the presentation of the OCP on June 9th, 2019, [REDACTED] approached you to express concerns about Policy 8.3 (6) in the OCP which relates to the status of Windermere Community Hall. I believe you told her that you would be interested in pursuing closer ties between the WCA and Rocky Mountain School District # 6 regarding possible uses for Windermere Hall. She suggested you might want to contact me in that regard. I agreed that I would send you a quick e-mail to facilitate that contact.

As Treasurer and/or Membership Coordinator, Hall Maintenance Coordinator and Grants Coordinator for the WCA for about ten years, I did a considerable amount of research concerning the history and legal status of both the Hall and the WCA including the legal relationship between the WCA and Rocky Mountain School District #6. Since stepping off the WCA Board I continue to study the history of Windermere itself as time permits. I also do occasional consultation work for Rocky Mountain School District # 6 and have a very good relationship with Superintendent Paul Carrière. I have also worked with the staff at Windermere on several occasions to develop joint projects with the WCA. I would be absolutely delighted to see a closer relationship developed between the WCA and Windermere School and would be more than willing to help you in pursuing that objective but would definitely suggest you contact me about the legal relationship between the WCA and District 6. I have reason to believe that few of the current members of the District 6 Administration may be aware that there is indeed a legal tie between the two organizations. This was most recently made evident when District 6 staff re-fenced the school yard and removed the gates that used to allow the grounds around the school and those surrounding Windermere Hall to be linked with very minimal effort. That of course acts as an new impediment for safe access to the Hall by pupils and staff of the school.

Should you wish to contact me, you can use either e-mail or call me at [REDACTED] However, I would recommend e-mail as I will be away from for a few days and spend much of my time in the garden when I am home.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Windermere, BC V0B 2L2

Kris Belanger

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: June 22, 2019 4:19 PM
Cc: Kris Belanger
Subject: [REDACTED] LW draft OCP comments

Hi All.

First let me say that if you do not want to receive further correspondence from me about the current Lake Windermere OCP, please just send me an email and I will remove your name from my mailing list.

What follows is my review of the draft Lake Windermere OCP that was presented at the last public consultation meeting. I am profoundly concerned. Everything in *italics* is cited from the Draft OCP, with the section number provided. I will submit this formally via the engage.rdek.bc.ca platform.

I had hoped to have time to do a density calculation for westside development potential before submitting these notes, but have not been able to get to this.

I hope that the RDEK will provide the public with a basic calculation of max buildout potential under clearly stated illustrative assumptions.

Sincerely;

In short, I am opposed to all of the many and extensive policies in the draft OCP that overtly and indirectly allow for sprawling development (by any name) on the westside while compromising the ecological integrity and viability of the rich and rare natural resource that is the westside of Lake Windermere. This document is in many ways custom-crafted for westside sprawl in the best interests of a single large land owner. The OCP is fatally inconsistent, on the one hand claiming to champion environmental responsibility and value, while on the other hand very effectively undermining the possibility of maintaining those ecological values and resources into the future. The rationale for this is never made clear in the document – there is NO statement provided that there is any public demand for this type of development, and yet, there are whole sections of the OCP that support it. The introduction of “conservation subdivision design” is a poor effort to rationalize development that the public is not demanding in that face of a clear public demand for the very opposite – protection of the westside as a large landscape.

The details of my statement above are outlined below.

1.1.1 ...[this] document is intended to reflect the **collective** vision of the plan area for the future.

I do not agree that the draft reflects the collective vision with respect to the Westside. On this topic, I feel that the plan defers almost entirely to a vision of the future being driven by a single developer that I believe is still Grizzly Ridge. I am baffled as to why this deference has been given to the developer – at every single public process to date since the former Hoffert Properties were purchased by the current owner, the public in our area has spoken clearly that sprawl development that wraps around our community to the south and west is not in our best interest.

This section states further that “*RDEK Board has considered the interests of the individual landowners and residents within the plan area and balanced those interests with the needs of the community and region as a whole*”. I do not agree on this point with respect to the westside. I feel very strongly that the OCP has given a single large landowner a trump card that cancels out the public voice of the residents of the Lake Windermere Area.

1.1.8 Relationship to the District of Invermere

The OCP also establishes policies that recognize potential opportunities for boundary expansion by the District of Invermere.

Where the DoI Official Community plan references boundary expansion, it SPECIFICALLY and principally references the need to consider an Urban Containment Boundary, and states clearly that there are limited rationale that should be considered for expansion. It makes no reference to development of estate residential as a rationale to expand the boundary of the municipality. The draft Lake Windermere OCP language cited above seems to infer that the District of Invermere is seeking potential opportunities for boundary expansion, which is not the case.

1.1.9.(3) Westside

The owners represent a range of interests including conservation, resource management, development and agricultural interests.

I believe I am accurately aware of who the major land owners are and I am also aware that 3 have not been consulted directly by the RDEK about westside development. These three are also opposed to development on the wide-open spaces that is the westside of Lake Windermere, of the type allowed in this draft OCP.

3.0 Goals of the OCP

Of the list of 13 goals of the OCP, it is my assessment that the policies that have been proposed respecting development on the westside will negatively influence achievement of at least 6, and will positively influence only 1. The Other 6 are not influenced by, nor do they influence the westside.

- Westside development policies will negatively affect:
 - Supporting agriculture
 - Recognizing the environmental importance of lake Windermere
 - Maintaining ecosystem function including grasslands, sensitive habitat, and connectivity corridors
 - Recognize the risk of interface fire
 - Conserve cultural resources
 - Reduce greenhouse gas emissions
- It seems that the only overall OCP goal that could possibly be interpreted as supporting the policies that have been drafted that allow extensive development on the westside is:
 - *“Encourage residential development that reflects the diverse interests and lifestyles of resident and non-resident homeowners and recognizes the need for a variety of housing types”*

This policy seems custom crafted to allow for westside expansion and development. I ask, where is the overall housing goal that says “encourage residential development that meets the needs of the emerging workforce and families in the region, while also taking into consideration that not all residents are homeowners, and there is a devastating crisis in the housing market that makes it almost impossible find a place to rent affordably”?!

In short, in the goals of the OCP there is almost nothing that leads logically to the incredible breadth of permissive policies, exceptions, and loopholes that have been embedded throughout in support of westside expansion.

4.1 Residential land use, background

First paragraph: ***Throughout the planning process, residents and non-residents expressed a desire to see infill development or new construction adjacent to existing residential nodes. Infill housing options such as secondary suites are seen as one opportunity to potentially increase the availability of rental housing stock in the area without the need to develop and service bare land... When planning for new residential development, some principles were universally supported during public consultation for this plan: A mix of residential densities (single, two and multi-family); infill development; community water and sewer should be provided for existing and future resident; new residential developments should include opportunities for non-motorized transportation and establish non-motorized connection between communities, open space, recreational amenities and commercial services and the; rural character of the area should be preserved.***

I note that there is no universal support stated for development of large tracts of land outside of existing communities, but there is universal support stated for infill development. How is it then that the goals of the OCP gloss over this need completely, and that it seems to so strongly support the one kind of development that was NOT universally supported? This must be addressed by the Board.

4.3 (g) *Conservation Subdivision Design* has been entered into this document as if it is a well understood development typology that will somehow maintain the ecological values of the westside of the lake while allowing for (on page 15) that “*the number of parcels in development clusters should be approximately the same as the number of parcels that would be provided on the parent parcel through a conventional rural subdivision*”. What exactly IS conservation subdivision design? I have studied with the author of the design concept – but I don’t believe that most people in this valley know, nor, likely, do the board members – how is it be assessed? – there is no “develop a CSD policy assessment process” noted in the implementation plan for the OCP – it is just assumed that everyone knows and should accept that when the developer applies to the RDEK for subdivision approval and the RDEK wants to allow development on the westside it will somehow be a “conservation” subdivision, and we should just trust that the astounding ecological values on the westside will be left intact at the hands of a developer who, to date, has actively denigrated the very ecological values we are being asked to assume they will “developprotect”. This is, to be blunt, entirely in-credible.

4.3 (5) Westside

(a) any policy that begins with the word “despite” should be examined closely. In this case, the word despite fatally undermines the stated 120 hectare parcel minimum for the westside and lays out 2.5 pages of exceptions to that rule, with 1.5 pages overtly pertaining to land where 120 hectare parcels are possible. Section 4.3 (5)c begins by stating the amazing ecological values and sensitivity of the land in question, and then goes on to state “*...Rezoning may be supported in this area if the proponent can demonstrate how development impacts, traffic concerns and existing recreational potential is maintained and enhanced through application of the following...*”. The land in question is the size of Invermere! By protecting some viewsapes, providing a big road and some trails, not developing in undevelopable sections (!), providing a report that promises that the development will not destroy Invermere’s water supply, and giving a bit of free stuff that we will decide about later, the developer wins the right to vastly transform the future of this region permanently and forever, despite the fact that there is no visible public or market demand for what the developer proposes to offer. This section even goes so far as to show the developer the path to success – Conservation Subdivision Design!! If you call it CSD, surely we the public will say yes. But we are not saying yes. We are still saying no.

6.3.(1)(b) Agricultural Land use. *Fragmentation or parcelization of agricultural lands in the plan area is generally not supported.*

This is an example of where the document indirectly undermines the policies elsewhere around ecological integrity etc.. The use of the word “generally” allows ample room for interpreting this policy to mean that parcelization of large tracts of land is really an option that is very much on the table. Why not just say it is “not” supported, and require developers to make the case, do the agricultural consultation, and CONVINCE the people of this region that their plans do not, in fact adversely impact ag values?

7.3 (2) The policies in this section on collaborative planning for locating a viable light industrial land base are very positive.

9.0 Open Space recreation and trails (OSRT)

There is a clearly stated public desire for recreational trails in the region. This OCP draft directly references the opportunities associated with the Westside Legacy Trail (I think it has a different name as a result of sponsorship and should be properly identified in the OCP), the Old Coach Greenway, Windermere beach Park, Cross Road Ball Park, and communities along the east side of lake Windermere. Appropriately, there is NO mention of developing new facilities on the westside of the lake, however, the westside development policies themselves seem to indicate that OSRT development is on the table there. Instead, what about highlighting the westside, conservation based recreation opportunities that are already existent on both public and private lands such as through NCC, the Nature Trust, and SRL, as well as one amazing provincial park site. None of these amenities

have required that we trade development rights at the expense of ecological integrity in order to achieve some trails. There is AMPLE recreation on the Westside and grizzly ridge recreation “opportunities” come at too high a price.

11. Environmental considerations

This section seems well thought out at first glance, until it is read with the westside development policies close at hand, and the caveats are properly understood. The language in this section is inherently permissive of development – simply stating that something is been measured, mapped, and recognized as having ecological value will not protect it. We must also say that we must not, except in the most extraordinary circumstances, allow for degradation of our remaining intact ecosystems. **This section does not meaningfully or effectively impede development in ESAs.**

For example: section 11.1(2)c talks about maintaining habitat connectivity, and very next paragraph at (3)a begins “*where intensive development is proposed in a wildlife corridor...*” again – this lacks credibility. This policy statement opens a wildlife/human interaction AND wildfire nightmare! Under what conditions would the board be willing to consider “intensive development” in a wildlife corridor, for goodness sake?! Why bother mapping the corridors at all? Then, just to confuse matters, just 5 paragraphs later (f), the document swings back to say “*future land uses should promote habitat connectivity and discourage fragmentation of contiguous ecosystems*”. So are we developing the corridors or not? Well, just a few paragraphs later, we see why it will be ok to develop the corridors... “because “*education programs such as WildSafe are encouraged*”. Thank goodness. Once we put the people with the wildlife, then the people can learn about how not to get in the wildlife’s way.

Simply put, the number one strategy for reducing wildlife-human conflict is not to develop in wildlife corridors. Later, at section (o), where a policy is established stating that “*preservation of wildlife connectivity corridors is encouraged and supported by the following:*” the third and fourth sub-policies talk about how extensive development *should* be avoided, but if it can’t, it should be done so as to “limit the impediment of wildlife movement”. There is a profound and inherent contradiction in this section about environmental considerations. If this section is intended to limit development in ecological valuable and sensitive areas, it is unlikely to be effective, and is more than likely to allow room for people to find ways to continue business as usual development. Ironically, section 11.2(1) states clearly that the number one threat to biodiversity is habitat loss. This document doesn’t really seem to be bothered by this fact – it is designed to get around it. Section 11.4 highlights the contiguous ecosystems on the westside of the lake that allow critical habitat connectivity from north to south and from east to west. So WHY, for goodness sake, so much deference to the one developer who stands willing and able to destroy these values?

DPA #2 Protection of ESAs **This section does not meaningfully or effectively impede development in ESAs**

The objective of Development Permit Area #2 is the protection, preservation, restoration and enhancement of the significant ecosystems, habitats and features identified in 19.3(6)(a)(i)-(vi) and on Schedules I1 to I4... Followed by the caveat that “*The intent is not to preclude all development in these areas, but to provide notice that the areas include unique characteristics that warrant special review and consideration and to ensure appropriate mitigation measures are prescribed where appropriate.*” Essentially, business as usual. Or more cynically, as long as a QEP can provide a report that the land on either side of the road you pushed in really no longer has ecological values, you can go ahead and develop – you just need an appropriately named Development Permit first. Again, the ESA DPA section is fatally undermined by shoulds and mays, and is terribly lacking in should nots and may nots. Given that it has been identified in the document, for example, that grasslands are critically endangered ecosystems, it is disheartening to find policies beginning “If development is proposed within grassland ecosystems...” and ending “...should minimize negative impacts”. How about “development in grassland ecosystems is strongly discouraged and there must be no net negative loss of the current extent of grasslands in the plan area as a result of human development”?

Later in this DPA, we see a strange collision of wildsafe and firesmart policy failures: at section (e) there is yet another allowance that there could be extensive development in a wildlife corridor, but this time pruning of underbrush and removal of forest cover is discouraged to support wildlife movement, thereby exacerbating the risk of BOTH of wildlife/human conflict and wildfire in new residential areas.

At section (d) we see allowance for the possibility of road building and industrial activity in mountain goat habitat – again the language is permissive, not prohibitive.

With respect to the deferral to QEPs, I would like to reflect back to you a brief story about a land use application that came across my desk years ago. Upon having been directed to provide an environmental impact assessment report for a proposed development, I received from the developer's QEP a 1 page report stating, literally, that after the property was developed, it would no longer have ecological values and wildlife should be prevented from accessing the property in order to minimize human-wildlife conflict. The property in question was ultimately approved under similarly permissive ESA policies, and was, sadly, formerly grassland and mixed IDF, as well as a mountain goat corridor. If this LW Draft OCP is going to defer so clearly to a QEP, the expectations for ecological PROTECTION must be far more clearly and prohibitively stated.

Finally, Implementation Strategy, section 20.5: I do not see any staff action identified to handle the major development implications of development on the westside – a tract of land equal in size to the District of Invermere. I have to assume that once an application comes in for this massive land development area, the implications and work load will be handled on an *ad hoc* basis. I believe that the rationale for NOT including Westside development in the implementation strategy despite the VERY permissive nature of the document in this regard, is that there is no public mandate for allocating staff and financial resources to the task. All of the other projects identified in the implementation strategy have a clear public mandate that has been developed and matured over time. No similar mandate exists for the Westside of the lake and yet the document gives abundant, repeated, and permissive consideration to development of the area.

As stated at the outset of my comments, I do not support westside development and feel comfortable stating that there will be strong and broad public opposition to it. I am terribly disappointed to be making these comments yet again after so many years. Very insulting is the glaring re-introduction of the very same Grizzly Ridge development proposal just to the south of Invermere that was so recently rejected by the Board of Directors. On what grounds has the RDEK OCP effectively re-invited that proposal?



Virus-free. www.avg.com

Kris Belanger

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: June 23, 2019 8:29 AM
Cc: Kris Belanger
Subject: RE: [REDACTED] LW draft OCP comments

Hi All. I forgot the crucial bit of information – where can YOU comment?

www.Engage.rdek.bc.ca

Comment period is open until July 10. Please send your comments as soon as possible. What a wonderful thing to do on this cool Sunday (hint hint 😊)

1. provide a summary statement about what you like and/or do not like in the draft OCP.
 - a. Then provide details. – if there are particular section that are of note, reference the section.
2. ***Send a copy of your comments by email to 20 friends in your contacts list and ask them to do the same.
 - a. This will ensure that you are part of getting the word out, AND has the magical benefit of making sure that you are respectful in your comments.

Thank you!!

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: June 22, 2019 4:19 PM
Cc: 'Kris Belanger' <kbelanger@rdek.bc.ca>
Subject: [REDACTED] LW draft OCP comments

Hi All.

First let me say that if you do not want to receive further correspondence from me about the current Lake Windermere OCP, please just send me an email and I will remove your name from my mailing list.

What follows is my review of the draft Lake Windermere OCP that was presented at the last public consultation meeting. I am profoundly concerned. Everything in *italics* is cited from the Draft OCP, with the section number provided. I will submit this formally via the engage.rdek.bc.ca platform.

I had hoped to have time to do a density calculation for westside development potential before submitting these notes, but have not been able to get to this.

I hope that the RDEK will provide the public with a basic calculation of max buildout potential under clearly stated illustrative assumptions.

Sincerely;

[REDACTED]

In short, I am opposed to all of the many and extensive policies in the draft OCP that overtly and indirectly allow for sprawling development (by any name) on the westside while compromising the ecological integrity and viability of the rich and rare natural resource that is the westside of Lake Windermere. This document is in many ways custom-crafted for westside sprawl in the best interests of a single large land owner. The OCP is fatally inconsistent, on the one hand claiming to champion environmental responsibility and value, while on the other hand very effectively undermining the possibility of maintaining those ecological values and resources into the future. The rationale for this is never made clear in the document – there is NO statement provided that there is any public demand for this

type of development, and yet, there are whole sections of the OCP that support it. The introduction of “conservation subdivision design” is a poor effort to rationalize development that the public is not demanding in that face of a clear public demand for the very opposite – protection of the westside as a large landscape.

The details of my statement above are outlined below.

1.1.1 ...[this] document is intended to reflect the **collective** vision of the plan area for the future.

I do not agree that the draft reflects the collective vision with respect to the Westside. On this topic, I feel that the plan defers almost entirely to a vision of the future being driven by a single developer that I believe is still Grizzly Ridge. I am baffled as to why this deference has been given to the developer – at every single public process to date since the former Hoffert Properties were purchased by the current owner, the public in our area has spoken clearly that sprawl development that wraps around our community to the south and west is not in our best interest.

This section states further that “RDEK Board has considered the interests of the individual landowners and residents within the plan area and balanced those interests with the needs of the community and region as a whole”. I do not agree on this point with respect to the westside. I feel very strongly that the OCP has given a single large landowner a trump card that cancels out the public voice of the residents of the Lake Windermere Area.

1.1.8 Relationship to the District of Invermere

The OCP also establishes policies that recognize potential opportunities for boundary expansion by the District of Invermere.

Where the DoI Official Community plan references boundary expansion, it SPECIFICALLY and principally references the need to consider an Urban Containment Boundary, and states clearly that there are limited rationale that should be considered for expansion. It makes no reference to development of estate residential as a rationale to expand the boundary of the municipality. The draft Lake Windermere OCP language cited above seems to infer that the District of Invermere is seeking potential opportunities for boundary expansion, which is not the case.

1.1.9.(3) Westside

The owners represent a range of interests including conservation, resource management, development and agricultural interests.

I believe I am accurately aware of who the major land owners are and I am also aware that 3 have not been consulted directly by the RDEK about westside development. These three are also opposed to development on the wide-open spaces that is the westside of Lake Windermere, of the type allowed in this draft OCP.

3.0 Goals of the OCP

Of the list of 13 goals of the OCP, it is my assessment that the policies that have been proposed respecting development on the westside will negatively influence achievement of at least 6, and will positively influence only 1. The Other 6 are not influenced by, nor do they influence the westside.

- Westside development policies will negatively affect:
 - Supporting agriculture
 - Recognizing the environmental importance of lake Windermere
 - Maintaining ecosystem function including grasslands, sensitive habitat, and connectivity corridors
 - Recognize the risk of interface fire
 - Conserve cultural resources
 - Reduce greenhouse gas emissions
- It seems that the only overall OCP goal that could possibly be interpreted as supporting the policies that have been drafted that allow extensive development on the westside is:

- *“Encourage residential development that reflects the diverse interests and lifestyles of resident and non-resident homeowners and recognizes the need for a variety of housing types”*

This policy seems custom crafted to allow for westside expansion and development. I ask, where is the overall housing goal that says “encourage residential development that meets the needs of the emerging workforce and families in the region, while also taking into consideration that not all residents are homeowners, and there is a devastating crisis in the housing market that makes it almost impossible find a place to rent affordably”?!

In short, in the goals of the OCP there is almost nothing that leads logically to the incredible breadth of permissive policies, exceptions, and loopholes that have been embedded throughout in support of westside expansion.

4.1 Residential land use, background

First paragraph: ***Throughout the planning process, residents and non-residents expressed a desire to see infill development or new construction adjacent to existing residential nodes. Infill housing options such as secondary suites are seen as one opportunity to potentially increase the availability of rental housing stock in the area without the need to develop and service bare land...*** When planning for new residential development, some principles were *universally* supported during public consultation for this plan: A mix of residential densities (single, two and multi-family); infill development; community water and sewer should be provided for existing and future resident; new residential developments should include opportunities for non-motorized transportation and establish non-motorized connection between communities, open space, recreational amenities and commercial services and the; rural character of the area should be preserved.

I note that there is no universal support stated for development of large tracts of land outside of existing communities, but there is is universal support stated for infill development. How is it then that the goals of the OCP gloss over this need completely, and that it seems to so strongly support the one kind of development that was NOT universally supported? This must be addressed by the Board.

4.3 (g) *Conservation Subdivision Design* has been entered into this document as if it is a well understood development typology that will somehow maintain the ecological values of the westside of the lake while allowing for (on page 15) that “*the number of parcels in development clusters should be approximately the same as the number of parcels that would be provided on the parent parcel through a conventional rural subdivision*”. What exactly IS conservation subdivision design? I have studied with the author of the design concept – but I don’t believe that most people in this valley know, nor, likely, do the board members – how is it be assessed? – there is no “develop a CSD policy assessment process” noted in the implementation plan for the OCP – it is just assumed that everyone knows and should accept that when the developer applies to the RDEK for subdivision approval and the RDEK wants to allow development on the westside it will somehow be a “conservation” subdivision, and we should just trust that the astounding ecological values on the westside will be left intact at the hands of a developer who, to date, has actively denigrated the very ecological values we are being asked to assume they will “developprotect”. This is, to be blunt, entirely in-credible.

4.3 (5) Westside

(a) any policy that begins with the word “despite” should be examined closely. In this case, the word despite fatally undermines the stated 120 hectare parcel minimum for the westside and lays out 2.5 pages of exceptions to that rule, with 1.5 pages overtly pertaining to land where 120 hectare parcels are possible. Section 4.3 (5)c begins by stating the amazing ecological values and sensitivity of the land in question, and then goes on to state “...Rezoning may be supported in this area if the proponent can demonstrate how development impacts, traffic concerns and existing recreational potential is maintained and enhanced through application of the following...” . The land in question is the size of Invermere! By protecting some viewsapes, providing a big road and some trails, not developing in undevelopable sections (!), providing a report that promises that the development will not destroy Invermere’s water supply, and giving a bit of free stuff that we will decide about later, the developer wins the right to vastly transform the future of this region permanently and forever, despite the fact that there is no visible public or market demand for what the developer proposes to offer. This section even goes so far as

to show the developer the path to success – Conservation Subdivision Design!! If you call it CSD, surely we the public will say yes. But we are not saying yes. We are still saying no.

6.3.(1)(b) Agricultural Land use. *Fragmentation or parcelization of agricultural lands in the plan area is generally not supported.*

This is an example of where the document indirectly undermines the policies elsewhere around ecological integrity etc.. The use of the word “generally” allows ample room for interpreting this policy to mean that parcelization of large tracts of land is really an option that is very much on the table. Why not just say it is “not” supported, and require developers to make the case, do the agricultural consultation, and CONVINCE the people of this region that their plans do not, in fact adversely impact ag values?

7.3 (2) The policies in this section on collaborative planning for locating a viable light industrial land base are very positive.

9.0 Open Space recreation and trails (OSRT)

There is a clearly stated public desire for recreational trails in the region. This OCP draft directly references the opportunities associated with the Westside Legacy Trail (I think it has a different name as a result of sponsorship and should be properly identified in the OCP), the Old Coach Greenway, Windermere beach Park, Cross Road Ball Park, and communities along the east side of lake Windermere. Appropriately, there is NO mention of developing new facilities on the westside of the lake, however, the westside development policies themselves seem to indicate that OSRT development is on the table there. Instead, what about highlighting the westside, conservation based recreation opportunities that are already existent on both public and private lands such as through NCC, the Nature Trust, and SRL, as well as one amazing provincial park site. None of these amenities have required that we trade development rights at the expense of ecological integrity in order to achieve some trails. There is AMPLE recreation on the Westside and grizzly ridge recreation “opportunities” come at too high a price.

11. Environmental considerations

This section seems well thought out at first glance, until it is read with the westside development policies close at hand, and the caveats are properly understood. The language in this section is inherently permissive of development – simply stating that something is been measured, mapped, and recognized as having ecological value will not protect it. We must also say that we must not, except in the most extraordinary circumstances, allow for degradation of our remaining intact ecosystems. **This section does not meaningfully or effectively impede development in ESAs.**

For example: section 11.1(2)c talks about maintaining habitat connectivity, and very next paragraph at (3)a begins “*where intensive development is proposed in a wildlife corridor...*” again – this lacks credibility. This policy statement opens a wildlife/human interaction AND wildfire nightmare! Under what conditions would the board be willing to consider “intensive development” in a wildlife corridor, for goodness sake?! Why bother mapping the corridors at all? Then, just to confuse matters, just 5 paragraphs later (f), the document swings back to say “*future land uses should promote habitat connectivity and discourage fragmentation of contiguous ecosystems*”. So are we developing the corridors or not? Well, just a few paragraphs later, we see why it will be ok to develop the corridors... “because “*education programs such as WildSafe are encouraged*”. Thank goodness. Once we put the people with the wildlife, then the people can learn about how not to get in the wildlife’s way.

Simply put, the number one strategy for reducing wildlife-human conflict is not to develop in wildlife corridors. Later, at section (o), where a policy is established stating that “*preservation of wildlife connectivity corridors is encouraged and supported by the following:*” the third and fourth sub-policies talk about how extensive development *should* be avoided, but if it can’t, it should be done so as to “limit the impediment of wildlife movement”. There is a profound and inherent contradiction in this section about environmental considerations. If this section is intended to limit development in ecological valuable and sensitive areas, it is

unlikely to be effective, and is more than likely to allow room for people to find ways to continue business as usual development. Ironically, section 11.2(1) states clearly that the number one threat to biodiversity is habitat loss. This document doesn't really seem to be bothered by this fact – it is designed to get around it. Section 11.4 highlights the contiguous ecosystems on the westside of the lake that allow critical habitat connectivity from north to south and from east to west. So WHY, for goodness sake, so much deference to the one developer who stands willing and able to destroy these values?

DPA #2 Protection of ESAs This section does not meaningfully or effectively impede development in ESAs

The objective of Development Permit Area #2 is the protection, preservation, restoration and enhancement of the significant ecosystems, habitats and features identified in 19.3(6)(a)(i)-(vi) and on Schedules I1 to I4.... Followed by the caveat that *“The intent is not to preclude all development in these areas, but to provide notice that the areas include unique characteristics that warrant special review and consideration and to ensure appropriate mitigation measures are prescribed where appropriate.”* Essentially, business as usual. Or more cynically, as long as a QEP can provide a report that the land on either side of the road you pushed in really no longer has ecological values, you can go ahead and develop – you just need an appropriately named Development Permit first. Again, the ESA DPA section is fatally undermined by shoulds and mays, and is terribly lacking in should nots and may nots. Given that it has been identified in the document, for example, that grasslands are critically endangered ecosystems, it is disheartening to find policies beginning *“If development is proposed within grassland ecosystems...”* and ending *“...should minimize negative impacts”*. How about *“development in grassland ecosystems is strongly discouraged and there must be no net negative loss of the current extent of grasslands in the plan area as a result of human development”*?

Later in this DPA, we see a strange collision of wildsafe and firesmart policy failures: at section (e) there is yet another allowance that there could be extensive development in a wildlife corridor, but this time pruning of underbrush and removal of forest cover is discouraged to support wildlife movement, thereby exacerbating the risk of BOTH of wildlife/human conflict and wildfire in new residential areas.

At section (d) we see allowance for the possibility of road building and industrial activity in mountain goat habitat – again the language is permissive, not prohibitive.

With respect to the deferral to QEPs, I would like to reflect back to you a brief story about a land use application that came across my desk years ago. Upon having been directed to provide an environmental impact assessment report for a proposed development, I received from the developer's QEP a 1 page report stating, literally, that after the property was developed, it would no longer have ecological values and wildlife should be prevented from accessing the property in order to minimize human-wildlife conflict. The property in question was ultimately approved under similarly permissive ESA policies, and was, sadly, formerly grassland and mixed IDF, as well as a mountain goat corridor. If this LW Draft OCP is going to defer so clearly to a QEP, the expectations for ecological PROTECTION must be far more clearly and prohibitively stated.

Finally, Implementation Strategy, section 20.5: I do not see any staff action identified to handle the major development implications of development on the westside – a tract of land equal in size to the District of Invermere. I have to assume that once an application comes in for this massive land development area, the implications and work load will be handled on an *ad hoc* basis. I believe that the rationale for NOT including Westside development in the implementation strategy despite the VERY permissive nature of the document in this regard, is that there is no public mandate for allocating staff and financial resources to the task. All of the other projects identified in the implementation strategy have a clear public mandate that has been developed and matured over time. No similar mandate exists for the Westside of the lake and yet the document gives abundant, repeated, and permissive consideration to development of the area.

As stated at the outset of my comments, I do not support westside development and feel comfortable stating that there will be strong and broad public opposition to it. I am terribly disappointed to be making these comments yet again after so many years. Very insulting is the glaring re-introduction of the very same Grizzly Ridge development proposal just to

the south of Invermere that was so recently rejected by the Board of Directors. On what grounds has the RDEK OCP effectively re-invited that proposal?



Virus-free. www.avg.com

Kris Belanger

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: June 23, 2019 1:53 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Kris Belanger; Susan Clovechok
Subject: RE: [REDACTED] LW draft OCP comments

Meredith,

Thank you for investing so much time in such a detailed break down of this issue. I agree with all of your criticism with regards to this current version of the OCP.

The development ringing the town of Invermere is being done without community vision, community demand or leadership by anyone other than the developer. The fact developer's representative was intimately involved in the drafting of these policies, months before the public ever saw them, and then the change in vision is being included in a document so large that it is very difficult for a lay citizen could reasonably dissect and get involved with and comment on in under one month is very concerning.

Over the past couple of years I have tried to share my desires to reduce sprawl of Invermere, the keep development within the boundaries of Invermere, to protect the environmental values and not have this large open space eroded. A large open space that adds so much the character and livability of our valley. I feel that my view point has largely been discounted as NIMBY by the RDEK, and that I was in a constant state of "negotiating" to minimize the negative effects of this seemingly inevitable development. At the start of the process I gathered over 30 residents of the Westside community for an open house at my house and to meet with Kris and the feedback was firmly against further development on these lands. There was a survey that had pro-development results, but there were large issues with the credibility of the results and the RDEK was not able to provide any data to show that the process had not been abused and the results manipulated.

I have been told by Andrew and Kris that any development still has to go through a public approval process and it can be stopped or adjusted there. The last land development application was stopped primarily because it was not supported in the OCP. If it is now in the OCP, does the RDEK open themselves up to legal liability if they deny the application? The developer can use the OCP to say there is a public mandate for development. This truly is the top of the slippery slope.

Kris and Susan,

This email is very blunt and to the point. I have invested a large amount of time in this process and do not feel that my concerns have been given the proper consideration. Do not discount a passionate and educated voice like [REDACTED] as being on the fringe, as it is not. You may not hear the masses rise up against this, but mostly because this document is so large and intimidating, and people are busy in their everyday lives. I shared the directions and the specific sections for comment with my Wednesday night bike group (a group of educated professionals); the feedback that I received was that it was too hard to understand and that I should write some emails explaining how it would affect them more specifically. If the "inevitable" development occurs, people will ask why did they let them do this, or who made this decision. But just like the large road cut up to Castlerock, the dangerous intersections on the highway, or the ugly Windermere storage bays, we will have to live with the consequences as residents and the developer will not be around to clean up the mess.

In my opinion we need to have a public meeting just about the Grizzly Ridge Policies. If there are good reasons for the development of these lands people need to hear them. There has to be something better than, "if the land owner expresses a desire to develop their land, we can't just ignore them".

Susan,

First let me say thank you for taking on this role as an RDEK Director. It is a thankless role and your commitment to the community is appreciated.

Now, I would like to ask you for some of leadership in this matter. If this is your vision for the community, please stand up and tell us why you feel this is best direction to go. Even though it is early in your term, this document may be one of the most impactful in your career as an RDEK director. You cannot vote to approve this at the RDEK table and not take responsibility for all of the OCP and its consequences. It may seem I am making a mountain out of a molehill to you, but the questions of if and how these properties are developed will affect my family everyday for the rest of my life.

There are some great improvements to the OCP, but this allowance for development is the most significant change. [REDACTED] has raised some very good points and I believe she deserves a detailed response, that [REDACTED] thoughts do represent a those of a large number of people in the valley, and that some of the contradictions in the OCP need to be addressed.

Yours truly,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From [REDACTED]
Sent: June 23, 2019 8:29 AM
Cc: 'Kris Belanger' <kbelanger@rdek.bc.ca>
Subject: RE: [REDACTED] LW draft OCP comments

Hi All. I forgot the crucial bit of information – where can YOU comment?

www.Engage.rdek.bc.ca

Comment period is open until July 10. Please send your comments as soon as possible. What a wonderful thing to do on this cool Sunday (hint hint 😊)

1. provide a summary statement about what you like and/or do not like in the draft OCP.
 - a. Then provide details. – if there are particular section that are of note, reference the section.
2. ***Send a copy of your comments by email to 20 friends in your contacts list and ask them to do the same.
 - a. This will ensure that you are part of getting the word out, AND has the magical benefit of making sure that you are respectful in your comments.

Thank you!!

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: June 22, 2019 4:19 PM
Cc: 'Kris Belanger' <kbelanger@rdek.bc.ca>
Subject: [REDACTED] LW draft OCP comments

Hi All.

First let me say that if you do not want to receive further correspondence from me about the current Lake Windermere OCP, please just send me an email and I will remove your name from my mailing list.

What follows is my review of the draft Lake Windermere OCP that was presented at the last public consultation meeting. I am profoundly concerned. Everything in *italics* is cited from the Draft OCP, with the section number provided. I will submit this formally via the engage.rdek.bc.ca platform.

I had hoped to have time to do a density calculation for westside development potential before submitting these notes, but have not been able to get to this.

I hope that the RDEK will provide the public with a basic calculation of max buildout potential under clearly stated illustrative assumptions.

Sincerely;

[REDACTED]

In short, I am opposed to all of the many and extensive policies in the draft OCP that overtly and indirectly allow for sprawling development (by any name) on the westside while compromising the ecological integrity and viability of the rich and rare natural resource that is the westside of Lake Windermere. This document is in many ways custom-crafted for westside sprawl in the best interests of a single large land owner. The OCP is fatally inconsistent, on the one hand claiming to champion environmental responsibility and value, while on the other hand very effectively undermining the possibility of maintaining those ecological values and resources into the future. The rationale for this is never made clear in the document – there is NO statement provided that there is any public demand for this type of development, and yet, there are whole sections of the OCP that support it. The introduction of “conservation subdivision design” is a poor effort to rationalize development that the public is not demanding in that face of a clear public demand for the very opposite – protection of the westside as a large landscape.

The details of my statement above are outlined below.

1.1.1 ...[this] document is intended to reflect the **collective** vision of the plan area for the future.

I do not agree that the draft reflects the collective vision with respect to the Westside. On this topic, I feel that the plan defers almost entirely to a vision of the future being driven by a single developer that I believe is still Grizzly Ridge. I am baffled as to why this deference has been given to the developer – at every single public process to date since the former Hoffert Properties were purchased by the current owner, the public in our area has spoken clearly that sprawl development that wraps around our community to the south and west is not in our best interest.

This section states further that “*RDEK Board has considered the interests of the individual landowners and residents within the plan area and balanced those interests with the needs of the community and region as a whole*”. I do not agree on this point with respect to the westside. I feel very strongly that the OCP has given a single large landowner a trump card that cancels out the public voice of the residents of the Lake Windermere Area.

1.1.8 Relationship to the District of Invermere

The OCP also establishes policies that recognize potential opportunities for boundary expansion by the District of Invermere.

Where the DoI Official Community plan references boundary expansion, it SPECIFICALLY and principally references the need to consider an Urban Containment Boundary, and states clearly that there are limited rationale that should be considered for expansion. It makes no reference to development of estate residential as a rationale to expand the boundary of the municipality. The draft Lake Windermere OCP language cited above seems to infer that the District of Invermere is seeking potential opportunities for boundary expansion, which is not the case.

1.1.9.(3) Westside

The owners represent a range of interests including conservation, resource management, development and agricultural interests.

I believe I am accurately aware of who the major land owners are and I am also aware that 3 have not been consulted directly by the RDEK about westside development. These three are also opposed to development on the wide-open spaces that is the westside of Lake Windermere, of the type allowed in this draft OCP.

3.0 Goals of the OCP

Of the list of 13 goals of the OCP, it is my assessment that the policies that have been proposed respecting development on the westside will negatively influence achievement of at least 6, and will positively influence only 1. The Other 6 are not influenced by, nor do they influence the westside.

- Westside development policies will negatively affect:
 - Supporting agriculture
 - Recognizing the environmental importance of lake Windermere
 - Maintaining ecosystem function including grasslands, sensitive habitat, and connectivity corridors
 - Recognize the risk of interface fire
 - Conserve cultural resources
 - Reduce greenhouse gas emissions
- It seems that the only overall OCP goal that could possibly be interpreted as supporting the policies that have been drafted that allow extensive development on the westside is:
 - *“Encourage residential development that reflects the diverse interests and lifestyles of resident and non-resident homeowners and recognizes the need for a variety of housing types”*

This policy seems custom crafted to allow for westside expansion and development. I ask, where is the overall housing goal that says “encourage residential development that meets the needs of the emerging workforce and families in the region, while also taking into consideration that not all residents are homeowners, and there is a devastating crisis in the housing market that makes it almost impossible find a place to rent affordably”?!

In short, in the goals of the OCP there is almost nothing that leads logically to the incredible breadth of permissive policies, exceptions, and loopholes that have been embedded throughout in support of westside expansion.

4.1 Residential land use, background

First paragraph: ***Throughout the planning process, residents and non-residents expressed a desire to see infill development or new construction adjacent to existing residential nodes. Infill housing options such as secondary suites are seen as one opportunity to potentially increase the availability of rental housing stock in the area without the need to develop and service bare land... When planning for new residential development, some principles were universally supported during public consultation for this plan: A mix of residential densities (single, two and multi-family); infill development; community water and sewer should be provided for existing and future resident; new residential developments should include opportunities for non-motorized transportation and establish non-motorized connection between communities, open space, recreational amenities and commercial services and the; rural character of the area should be preserved.***

I note that there is no universal support stated for development of large tracts of land outside of existing communities, but there is universal support stated for infill development. How is it then that the goals of the OCP gloss over this need completely, and that it seems to so strongly support the one kind of development that was NOT universally supported? This must be addressed by the Board.

4.3 (g) *Conservation Subdivision Design* has been entered into this document as if it is a well understood development typology that will somehow maintain the ecological values of the westside of the lake while allowing for (on page 15) that “*the number of parcels in development clusters should be approximately the same as the number of parcels that would be provided on the parent parcel through a conventional rural subdivision*”. What exactly IS conservation subdivision design? I have studied with the author of the design concept – but I don’t believe that most people in this valley know, nor, likely, do the board members – how is it be assessed? – there is no “develop a CSD policy assessment process” noted in the implementation plan for the OCP – it is just assumed that everyone knows and should accept that when the developer applies to the RDEK for subdivision approval and the RDEK wants to allow development on the westside it will somehow be a “conservation” subdivision, and we should just trust that the astounding ecological values on the westside will be left intact at the hands of a developer who, to date, has actively denigrated the very ecological values we are being asked to assume they will “developprotect”. This is, to be blunt, entirely in-credible.

4.3 (5) Westside

(a) any policy that begins with the word “despite” should be examined closely. In this case, the word despite fatally undermines the stated 120 hectare parcel minimum for the westside and lays out 2.5 pages of exceptions to that rule, with 1.5 pages overtly pertaining to land where 120 hectare parcels are possible. Section 4.3 (5)c begins by stating the amazing ecological values and sensitivity of the land in question, and then goes on to state “*...Rezoning may be supported in this area if the proponent can demonstrate how development impacts, traffic concerns and existing recreational potential is maintained and enhanced through application of the following...*”. The land in question is the size of Invermere! By protecting some viewsapes, providing a big road and some trails, not developing in undevelopable sections (!), providing a report that promises that the development will not destroy Invermere’s water supply, and giving a bit of free stuff that we will decide about later, the developer wins the right to vastly transform the future of this region permanently and forever, despite the fact that there is no visible public or market demand for what the developer proposes to offer. This section even goes so far as to show the developer the path to success – Conservation Subdivision Design!! If you call it CSD, surely we the public will say yes. But we are not saying yes. We are still saying no.

6.3.(1)(b) Agricultural Land use. *Fragmentation or parcelization of agricultural lands in the plan area is generally not supported.*

This is an example of where the document indirectly undermines the policies elsewhere around ecological integrity etc.. The use of the word “generally” allows ample room for interpreting this policy to mean that parcelization of large tracts of land is really an option that is very much on the table. Why not just say it is “not” supported, and require developers to make the case, do the agricultural consultation, and CONVINCE the people of this region that their plans do not, in fact adversely impact ag values?

7.3 (2) The policies in this section on collaborative planning for locating a viable light industrial land base are very positive.

9.0 Open Space recreation and trails (OSRT)

There is a clearly stated public desire for recreational trails in the region. This OCP draft directly references the opportunities associated with the Westside Legacy Trail (I think it has a different name as a result of sponsorship and should be properly identified in the OCP), the Old Coach Greenway, Windermere beach Park, Cross Road Ball Park, and communities along the east side of lake Windermere. Appropriately, there is NO mention of developing new facilities on the westside of the lake, however, the westside development policies themselves seem to indicate that OSRT development is on the table there. Instead, what about highlighting the westside, conservation based recreation opportunities that are already existent on both public and private lands such as through NCC, the Nature Trust, and SRL, as well as one amazing provincial park site. None of these amenities

have required that we trade development rights at the expense of ecological integrity in order to achieve some trails. There is AMPLE recreation on the Westside and grizzly ridge recreation “opportunities” come at too high a price.

11. Environmental considerations

This section seems well thought out at first glance, until it is read with the westside development policies close at hand, and the caveats are properly understood. The language in this section is inherently permissive of development – simply stating that something is been measured, mapped, and recognized as having ecological value will not protect it. We must also say that we must not, except in the most extraordinary circumstances, allow for degradation of our remaining intact ecosystems. **This section does not meaningfully or effectively impede development in ESAs.**

For example: section 11.1(2)c talks about maintaining habitat connectivity, and very next paragraph at (3)a begins “*where intensive development is proposed in a wildlife corridor...*” again – this lacks credibility. This policy statement opens a wildlife/human interaction AND wildfire nightmare! Under what conditions would the board be willing to consider “intensive development” in a wildlife corridor, for goodness sake?! Why bother mapping the corridors at all? Then, just to confuse matters, just 5 paragraphs later (f), the document swings back to say “*future land uses should promote habitat connectivity and discourage fragmentation of contiguous ecosystems*”. So are we developing the corridors or not? Well, just a few paragraphs later, we see why it will be ok to develop the corridors... “because “*education programs such as WildSafe are encouraged*”. Thank goodness. Once we put the people with the wildlife, then the people can learn about how not to get in the wildlife’s way.

Simply put, the number one strategy for reducing wildlife-human conflict is not to develop in wildlife corridors. Later, at section (o), where a policy is established stating that “*preservation of wildlife connectivity corridors is encouraged and supported by the following:*” the third and fourth sub-policies talk about how extensive development *should* be avoided, but if it can’t, it should be done so as to “limit the impediment of wildlife movement”. There is a profound and inherent contradiction in this section about environmental considerations. If this section is intended to limit development in ecological valuable and sensitive areas, it is unlikely to be effective, and is more than likely to allow room for people to find ways to continue business as usual development. Ironically, section 11.2(1) states clearly that the number one threat to biodiversity is habitat loss. This document doesn’t really seem to be bothered by this fact – it is designed to get around it. Section 11.4 highlights the contiguous ecosystems on the westside of the lake that allow critical habitat connectivity from north to south and from east to west. So WHY, for goodness sake, so much deference to the one developer who stands willing and able to destroy these values?

DPA #2 Protection of ESAs **This section does not meaningfully or effectively impede development in ESAs**

The objective of Development Permit Area #2 is the protection, preservation, restoration and enhancement of the significant ecosystems, habitats and features identified in 19.3(6)(a)(i)-(vi) and on Schedules I1 to I4... Followed by the caveat that “*The intent is not to preclude all development in these areas, but to provide notice that the areas include unique characteristics that warrant special review and consideration and to ensure appropriate mitigation measures are prescribed where appropriate.*” Essentially, business as usual. Or more cynically, as long as a QEP can provide a report that the land on either side of the road you pushed in really no longer has ecological values, you can go ahead and develop – you just need an appropriately named Development Permit first. Again, the ESA DPA section is fatally undermined by shoulds and mays, and is terribly lacking in should nots and may nots. Given that it has been identified in the document, for example, that grasslands are critically endangered ecosystems, it is disheartening to find policies beginning “If development is proposed within grassland ecosystems...” and ending “...should minimize negative impacts”. How about “development in grassland ecosystems is strongly discouraged and there must be no net negative loss of the current extent of grasslands in the plan area as a result of human development”?

Later in this DPA, we see a strange collision of wildsafe and firesmart policy failures: at section (e) there is yet another allowance that there could be extensive development in a wildlife corridor, but this time pruning of underbrush and removal of forest cover is discouraged to support wildlife movement, thereby exacerbating the risk of BOTH of wildlife/human conflict and wildfire in new residential areas.

At section (d) we see allowance for the possibility of road building and industrial activity in mountain goat habitat – again the language is permissive, not prohibitive.

With respect to the deferral to QEPs, I would like to reflect back to you a brief story about a land use application that came across my desk years ago. Upon having been directed to provide an environmental impact assessment report for a proposed development, I received from the developer's QEP a 1 page report stating, literally, that after the property was developed, it would no longer have ecological values and wildlife should be prevented from accessing the property in order to minimize human-wildlife conflict. The property in question was ultimately approved under similarly permissive ESA policies, and was, sadly, formerly grassland and mixed IDF, as well as a mountain goat corridor. If this LW Draft OCP is going to defer so clearly to a QEP, the expectations for ecological PROTECTION must be far more clearly and prohibitively stated.

Finally, Implementation Strategy, section 20.5: I do not see any staff action identified to handle the major development implications of development on the westside – a tract of land equal in size to the District of Invermere. I have to assume that once an application comes in for this massive land development area, the implications and work load will be handled on an *ad hoc* basis. I believe that the rationale for NOT including Westside development in the implementation strategy despite the VERY permissive nature of the document in this regard, is that there is no public mandate for allocating staff and financial resources to the task. All of the other projects identified in the implementation strategy have a clear public mandate that has been developed and matured over time. No similar mandate exists for the Westside of the lake and yet the document gives abundant, repeated, and permissive consideration to development of the area.

As stated at the outset of my comments, I do not support westside development and feel comfortable stating that there will be strong and broad public opposition to it. I am terribly disappointed to be making these comments yet again after so many years. Very insulting is the glaring re-introduction of the very same Grizzly Ridge development proposal just to the south of Invermere that was so recently rejected by the Board of Directors. On what grounds has the RDEK OCP effectively re-invited that proposal?



Virus-free. www.avg.com

Kris Belanger

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: June 28, 2019 3:12 PM
To: Kris Belanger; Susan Clovechok
Subject: Lake Windermere OCP

Dear Kris and Susan

Please consider the following huge concerns I have over 2019 Lake Windermere OCP – specifically regarding the Westside.

The OCP's support of potential development on large tracts of Westside land (that have historically been highly valued and maintained in keeping with their undisturbed natural beauty) is nothing short of frightening. The ecologically rich and rare natural resources of this area play an integral role in the health and welfare of our valley community and should NOT be compromised. The 2008 OCP definitively recognized the importance of keeping the west side as natural and rural as possible, and supported this mandate. Why this about face? What has changed?

Correct me if I am wrong, but I believe that a single large landowner (who is persistent in his quest for development) is succeeding in wearing down the guiding principals of the RDEK. In 2017 this landowner applied to amend two bylaws on the 23 acre parcel (2019 OCP - Westside - 5 (d) figure 8). The RDEK in its wisdom listened to the advisory board and the heard the public opposition, both of which were loud and clear. They voted down the bylaw amendment which would have allowed the developer to subdivide his 23 acres into six smaller acreage lots. Well done.

Fast forward two years and according to the current OCP Draft -
the rezoning of lands shown in figure 8 may be supported subject to the following;
(iv) The minimum parcel size permitted by the rezoning is 1 ha.

This supports a subdivision of up to 10 smaller acreage lots on the same property that was recently turned down for subdivision of 6 lots.

As I mentioned earlier, I simply cannot comprehend how this has come to pass. Westside sprawl for the benefit of one individual is both frightening and potentially devastating to the values of our community. It is crucial to stop this process now or the Westside will surely be facing *Death by a Thousand Cuts* in years to come.

The RDEK has a chance to get this right for once and for all. Please listen, act now, and put ***The C (Community) voice back in the OCP.***

Thank you.

[REDACTED]

Kris Belanger

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: July 3, 2019 4:02 PM
To: Kris Belanger
Subject: Lake Windermere OCP
Attachments: Opentrails Map GRL PL.pdf; Opentrails Map Juniper Heights PL.pdf

Kris,

We have reviewed the Lake Windermere OCP with [REDACTED] and provide the following comments:

1. We have proceeded through this OCP process with the understanding that the RDEK was obtaining balanced input from the steering committee and utilizing this input to assist the RDEK in preparing a document that provided consistent planning policy across the plan area. However, upon review of the draft document, this does not appear to be the case. Two examples:
 - a. The Juniper Heights area has been considered for development for over 40 years, contains significant topographic constraints and is located adjacent to an existing residential community with known water issues. In addition, there are well known and heavily utilized hike/bike trail on the property. This property however must only meet four minor items to be considered for rezoning. This clearly demonstrates that the RDEK's and the steering committee's focus is not on the entire plan area but is simply to see no development on the Grizzly Ridge lands. If all properties were considered equally, this property would be subject to the same conditions as the Grizzly Ridge lands – water, sewer, conservation design, trail retention, open space preservation, etc. We have attached a plan from Openstreets.org showing the trails within the Juniper Heights area. This plan also shows the topography at the rear of the property.
 - b. The Lower Toby Benches area has seen a number of development enquiries over the years and the previous OCP spoke to this area. The current OCP contains no language whatsoever about this subarea. We interpret this to mean that this area is open to development consistent with the general policies of the residential section of the OCP. If this is not the case, specific policies restricting development in this area should be included in the OCP. Policies similar to 4.3(4)(a) would be appropriate for this area: *"Subdivision is generally not supported in the Windermere East subarea, with the exception of those parcels specifically identified within this plan and subdivision for a relative as per the minimum parcel size requirements established in the zoning bylaw and Local Government Act."* How this subarea could be left out of the OCP entirely when the Grizzly Ridge lands are so heavily scrutinized leads one to believe that this is simply a case of NIMBYism from the steering committee with regard to the Grizzly Ridge lands. The Lower Toby Bench area is highly visible from the wetlands and development within this area would be, we believe, quite contentious within the local community.

We continue to have concerns with those portions of the OCP which deal with the Grizzly Ridge lands. However, we have only commented on the following items we believe are essential to resolve prior to adoption of the OCP:

2. Section 4.3(5)(c) regarding the lands south of Castlerock. We fail to understand why the RDEK is not supportive of some subdivision of these lands, regardless of their inclusion in the District of Invermere. It remains the property owner's intent to successfully annex these lands into Invermere and we will proceed in that direction in the future. However, should annexation not be successful, some development of these lands with larger lots (ie. 1 acre plus) may make sense based on the existing road infrastructure available. We request that the RDEK

simply change the words “generally not supported “ in this clause to “may be supported”. We would also appreciate confirmation that “single family density” refers to R1 residential uses and does not include Small Holdings residential uses. We believe that this wording is suitably descriptive of the development densities supported in the RDEK.

3. Section 4.3(5)(d) regarding the Grizzly Ridge lands on located Westside Road:

- a. The plan indicates that the RDEK supports this area for development of lots no smaller than 1.0ha. This should be indicated on Plan D5 by designating the area as SH – Small Holdings.
- b. We believe that use of adverbs such as “strongly” is unnecessary in a policy document such as this OCP. (Section 4.3(5)(d)(iii)).

4. Section 4.3(5)(e) regarding the Grizzly Ridge lands west of Castle Rock and Pineridge:

- a. It has been suggested previously that Section 4.3(5)(e) is a “preamble” to the clauses below it. We do not read the OCP in this manner and do not believe that other will either. As such, the clause should not contain language that is opinionated or emotional and should be factually correct.
 - i. Paddy Ryan Lakes are not within the plan area.
 - ii. The description of trails as “well loved” is unnecessary.

We continue to believe that the language provided previously would eliminate the issues with this clause and would not change to overall meaning of the section: *“The lands shown outlined in bold in Figure 9 include areas such as Toby Creek escarpment, the Goldie Creek watershed and Ben Abel Creek that require protection and areas that support historic recreational uses by the local community (such as mountain bike trails and walking trails). Rezoning of these lands is supported if the applicant demonstrates that development impacts, traffic concerns and recreational access are maintained through application of the following:”*

- b. Section 4.3(5)(e)(vii) states: *“Retention of the existing trail network to the greatest degree possible and the provision of new trails where it is not possible to retain existing routes. It must be demonstrated how the natural character will be maintained for trail users. Trails must be for public use in perpetuity through the use of a Sec. 219 Covenant, statutory right-of-way, transfer of ownership to the District of Invermere or another legal instrument amenable to the RDEK.”*

We find this clause unnecessarily ambiguous and open to wide interpretation. Use of the words “to the greatest degree possible” does not define what is actually required by the landowner. We would prefer some definition of what the RDEK is seeking on this matter. We have attached a plan that shows most (but not all) of the trails within the Grizzly Ridge lands (the plan area is shown with a yellow tone). Retention of this trail network in its current configuration and in its entirety would preclude any residential development on the lands.

We also question the legal process for transferring ownership to the District of Invermere and why ownership by the RDEK is not considered as an option.

We believe that the following language would eliminate the ambiguity of this section: *“Retention of a mountain biking and walking trail network within the area shown outlined in bold in Figure 9. Retention of a trail network shall include protection of lands for a meaningful looping trail system, including protection of lands as required for a realignment of portions of some trails as required to permit future subdivision of the lands, while maintaining the natural character of the trail corridor. The retained trail network shall be protected in perpetuity for public use using a Sec. 219 Covenant, statutory right-of-way, transfer of ownership to a local government or another legal instrument acceptable to the RDEK. The*

construction of trails, maintenance of the protected trail corridor and indemnity from damages shall not be the responsibility of the landowner."

- c. Section 4.3(5)(e)(viii)(A) states: *"A minimum of 50% of the buildable area of the parent parcel must be retained as undeveloped space and not parcelized;"*

We find this clause to be unclear, but more importantly, we believe that this requirement is unprecedented in the RDEK and is not a reasonable requirement for low-density development to occur on the lands. The term "buildable area" is not defined in the OCP and is open to wide interpretation. Additionally, use of the term "parcelized" is somewhat confusing. All lots, whether a residential lot or a public park are "parcels" of land and must be defined as a "lot" or parcel on a legal plan.

We have reviewed the areas available for development versus the areas likely required for protection of ESA, creeks, trails, etc and believe that the following is appropriate based on the total protected areas. We also believe that the ability to protect a percentage of the required lands within private lots is appropriate. We do not believe that there is a precedent in the RDEK for the level of protection being requested for these lands and that this is a realistic compromise for all parties.

We believe that a clause as follows would reduce the ambiguity in this section and address a realistic open space requirement: *"A minimum of 30% of the area outlined in bold in Figure 9 shall be retained in its natural condition. This may be achieved with covenants on private lands (ie. covenant(s) limiting tree removal and soil removal and restricting buildings within the covenant area) or through protection of lands with a Sec. 219 Covenant, statutory right-of-way, transfer of ownership to a local government or another legal instrument acceptable to the RDEK. No more than 30% of the lands required for protection shall be contained within subdivided residential lots. Greenspace protection measures shall be implemented on a pro-rata basis as lands are developed unless a comprehensive greenspace protection plan is prepared by the landowner to the satisfaction of the RDEK;"*

- d. Section 4.3(5)(e)(viii)(E) states: *"The number of parcels in development clusters should be approximately the same as the number of parcels that would be provided on the parent parcel through a conventional rural subdivision. This is achieved by permitting smaller parcels in development clusters than would be provided in a conventional rural subdivision;"*

It was demonstrated at the recent public meeting that this clause is unclear and open to wide speculation. We believe that more clearly defining the RDEK's goals with regard to density is required. We would also support inclusion of a residential density cap for the lands shown in Figure 9.

"The number and size of residential development parcels permitted shall be established using conservation design principles. To achieve this, the proponent shall determine overall density on the basis of a "yield plan" consisting of conventional rural lot and road layouts. The calculated density determined is then redistributed using conservation design principles using smaller lot sizes to achieve the same overall density as a conventional subdivision while protecting greenspace and environmentally important areas as per the requirements of Section (c)(viii)(A). Regardless of the yield determined, no more than 150 residential lots shall be created within the area shown outlined in bold on Figure 9"

- e. Section 4.3(5)(e)(viii)(F) states: *"To achieve higher densities in the development clusters, provision of community sewer and water services are strongly encouraged"*.

We believe that this clause may cause some confusion. The densities proposed for the area shown in Figure 9 are not at a level that demands municipal servicing. If the densities proposed did reach the level of requiring municipal servicing this would raise the question of annexation as community water and sewer would typically be provided by a municipality. We do not believe that this is the intent of the

RDEK. As such, we believe that General policy 4.3(1)(a) which states “*New multi-parcel subdivisions of single family or greater density should be serviced by community water and sewer systems*” serves to address this item and it is not necessary to restate it in this section.

We trust that the preceding is helpful as you finalize wording for the Lake Windermere OCP.

Thanks,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Invermere, BC V0A 1K0

[REDACTED]

Confidentiality Warning: This message and any attachments are intended only for the use of the intended recipient(s), are confidential, and may be privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, retransmission, conversion to hard copy, copying, circulation or other use of this message and any attachments is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail, and delete this message and any attachments from your system. Thank you.

Kris Belanger

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: July 7, 2019 2:20 PM
To: Kris Belanger; krisbelanger@rdek.bc.ca
Subject: Lake Windermere OCP

Dear RDEK directors,

First, let me say that it's a good thing to have the OCP for our area updated by this 2019 OCP process. I also realize that the process will not and can not please the entire larger community. Thank you also for hosting open houses and for providing opportunities for feedback.

An OCP provides "the longer term vision for the community ". I would assume that means for the immediate community in question or the community most affected by the outcomes of an OCP.

If this is the case then I hope that the RDEK will listen carefully to those members of the community in the Westside area of Lake Windermere, south of Invermere, as their concerns about the significant subdivision of land to the east of the Westside road just south of Invermere, are definitely warranted.

I recall, years ago, talking to Calgarians that I met while out walking the Hoffert lands that had just been acquired by Grizzly Ridge Estates and hearing from them that they were recent investors in the land in question. They were obviously speculating on the property in question but it became clear to me that they didn't understand either the subdivision steps necessary in this part of BC, the status of the land in question or that they had been misinformed when it came to what they were getting into.

Later, it became even more apparent that investor "due diligence" regarding this land acquisition had not been adequately carried out as it was obvious that expectations did not match reality and that things were not turning out for the investors as they had hoped. In other words the 'slam dunk' regarding the subdivision of the property was not materializing.

I sincerely hope that the RDEK in supporting the subdivision in question has not simply been worn down by one developer's error in judgement and is now compounding that bad decision. One bad or flawed decision should not lead to a situation where by an entire community pays the price of one persons or a small group of people's lack of return on investment...because that's what all this ultimately boils down to.

If Invermere were bursting at the seams or if Invermere had been sufficiently 'infilled' at this point in time or if Invermere were seeking land for affordable housing for residents to live and work in the area then I would likely feel very different.

The RDEK is opening the door to Westside sprawl at this juncture, not only by providing the key but by also turning that key and giving that door a solid push!

I urge the RDEK to carefully consider the ramifications of the decisions that will soon be made by those in positions of power and authority and acting on behalf of those already living in the areas covered by the upcoming Official Community Plan.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPad

Kris Belanger

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: July 8, 2019 2:46 PM
To: Kris Belanger
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: LWOCP 5.3(3) (d)

Dear Mr. Belanger:

I am writing this letter to express my concern (yet again) regarding the proliferation of storage facilities in Windermere. The draft LWOCP has a policy that removes mini-storage, boat and RV storage from the list of permitted uses in the C-2 Commercial Zone.

It has come to my attention that a new policy has been recently added that exempts this requirement from a parcel of land on North Street at the "Entrance Way" to Windermere. The existing storage facility was described as an 'accessory building' to the home it is beside. This use of language was deceptive. The landowner wants to build even more storage facilities on the property under 5.3(3)d. I believe we as residents are owed an apology and an explanation for this new change of policy. It really must be reversed!

Public input re storage facilities is clear. They belong in light industrial zones; not on Hwy 93/95; not on North Street and not on the road into Invermere.

No other community has had to put up with this storage facility eyesore! Planners and our elected officials appear to be turning a blind eye to our concerns. The issue is 'achingly' simple. Storage facilities belong in a light industrial zone.

Windermere residents and the Windermere Community Association are reaching out to the Ministry of Highways and Infrastructure and others to find the resources to create a more attractive impression of Windermere.

Policy 5.3(3) (d) actively challenges this vision. These 'facilities' create no jobs, do not cultivate a sense of community and mitigate the efforts of existing small businesses that are making improvements to their frontages.

On behalf of the WCA and the larger community of Windermere please delete Policy 5.3(3)d from the draft LWOCP.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Windermere, BC

Sent from my iPad

Kris Belanger

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: July 8, 2019 9:06 PM
To: Kris Belanger
Subject: Lake Windermere DRAFT OCP Comment

Dear Mr. Belanger, Ms. Clovechok, and the RDEK Board,

It 's my privilege to be able to share my opinions with you regarding the draft Lake Windermere Official Community Plan, and I don't take this lightly.

As you may know, I'm a [REDACTED] of Wildsight Invermere. You can refer to the many points that we've outlined on our website (<https://secure.wildsight.ca/windermeresprawl>) that deal with the specific shortfalls of the OCP as they relate to Westside Lake Windermere. Please refer to them. I agree with them all.

In my comments here, I would rather offer you a broader, global perspective. Having travelled the mountain world extensively, my experiences have forged a genuine appreciation and personal conviction that our greatest assets here in the East Kootenay, and more specifically here in the headwaters of the Columbia River that include Lake Windermere and the Columbia Wetlands, include our natural environment and the ecological services they offer.

We are in a unique position in the upper Columbia Valley because we haven't yet become another over developed, traffic dense, over heated Okanagan ... (and, by some miracle, and in spite of the sexy branding "It's time to Unwind", Invermere has blissfully avoided becoming another beleaguered Canmore). But we're at a tipping point; the tendency for more development at any cost puts this threat very much on my mind.

Issues like climate change, water availability, affordable housing, agricultural viability, food security, and good jobs all factor in to my assessment of the draft OCP. This is why I'm opposed to many of the statements in the OCP that relate to Westside Lake Windermere.

As a concerned member of the community, I appreciate your efforts to review the Lake Windermere Official Community Plan and I hope the results of this will bring forward better protections for the west side of Lake Windermere.

As we place more value on our communities, ecosystems, wildlife and creative solutions over shortsighted development, I guarantee that we will thrive.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]
Wilmer, BC V0A1K5
Canada

Kris Belanger

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: July 9, 2019 8:23 AM
To: Kris Belanger
Subject: Storage Facilities in LWOPC Area

Good Morning Kris

As a resident of Windermere I would like to comment on the issue of Boat/RV/ Self Storage in the LWOPC Area.

Residents do not want RV/Boat/Self Storage along Highway 93/95 or at the entrances to Invermere or Windermere. The visual impact is very industrial and not appropriate for entrances to communities that have building schemes that homeowners have to adhere to make their properties look pleasing and cohesive. Seeing Industrial nodes close to residential areas gives the impression there is no OCP in place and that any business can decide what is appropriate according to their needs and wants.

First impressions are lasting, let's keep Industrial locations like Self Storage, Boat/RV Storage etc. in Industrial Zones where they belong.

I have read the Draft LWOPC document. The people have spoken, please listen!

Thank you
[REDACTED]

Kris Belanger

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: July 9, 2019 2:17 PM
To: Kris Belanger
Subject: comments on Lake Windermere draft OCP

3(1) Goal 1. I strongly believe that this goal should explicitly attach priority to meeting the needs of valley permanent residents over the needs of wealthy non-residents. Without such priority, the added profitability of expensive and luxury homes will always result in the needs of non-residents being met while severe housing shortages persist for working class residents. Furthermore, property developers not only seek to meet the needs of existing non-residents, but market the valley in such a way as to perpetuate the arrival of waves of new non-residents while resident needs remain unmet. Please send a strong signal in this goal that residential needs of residents is the top priority; after all, without the local residents how are the non-resident homeowners going to receive the services they've come to expect?

3(5) I strongly support the objective of connecting neighbourhoods with non-motorized trails.

3(6) I support providing public access opportunities for non-motorized uses only. Our lake is absolutely overrun with motor boats to the point where I no longer enjoy going to the lake in summer. This plan needs to recognize the need for a cap on motorized use of the lake, and the way to do this is not to keep attempting to provide access to meet demand as non-resident boaters keep pouring into the valley. I support the stewardship portion of this goal, however.

3(7)(11) These need to be a top priority.

4.1 Regarding the question of whether developers should provide improvements to boat launch facilities... the last thing this lake needs is more and improved public boat launch facilities. Instead, any new developments should only be approved with the stipulation that there will be no boat facilities provided.

4.2(1) As stated above, the needs of resident homeowners need to be prioritized ahead of non-residents, otherwise we will continue to see expensive, luxury homes built for non-residents, and affordable housing in existing communities will continue to be neglected.

4.2(2) I do not see a convincing case in this plan that there is a need for new rural residential development. Infill development within existing communities can provide sufficient opportunities. There is no way to create new rural residential developments without having a substantial and unnecessary impact on the remaining ecological value of our rural areas.

4.2 There needs to be an additional objective here that provides that all future development, to the extent possible, will be within and adjacent to existing communities, rather than dispersed through the rural areas, in order to reduce urban and suburban "sprawl", maintain ecological function of rural areas, maintain viewsapes, and maintain availability of compatible recreational activities.

4.3.1(e) I agree with development of internal non-motorized trails, however, these need to be designated as open to the public. It is extremely unfortunate that in some developments (eg, Lakeview Meadows) the pathway system is off-limits to the public. Additionally, some recognition needs to be given to the fact that walking and cycling are often not compatible depending on terrain, pathway surface, volume of use, and cycling behaviour.

4.3(1)(f) As stated above, Lake Windermere is already filled to the brim with motor boats that are becoming larger and more numerous each year. We cannot simply keep providing new access and facilities to accommodate more and more motorboats. A better approach would be: (1) not to allow more residential parcels if those are going to create more demand for boating and access. (2) use amenity contributions to create/upgrade/convert new or existing public access into non-motorized access and use only. (3) develop education and awareness programs for the public, visitors, developers, and the real estate industry to promote non-motorized use of the lake only. A majority of lake users are non-motorized users, and yet only something like 1% of the lake is available exclusively for non-motorized recreation. This needs to be turned around.

4.3 (1)(g)(iii)iv) Agreed – important.

4.3 (2) Windermere North. This seems to be a better choice of a residential area than rural areas, since it's embedded within existing residential and commercial areas, except that (a) as an undeveloped area it may support ecological

processes that occur in adjacent woodlands and Copper Point golf course, and it may serve a role as part of a north-south wildlife corridor. Of particular concern is the high suitability of the area as habitat for endangered BC badgers. See the following for additional information:

<http://jem-online.org/index.php/jem/article/viewFile/566/500>

4.3 (3) (c) The parcels mapped in figure 4 run along the north bank of Windermere Creek and would be a natural area for wildlife movement and habitat. This is another reason, along with agricultural objectives, not to allow intensive development of these lots.

4.3 (5)(a)(b) and (c) Agree strongly that subdivision within the Westside subarea should not be approved. The lands in Figure 7, 8, and 9 are too far outside of existing undeveloped lands within the District of Invermere and should not be developed, at least not until there is a much higher utilization of lands within Invermere. Developing/subdividing these parcels would violate ecological planning principles and would propagate “suburban sprawl”.

4.3 (5)(d) The lands shown in figure 8 should not be rezoned or subdivided. These lands are close to the lake and, notwithstanding the railway, provide support to shoreline ecological processes. For example, breeding waterbirds likely have nests in the adjacent forest area. Furthermore, the proximity of this area to the lake would create demands for lake access and the addition of still more motorboats to an already ridiculously busy lake.

5.1 I agree with many of the views apparently expressed during the previous public engagement process. However, I do want to point out that while there was a preference expressed for “tourism-oriented services”, in fact tourism-related activities can have serious environmental impacts unless carefully and strictly managed, particularly if those activities result in large numbers of people being placed into sensitive areas, or simply dispersed broadly such that wildlife have fewer places to avoid human activity.

5.2(2) As per my comment on 5.1, I don’t agree that the plan should give such carte blanche support to commercial recreation and tourism land uses. At the very least, re-word this to state “Commercial recreation and tourism land uses within the plan area MAY be supported where compatible with adjacent land uses AND where impacts on wildlife and ecosystems are non-existential or minimal.”

5.2(2)(e)(ii) Would point out that a wide range of tourism activities describe themselves as “ecotourism”, even those with significant and serious environmental impacts. Oftentimes, tourism operators are unaware that activities that place large numbers of people on the landscape have serious deleterious disturbance effects on wildlife, even if the activities appear to be creating no physical damage.

5.2(2)(h) I believe that we shouldn’t be having commercial development sprawl along highway 93/95. Businesses that provide essential services could be permitted, but only within existing commercial /industrial nodes.

6.3(1)(i) I support the existence of the ALR and most of the provisions of 6.2(1). However, I think RDEK should be careful about generally supporting Licenses of Occupation for grazing tenures on Crown land, particularly new ones. I would suggest rewording this clause to “New and continued Licenses of Occupation for grazing tenures on Crown Land are generally supported provided the tenures are not associated with wildlife fencing and the lands are not prime ungulate winter range”.

6.3(1)(m) I suggest this be changed to: “Ecosystem restoration efforts that enhance grasslands and rangelands and reduce impacts from motorized vehicles are supported...”

6.3(2)(d) Yes!

9.1 The ecological impacts of motorized recreation are enormous, including soil damage, vegetation damage, disturbance of wildlife, spread of non-native plants, and air pollution including contributions to greenhouse gas emissions. There are also serious social impacts including conflicts with non-motorized users and noise impacts on adjacent neighbourhoods. Most motorized recreation in the Columbia Valley is by non-residents from Alberta who either own or rent second homes here. RDEK needs to take significant steps, working with the provincial government, to reduce the prevalence and impacts of motorized recreation within the plan area. In Alberta the government has wisely taken steps to substantially reduce the areas in which motorized recreation vehicles can be used. However, this means that more and more Albertans are coming to our unregulated crown lands to use their motorized toys. This plan should be taking active steps to reduce motorized recreation, not simply turning a blind eye to it. Continuation and even growth of motorized recreation in our valley is simply not compatible with ecological objectives and with the plan’s commitment to reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

9.2 At the very least, you need an additional objective in here to promote non-motorized recreation as a healthy and less environmentally damaging form of recreation, but preferably to include closing lands to off-road motorized recreation.

9.3(1) Please note that there are dangers inherent in creating trail systems in which cyclists and walkers use the same paths. I think the plan needs to address somewhere that these safety concerns, as well as social considerations, need to be considered. The cycling community is very well organized and active in planning processes, with the result that often the needs of walkers/hikers are not fully considered in trail planning.

9.3(6) As mentioned above, more lake access needs to be dedicated to the majority of users who do not use motorized craft. New and changed access via right-of-ways should only be for non-motorized uses.

10.2 Please add the following objective: “(5) Over time phase out private docks and boat houses that encroach below the high water mark, with the ultimate aim of achieving a shoreline that is accessible to all.” The first step should be to stop allowing new private docks and not to approve changes to existing docks.

10.2 Another objective is needed that recognizes that it is completely unsustainable for developers to keep marketing the lake to boaters, leading to a steady growth in the size and number of boats each year. We have to figure out how to stop the growth of motorboating on the lake, and fast.

10.3 (1) (2) I agree wholeheartedly with this.

10.3 (4) No, this only encourages the marketing of new developments to the motor boat crowd. Developers need to start telling buyers that there is no on-site boat storage, and that it is going to be difficult to keep a boat here.

10.3 (5) I agree 100% with this but can it explicitly state that this includes docks? Some of the ones either side of Kinsmen’s beach are among the worst examples of docks preventing or impeding public access, but I am sure there are many more examples on the Windermere side.

10.3 (13) Are these “established individual moorages” in Rushmere currently legally authorized? If not, and these are just the result of people constructing docks without permits, I think it should be required that a group moorage be created or, better still, remove the nonconforming docks.

11.1 Wildlife Habitat.

- Glad to see the considerations for mountain goats in Toby Creek, long overdue. I am concerned that mountain bikers in particular will be reluctant to alter their use of this area to accommodate mountain goats, however.

- The issue of endangered BC badgers is serious enough that I think you should include a paragraph about the issue in the background (11.1 (1)).

- Bighorn sheep occur on the east side of the valley in the Shuswap-Windermere Creek areas, and occasionally come right down to highway 93/95. Of particular concern is whether land owners within or adjacent to wild sheep range keep domestic livestock such as domestic sheep or goats. These animals have the potential to spread catastrophic disease to wild sheep, a major cause of the decline of wild sheep populations in North America in the 20th century. A consideration for agricultural lands, particularly those east of highway 93/95 is whether they would or could be used for domestic sheep. This clearly need to be prohibited. You may want to talk to the provincial wildlife section in Cranbrook about this issue.

11.1 (3)(h) This statement doesn’t seem as strongly worded as previous paragraphs regarding the potential impacts of wildlife fencing. Note that another impact if wildlife fencing occurs near roads or highways is that wildlife crossing the road can be blocked by the fence and then “bounce back” onto the road and get struck by vehicles. Also, fencing that is tall but not quite tall enough to exclude all wildlife can end up causing separation of family groups (ie, mother and young).

11.3 Surely this section should mention the water quality issues around having hundreds of high powered motorboats on the lake each day, and identify the problem that continued growth of this activity will lead to the worsening of the situation.

12.2 Is there such a thing as an Interface Fire Hazard plan for the whole plan area? Do we know what the risks are to communities and rural areas from potential wildfire, and have priority areas for fire-smarting been established? Are there some rural locations where the risk of wildfire (and the cost of fuel modification) is simply too high to allow development?

14.1 A few years ago I visited Lake Lucerne in Switzerland. This beautiful lake is larger than Lake Windermere and has a vastly larger human population around it and in the region. On a hot summer day I remarked to my hosts that I was amazed and delighted to see such a beautiful lake and almost no recreational boating or jet-skiing use. The reason for this, I was told, was that there was so little public access to the lake. This should be a lesson to us; if we build access, they will come. If we are concerned about the ecological, social, and safety aspects of so much motorized use on Lake Windermere, then the last thing we should be doing is to provide more and larger boat launches, marinas, etc. We need to start moving away from pandering to the minority of lake users who operate motor boats.

14.3(3) If these rights-of-way provide motor boat launches, then yes, closure of them should be supported, or at least conversion of them to non-motorized use only.

16 Greenhouse Gas Emissions. I support the objectives here, but I think any of the suggested reductions to emissions will potentially be resoundingly negated if unchecked growth of the non-resident population continues. Consider the huge amount of gas consumed by motorists coming from Alberta, many of them driving large vehicles and towing huge boats or other recreational vehicles. Consider the inefficiency of thousands of non-residents maintaining heated homes year-round that are only used a few weeks a year. And consider the high rates of emissions coming from the motorized recreational toys that so many of the non-residents bring to the valley. If RDEK is serious about reducing GHG emissions then it really needs to start trying to move us to a sustainable economy, not one that depends on more and more and more visitors and non-resident homeowners year after year.

18. Crown Land Management. Please see my comments above about reducing motorized recreation on crown land. I recommend changing 18.2(3) to "Preserve public access to Crown land for NON-MOTORIZED recreation purposes", or at least "Preserve public access to Crown land with the preference being on non-motorized activities."

18.3(5) I suggest adding: "The RDEK encourages... that: (h) emphasizes non-motorized forms of recreation."

19.3 I recommend adding a sub-paragraph that pertains to protecting bighorn sheep from coming into contact with domestic sheep or goats.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

Kris Belanger

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: July 9, 2019 9:13 PM
To: Kris Belanger
Subject: Lake Windermere DRAFT OCP Comment

Dear Mr. Belanger, Ms. Clovechok, and the RDEK Board,

I wish to express my grave concerns about proposed changes to the Lake Windermere Official Community Plan which would allow greater development on the west side of Lake Windermere.

I am gratified that the draft OCP is far-sighted enough to recognize the importance of this area--its biological diversity and cultural importance, as well as the critically endangered species now protected there.

Why then, would the draft plan go on to allow developers to threaten these very values?

Invermere residents have already made it clear that we do not want even more of this type of development. We have already concluded that more housing is needed within the existing community boundaries. More rental housing stock should be a priority so that a younger generation can afford to live in Invermere and contribute to its prosperity.

Residents and non-residents alike value the natural environment of Lake Windermere. One does not even have to know that the grasslands in question are critically endangered to appreciate them. Why would those who know these facts choose to see them destroyed?

Resort community after resort community after resort community has made the mistake of over-building its supply of expensive housing stock and neglecting its core community. Have we not learned from the mistakes of others?

There is such a long list of reasons for not allowing this development: agricultural lands, wildlife corridors, ecosystem fragmentation, critical mountain goat habitat.

These values are not replaceable. Our existing Official Community Plan recognizes these values.

I ask that you protect the west side of Lake Windermere instead of developing it. Future generations will applaud your decision.

Respectfully,

[REDACTED]
Windermere, BC V0B 2L2
Canada

Kris Belanger

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: July 9, 2019 10:57 PM
To: Kris Belanger
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: LWOCP-Boat/RV Storage on the North Street Entrance to Windermere

Hi Kris

I am just back home from a kayaking trip where I had no access to wifi and my emails or phone.

Thank you for clarifying that 5.3(3)(d) pertains to the Real Storage property only and that its purpose is to acknowledge there is an existing storage business in a commercial zone.

I do however still have concerns with the wording of 5.3(3)(c) regarding the property on North Street and the implementation of 5.3.1(i).

5.3(3)(c) states:

A mix of commercial and residential uses are supported for the property shown in Figure 12 subject to a rezoning application. Land fronting North Street is preferred to be used for commercial purposes that serve residents and the travelling public.

Both you and I have met with the planning consultant for the landowner and were told an application would be forthcoming to rezone the lands from A-2 for C-2. The proposed development would put future commercial uses along North Street with 2 additional 5-unit storage facilities behind it. The remaining lands would be subdivided into 5 lots and sold for some sort of "attainable?" housing.

Policy 5.3(3)(c), as written, would not prevent this from occurring even after the LWOCP is approved.

In addition to the wording in this policy, I also have serious concerns with the timing of the implementation of 5.3.1(i) which would remove mini-storage along with boat/RV storage as permitted and accessory uses from C-2 zone.

Below is the question I posed to Andrew McLeod, Manager of the RDEK Planning Department, as to when 5.3.1(i) would be implemented.

The draft LWOCP contains the following policy: "An amendment to the Upper Columbia Valley Zoning Bylaw to remove mini-storage, boat and recreational vehicle storage from the list of permitted and accessory uses in the C-2, Service Commercial zone....." Could you please tell me when this will be put to the RDEK Board of Directors for approval? The concern is it is anticipated that another application to allow boat and RV storage on C-2 lands will be submitted in the near future.

First, the OCP must be adopted with such a statement in it. Assuming that happens, then sometime in 2020 seems reasonable if the Board wishes to move ahead with it.

Based on this timeline, the landowner could apply for a rezoning to C-2 after the OCP is approved in August and still receive approval to build the 2 storage units as this use is permitted under the current C-2 zoning. This means other applications to allow storage in C-2 could also be approved until "sometime in 2020" or until the RDEK Board of Directors chooses to implement 5.3.1(i). If the Board decides not to move ahead with implementing the policy, mini, boat and RV storage will continue to be located on commercial lands at the entrances to Windermere and Invermere and along highway #93/95. As the public has clearly indicated to the RDEK that they do not want to see storage in these locations, it is recommended the following be implemented:

1. To address the issue of prohibiting mini/boat/RV storage on North Street as indicated on Figure 12, a statement should be included that clearly states no additional storage units will be permitted on this property or:

2. To address the issue of mini/boat/RV storage in the LWOCP plan area, an amendment to the Upper Columbia Zoning Bylaw No. 900 should be made to remove mini-storage, boat and recreational vehicle storage from the list of permitted and accessory uses in the C-2, Service Commercial zone **in the plan area concurrent with approval of the LWOCP.**

Sorry I missed you when I called today. I look forward to further discussion on this issue.

Thanks

[REDACTED]

On Jul 9, 2019, at 9:56 AM, Kris Belanger <kbelanger@rdek.bc.ca> wrote:

Hi [REDACTED]

I think there's a bit of confusion here. Did you perhaps read policy 5.3(3)(d) while looking at the figure for 5.3(3)(c)? We don't support storage businesses on the property shown in figure 12.

5.3(3)(d) is there because when the zoning bylaw amendment is made to remove storage businesses from the C-2 zone and put in commercial, we don't want to create a non-conformity with the existing storage business (Real Storage).

5.3(3)(c) related to the A-2 zoned lands which has an existing house and storage unit on the property. If these are rezoned commercial, the OCP (and hopefully the zoning as well) won't support storage based business on the property.

To recap, the OCPs position on storage businesses is:

- Support a change to the zoning bylaw to move storage based businesses from the current C-2 commercial zone to a light industrial zone - policy 5.3(1)(i). This amendment will include a site specific amendment for the Real Storage property only that will acknowledge they have a storage business in a commercial zone – policy 5.3(3)(d).
- When storage based businesses are included in the light industrial zone (and NOT allowed in commercial zones) we have included a policy that says we DO NOT support rezoning of commercial lands to industrial in order to support storage facilities in the highly visible areas like Althamer Road, along the highway (which include the entrance to Windermere) and in Windermere - policy 7.3(1).

I've asked for the APC to call me during the meeting so I can speak to the plan and answer any questions.

Give me a call if you want to discuss further.

All the best,

Kris

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: July 6, 2019 6:32 PM
To: Kris Belanger <kbelanger@rdek.bc.ca>
Cc: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Subject: LWOCP-Inclusion of a New Policy to Permit Boat/RV Storage on the North Street Entrance to Windermere

Hi Kris

I was just taking a last look at the draft LWOCP and can not believe that policy 5.3(3)(d) was added to the latest version. Why was it not included prior to this which would have allowed the LWOCP Advisory Group to reiterate yet again that storage facilities should not be located on the entranceway to Windermere. I don't know how many times this was stated at our meetings. I also sent you a letter on April 6, 2019 (see attached) outlining why there was no planning rationale or justification for allowing boat and RV storage facilities on these lands when they are rezoned to C-2.

I am aware that the planning consultant for the landowner met with you in late March to discuss his proposal to add 2 more storage units beside the existing storage unit along with some residential lots. He also took me on a site visit the same week and told me how if 2 more storage buildings were approved, the landowner would also build much needed "attainable" housing. In fact at that meeting I noticed there was already a *For Sale* sign posted on this portion of the site in anticipation of approval of the proposal.

As you are aware through the public consultation process of the LWOCP and the Bad Toro Properties Ltd. application, the public clearly does not want boat/RV/self storage at the entrance to Windermere. I am bewildered as to how this policy can be included given the input the RDEK has recieved on this issue.

Of course there is only a few days left before the closing of comments from the public for the LWOCP. I do however believe the document must go to the Planning Advisory Commission and a Public Hearing where there will be another opportunity for the public to yet again express their opposition to storage facilities on the entranceway to Windermere. I anticipate this will be a major area of contention at that meeting.

I am so disappointed.....

[REDACTED]

Kris Belanger

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: July 10, 2019 7:25 AM
To: Kris Belanger
Subject: OCP

Dear Mr. Belanger, Ms. Clovechok, and the RDEK Board,

I am concerned about the OCP draft for these three reasons;

1. The sprawl proposed on grizzly ridge wasn't the result of community input.
2. The sprawl is bad for our community.
3. The sprawl will negatively impact our regions biodiversity.

Thank you for considering my input

[REDACTED]
Invermere, BC V0A 1K4
Canada

Kris Belanger

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: July 10, 2019 8:15 AM
To: Kris Belanger
Subject: OCP Comments

Good Morning Kris
A couple of comments;

1. I believe that where Commercial development abuts Residentially Zoned property, the proponent should be required to screen such properties to the degree that is practical. I would suggest fencing, chain link with plastic threaded through its links and/or landscaping treatment

Please drop the support for Grizzly Ridge's expansion of the DOI's boundary. At this point in time, Invermere has lots of infill area yet to be developed and/or redeveloped. I feel here is no need for that amalgamation at this time. It is a politically charged proposal and it is not necessary at this time, to include it or support its amalgamation to Invermere.

Thanks

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Kris Belanger

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: July 10, 2019 10:59 AM
To: Kris Belanger
Subject: [BULK] Lake Windermere OCP

Importance: Low

Dear Mr. Belanger, Ms. Clovechok, and the RDEK Board,

Please do not permit urban sprawl along the west side of Lake Windermere.

Enough is enough. Think of the future. If you don't act to protect the Valley you will be responsible for destroying it. Do you want this Valley to become like Canmore?

[REDACTED]
Panorama, BC

[REDACTED]
Panorama, BC V0A 1T0
Canada

Kris Belanger

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: July 10, 2019 1:43 PM
To: Kris Belanger
Subject: Lake Windermere DRAFT OCP Comment

Dear Mr. Belanger, Ms. Clovechok, and the RDEK Board, My name is [REDACTED] An Invermere resident these past 52 years. I am totally opposed to any residential development on the West side of our beautiful Lake Windermere. (As you may or not know that 'Lake' Windermere is not a lake per se but rather a widening of the Columbia River.) That being said the lake already is being overused. It cannot realistically and safely handle any more "muscle-boat" traffic. I suggest you take a brief tour of Invermere and Athalmer boat storage yards (I believe there are 3 of them?) and count the number of these massive boats in storage apart from the boats already tied up on the docks.

Now if there is a development as you propose, future residents will fully and naturally expect to put their boats and other water-craft on the lake near where they live. I predict frustration and yes anger by boat owners as predictable limitations of boat/engine sizes come into effect.

Ask yourself why do people want to reside on the West side of the lakepeace and quiet; safe boating etc. This will not happen as dollar-focused developers keep adding more and more Alberta second home residents. I urge you to consider the long-term effects of this proposed plan. As I have always been taught "think man -think".

I am writing to voice my concerns about the draft Lake Windermere Official Community Plan where numerous sections allow for greater development on the west side of Lake Windermere.

This draft OCP starts by outlining the many reasons that this area is biologically diverse, culturally important, and critically endangered. Unfortunately, it goes on to contradict these values, and allows for developers to interpret the plan to suit their wishes.

The plan never states that there is community demand for this type of development, instead stating in Section 4.1 "Throughout the planning process, residents and non-residents expressed a desire to see infill development or new construction adjacent to existing residential nodes. Infill housing options such as secondary suites are seen as one opportunity to potentially increase the availability of rental housing stock in the area without the need to develop and service bare land."

Section 19.3 (7)(c)(ii) states that "If development is proposed within grassland ecosystem areas a compact development footprint should be utilized to minimize negative impacts to existing grasslands." This opens the door to development in grassland environments that will effectively destroy the unique and critically endangered grassland environment we have in our region.

In Section 6.3 (1)(b) agricultural land is made vulnerable through the highly interpretable statement, "Fragmentation or parcelization of agricultural lands in the plan area is generally not supported." Thus it seems that exceptions will be allowed, with no parameters around what constitutes a worthy exception.

If the best way to reduce human-wildlife conflicts is to avoid development within wildlife corridors, and Section 11.1 (3)(f) states that "Future land uses should promote habitat connectivity and discourage fragmentation of contiguous ecosystems and ecosystem components..." then any development in wildlife corridors or fragmentation of this ecosystem should be denied. Local education programs such as Wildsafe BC should not be relied on to provide temporary solutions to a problem that could have been avoided in the first place.

An International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) threat assessment of mountain goats in 2015 identified that the highest threat was human intrusions and disturbance. Road building near mountain goat habitat allowing predators and hunters easier access was also identified as a risk (B.C. Conservation Data Centre. 2015. Conservation Status Report:


Oreamnos americanus. B.C. Minist. of Environment.). Thus the permissive language in Section 19.3 (7)(d)(iv & v) that allows for development near mountain goat habitat would undoubtedly negatively affect our local mountain goat populations.

Thus the Official Community Plan needs the following:

- a) Housing policies that encourage residential development that meets the needs of the emerging workforce and families in the region, while also taking into consideration that not all residents are homeowners. Also consideration needs to be placed on the fact that there is a devastating housing crisis making it almost impossible to find a place to rent affordably in Invermere.
- b) Policies that strongly discourage development in grassland ecosystems and further outline that human development within the plan area must not result in a net negative loss of the existing grasslands.
- c) An agricultural land use policy that does not support fragmentation or parcelization of agricultural lands in the plan area. Developers should be required to go through a series of stringent steps including an agricultural consultation as well as public review and consultations.
- d) Policies that do not allow “intensive development” in wildlife corridors but instead put great value on sustaining biodiversity by leaving wildlife corridors and habitat areas untouched by development.
- e) Policies that recognize the significant value of southern populations of mountain goats by prohibiting development in mountain goat habitat.

As a concerned member of the community, I applaud your efforts to review the Lake Windermere Official Community Plan and I hope the results of this will bring forward better protections for the west side of Lake Windermere. We must value our communities, ecosystems, wildlife and future generations over short-sighted development.

Thank you,


Invermere, BC VoA 1KO
Canada

Kris Belanger

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: July 10, 2019 8:04 PM
To: Kris Belanger
Subject: Lake Windermere DRAFT OCP Comment

Dear Mr. Belanger,

I have many concerns about this draft of our Official Community Plan. It seems to lack the foresight needed to develop a healthy community culture in our area. While I see the allure of owning a large lakeview property, I also understand the effect it would have on our community. We already deal with an overwhelming amount of sprawl. I teach in the local primary school and can't believe how many cars are in the parking lot dropping off and picking up students. Children are unable to walk to school on their own because their family homes are spread far and wide. We have many young teachers who are unable to find places to live because of a lack of affordable housing. By giving in to the wishes of developers who have no concern for the well being of our community, by allowing them to sell expensive pieces of property outside the town boundaries, you are ensuring that the culture of Invermere becomes even more segregated (full time residents vs. part time property owners), that young professionals and families will not be able find affordable homes and settle in our community because builders are discouraged from building within existing town limits.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Invermere, BC
Canada

Kris Belanger

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: July 10, 2019 4:51 PM
To: Kris Belanger
Subject: LWOCP

Hello Kris,

I am an area F resident and member of the Advisory Planning Committee.

Re: Boat/RV self storage along the Hwy and entrances to Invermere/Windermere and 5.3(1) (i). I suggest a policy should be implemented at the

same time the LWOCP is approved so the bylaws are consistent. The unsightly industrial look to our communities is really not welcoming.

Thank you for all your work on this.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Survey Report

09 June 2019 - 10 July 2019

Lake Windermere DRAFT OCP Comments

PROJECT: Lake Windermere OCP

Engage East Kootenay

engagement 
by Bang the Table

Q1 | Please provide comments here

Anonymous

6/10/2019 04:39 PM

I wrote the bellow letter about a year ago. I belive all of it still makes sense. I have had many converstions since this letter and time to think about it more. I would like to add a couple points to the original letter here. 1. As a business owner on of the challenges I face is finding staff. I have spoken to many people who would love to live and work in the valley here but have such a hard time finding a place to live that they just stop trying. I am not the only business owner to face this challenge. 2. Allowing secondary suits makes it safer for those who are living in them as well. We all know that there are many suits in the OCP that are deemed "non-compliant" simply because they are suits. The truth is there are many of the illegal suits that are just not safe. Allowing these suits means the RDEK will have some power over them. Making it mandatory to have RDEK inspect them, ensure proper egress, safe heating units are intalled, proper parking ect. is met makes this better for everyone. 3. As much as I enjoy Air B&B's they are taking over making it even more difficult for people to find a place to live and compounding the problem further.

It's not a secret that there is a housing crisis in the entirety of our beautiful province. Mortgage prices are high and the cost of living is not low in the valley. Young adults are finding it more than challenging to both find affordable housing and break into the Real-estate market. One way we as a community can help this is by allowing rental suites to be utilized in R1A zoning. The extra income a homeowner can make from this cuts a mortgage in half giving the homeowner a financial break in this pricey world. Having this written into our bylaws also allows buyers to account for this income when applying for the mortgage it's self, making mortgage approvals more likely. When young adults are given a financial break in this world several things happen. They can more easily afford their educations or pay for their children's education. Education leads to good jobs and or entrepreneurs. Good jobs pay well and lead to spending in our community. Spending leads to positive economic growth. It is this economic growth in turn provides good jobs. They buy houses, and have children that go to our schools. They teach their children to be productive members of society. I am the face of our evolving community and my children are the future. When opportunities for growth are taking away several things happen. Education becomes unaffordable, good jobs become harder to find and the confidence to become an entrepreneur becomes less. The ability to buy goods in the community becomes hindered by lack of income never mind being able to afford a house in today's market. The need for unemployment insurance becomes higher and all of a sudden there is a negative impact on our economy, our country and all of her collective inhabitants. For all of the fledgling youths looking for a place to live that isn't their parents basement. For all the young families doing their best to buy their first home out there. For all the middle aged family's sending their kids to college, and our retired community members

Anonymous

6/10/2019 07:06 PM

looking to supplement their retirement fund. Lets make a change in our community and support a bylaw change allowing rental suites in all residential zones in the Lake Windermere Community Plan

Hello, Please put some planning into Lakeview Drive and how to make it safer for cyclists and pedestrians. The speed limit of 50km/h is exceeded frequently, there is no pathway and no bicycle lane. Especially when adding more housing, this road needs to get traffic calming and safety measures put in place. Regards, [REDACTED]

Anonymous

6/11/2019 08:49 AM

The guidelines around development along the foreshore of Lake Windermere relating to privately owned land seem extreme. i.e. 10.3 (1) "...repair to existing... not supported" ????. This restrictive concept flow through the document. Landowners need to be able to maintain and repair their existing foreshore improvements. I believe much of the language relating even to new foreshore development is covered by DFO regulation and should not be repeated here to avoid confusion / conflict. There is already a robust process in place federally to ensure responsible development of the foreshore.

Public lake access areas need to be identified. There should be more identified and opened/re-opened. The traffic issues need to be addressed in these areas. Abandoned trailers taking all the available parking should be dealt with.

Anonymous

6/11/2019 11:29 AM

Anonymous

6/11/2019 12:50 PM

[REDACTED] We are hoping that the OCP will include a streamlined process for the possible rezoning of R-SF zoned areas to allow for "in dwelling suites," the current process of rezoning R-1 to R-1c is arduous and prohibitive. With the advent of home sharing this has created a grey area and many residences are being used in this manner without the correct zoning. The OCP draft community plan states that 70% of the dwellings are owned by non residents and in this many of the properties are empty when not in recreational use. This leaves the community with little rental accommodations for those looking to reside but cannot afford a home or unable to find accommodations during high tourist seasons. This also limits the business community a lot of revenue in these unoccupied times as the resident population fluctuates drastically. Other jurisdictions have brought in a framework to allow for home sharing or secondary in premise suites to address this new usage. It would be great to see the OCP include a more streamlined process other than rezoning for each and every residential home that is R-SF, understanding that outbuildings and garages are a whole different issue and not included in this suggestion. A way to request a building permit for a secondary suite and permit home sharing use would be a good way to modernize the Lake Windermere OCP. If the owners that are currently home sharing are following the rules they are paying residential taxes, PST, and possible accommodation taxes depending on their booking agent. This will only increase when large events such as the Junior World ski Championships are held in nearby communities in the coming years.

Anonymous

6/12/2019 10:20 AM

I am unable to register with your OCP. Please accept my comment that this lake is already crowded on summer weekends. Further lakefront development was not agreed to on previous plans and I see no reason that it is included in this plan other than to allow a developer to make money. [REDACTED]

Anonymous

6/16/2019 10:36 AM

I am very concerned that the rezoning of land in the Grizzly Ridge properties will have too much density of housing on small parcels of land. The West side of the lake was projected to have more open green spaces and sparse housing on acreages.

Anonymous

6/16/2019 12:21 PM

re 4.3(5)e I completely agree with the policy regarding the value of trails that have long been established in the area. The Grizzly Ridge development has long threatened these trails. In addition, the development abuts right against the canyon. I saw a goat in the canyon a month ago and strongly support all policies to protect the critical goat habitat in Toby Creek canyon and a substantial buffer zone. The area between the canyon and Toby Creek cutoff road should be development free. re 11.1(3) completely agree with clustered development and greenspace retention. agree with protecting habitat connectivity, and protecting the mountain goat salt licks. Please consider designating the area between Toby Creek and Toby Creek cutoff as a conservation area/ESA. re 14.3(7) please consider supporting efforts by Wildsight to establish an electric car share co-op. re 14.3(8) I support the development of a bike path between Windermere and Invermere, and ideally a trail that connects all communities: Fairmont to Windermere to Invermere to West Side Legacy trail! re 18.2(3) access to the Caste Rock trail, and crown land to the west of Invermere, ie Goldie Creek/Abel Creek, Toby Creek historical bridge trail etc is currently not possible without passing through private property. An easement should be established to allow public access to these areas.

Anonymous

6/17/2019 06:55 AM

RDEK Cranbrook, BC Dear Sir and Madam RE: OCP Draft open house Sunday – June 9, 2019 With respect to the above noted firstly thank you for your presentation. I firmly believe that the OCP draft presented did incorporate alot of work by the RDEK but is still lacking effective back up and research on what this PROPOSED OCP will actually do to the current state of our forests etc. Below are my concerns and comments: (A) The WESTSIDE plan is being based on the fact that the adjacent property was subdivided into small holdings. The subdivision on this parcel was SOLEY given to family to help assist with the care of aging parents. According to the OCP there is no provisions/protection to what this will look like and how will it effect lands with respect to erosion and the water table levels. (B) In the OCP the roads are to be discussed with the appropriate dept. but the said developer has built many roads within these proposed lands and has already taken undisturbed lands and completely alternated them with no regard to your OCP plan. These roads are all over the properties in questions along with elaborate gates that are placed wherever this said developer placed again with no regard to any guidance or placement advise. (C) The said ONE owner has been given Carte Blanche and the ONE already has taken raw land and developed over 100 lots outfitted with water and sewer and , to date the large majority is still unsold within the District of Invermere. (D) The world is urging us to be careful with our environment as the Forests provide many ecosystem services. They support biodiversity, providing critical habitat for wildlife, remove carbon dioxide from the atmosphere, intercept precipitation,

slow down surface runoff, and reduce soil erosion and flooding. These important ecosystem services will be reduced or destroyed when forests are converted to development. (E) There was an email sent out for our preliminary views on the said proposal – they are currently 35 homes hence 35 emails surrounding proposed development, my question is how did the RDEK receive 70 response (approx.) this was not a TRUE representation of what the present homeowners feel. (F) There are no report / research / environmental impact / of any kind on what this will actually LOOK LIKE . (G) Lastly to quote The letter to the Editor written in the Pioneer by Pat Morrow.. dated May , 2019 - “all of this for the almighty dollars” with no consideration for the long term effects. In closing thank you for your time in reviewing my comments and protecting what raw land we have for future generations and remember that RDEK represents the people, lands and environment not only ONE corporation which is exactly what the current OCP plan represents. Yours truly, [REDACTED] Invermere, BC

Anonymous

6/17/2019 11:02 AM

Section 4.3(5)(e) is great. In particular item vii regarding maintaining the existing trail network. This is very positive as there are no other trails within walking/running distance of Invermere.

Anonymous

6/17/2019 01:32 PM

To Kris Belanger , Susan Clovechok, As an area F resident, I am writing to express my concerns with policies related to development in the Westside subarea as outlined in the Lake Windermere OCP Draft 2019. I believe it is critical at this time to speak out against any development in the Westside subarea which does not comply with zoning which is currently in place. The subdivision and/or annexation of Grizzly Ridge Properties Holdings as supported in Policies 4.3(5)(c)and(d) of the new OCP draft is completely unacceptable. This developer is motivated only by profit and has no interest in preserving the rural and natural values of the Westside subarea. Development continues to boom in Invermere and on the East side of Lake Windermere. Will the Westside subarea be the next to be sacrificed to urban sprawl? We have reached a critical point and the current RDEK directors have an opportunity to maintain Westside as green space and stand together with others to protect and preserve this special area. Those others include Windermere Lake Park, Shaunessy Reserve Lands, Nature Conservancy of Canada, Zehnder Ranch, and Westside Legacy Trail. Invermere should be encouraged to be a gateway to a green Westside and not a sprawling town. Invermere's District Lot 4616 zoned P2 (Public Parks and Open Space) abuts the property which Grizzly Ridge Properties hopes to see annexed by the District of Invermere. This parkland is ideally located to be a transition zone from Invermere to a rural green Westside. A related safety issue concerns the location of the railway tracks on the west side of Lake Windermere. Lake access is severely limited and further development would only increase pressure to access the lake. This is not a safe option. Please take a long term view of our valley and preserve Westside while you still can. Once it's gone, it's gone! Respectfully, [REDACTED]

Anonymous

6/18/2019 02:44 PM

4.3(5) My family and I use the trails in Pine Ridge/ Grizzly Ridge on a nearly daily basis year round. Mountain biking, walking, trail running, and fat biking. These trails represent a important recreation ares for the residents due to

Anonymous

6/21/2019 09:47 AM

their close proximity to town. It is of vital importance that these trails be maintained as close to intact as possible. The trails will be an important amenity to future homeowners in those subdivisions and therefore an important sales feature. Finding a strategy to maintain/ increase trail systems synergistically with real estate development is essential for communities like ours.

Please accept my feedback on the policies included in 4.3(5). I do not support the proposed urban sprawl on the peripheries of Invermere until the community of Invermere demonstrates a need for the property for development and a vision for the community that includes that development. Given the current efforts to limit green house gas emissions and safeguard the environment it amazes me that this development which will not be walkable to the main community is being planned. It also concerns me that proposed zoning on the land between the Westside Road and the lake will have up to 19 properties all drawing their water from the aquifer. This is a huge increase in households drawing from the aquifer which is the existing residents' sole source of drinking water. With the predicted stress that is to come on our mountain source aquifers from climate change, this does not seem to be good planning. This planning is developer driven and does not consider the long term health of the community from an aesthetic or environmental perspective.

Anonymous

6/22/2019 03:19 PM

What follows is my review of the draft Lake Windermere OCP that was presented at the last public consultation meeting. I am profoundly concerned. I had hoped to have time to do a density calculation for westside development potential before submitting these notes, but have not been able to get to this. I hope that the RDEK will provide the public with a basic calculation of max buildout potential under clearly stated illustrative assumptions. In short, I am opposed to all of the many and extensive policies in the draft OCP that overtly and indirectly allow for sprawling development (by any name) on the westside while compromising the ecological integrity and viability of the rich and rare natural resource that is the westside of Lake Windermere. This document is in many ways custom-crafted for westside sprawl in the best interests of a single large land owner. The OCP is fatally inconsistent, on the one hand claiming to champion environmental responsibility and value, while on the other hand very effectively undermining the possibility of maintaining those ecological values and resources into the future. The rationale for this is never made clear in the document – there is NO statement provided that there is any public demand for this type of development, and yet, there are whole sections of the OCP that support it. The introduction of “conservation subdivision design” is a poor effort to rationalize development that the public is not demanding in that face of a clear public demand for the very opposite – protection of the westside as a large landscape. The details of my statement above are outlined below. 1.1.1 ...[this] document is intended to reflect the collective vision of the plan area for the future. I do not agree that the draft reflects the collective vision with respect to the Westside. On this topic, I feel that the plan defers almost entirely to a vision of the future being driven by a single developer that I

believe is still Grizzly Ridge. I am baffled as to why this deference has been given to the developer – at every single public process to date since the former Hoffert Properties were purchased by the current owner, the public in our area has spoken clearly that sprawl development that wraps around our community to the south and west is not in our best interest. This section states further that “RDEK Board has considered the interests of the individual landowners and residents within the plan area and balanced those interests with the needs of the community and region as a whole”. I do not agree on this point with respect to the westside. I feel very strongly that the OCP has given a single large landowner a trump card that cancels out the public voice of the residents of the Lake Windermere Area.

1.1.8 Relationship to the District of Invermere The OCP also establishes policies that recognize potential opportunities for boundary expansion by the District of Invermere. Where the DoI Official Community plan references boundary expansion, it SPECIFICALLY and principally references the need to consider an Urban Containment Boundary, and states clearly that there are limited rationale that should be considered for expansion. It makes no reference to development of estate residential as a rationale to expand the boundary of the municipality. The draft Lake Windermere OCP language cited above seems to infer that the District of Invermere is seeking potential opportunities for boundary expansion, which is not the case.

1.1.9.(3) Westside The owners represent a range of interests including conservation, resource management, development and agricultural interests. I believe I am accurately aware of who the major land owners are and I am also aware that 3 have not been consulted directly by the RDEK about westside development. These three are also opposed to development on the wide-open spaces that is the westside of Lake Windermere, of the type allowed in this draft OCP.

3.0 Goals of the OCP Of the list of 13 goals of the OCP, it is my assessment that the policies that have been proposed respecting development on the westside will negatively influence achievement of at least 6, and will positively influence only 1. The Other 6 are not influenced by, nor do they influence the westside.

- Westside development policies will negatively affect:
 - o Supporting agriculture
 - o Recognizing the environmental importance of lake Windermere
 - o Maintaining ecosystem function including grasslands, sensitive habitat, and connectivity corridors
 - o Recognize the risk of interface fire
 - o Conserve cultural resources
 - o Reduce greenhouse gas emissions
- It seems that the only overall OCP goal that could possibly be interpreted as supporting the policies that have been drafted that allow extensive development on the westside is:
 - o “Encourage residential development that reflects the diverse interests and lifestyles of resident and non-resident homeowners and recognizes the need for a variety of housing types”

This policy seems custom crafted to allow for westside expansion and development. I ask, where is the overall housing goal that says “encourage residential development that meets the needs of the emerging workforce and families in the region, while also taking into consideration that not all residents are homeowners, and there is a devastating crisis in the housing market that makes it almost impossible find a place to rent affordably”? In

short, in the goals of the OCP there is almost nothing that leads logically to the incredible breadth of permissive policies, exceptions, and loopholes that have been embedded throughout in support of westside expansion. 4.1 Residential land use, background First paragraph: Throughout the planning process, residents and non-residents expressed a desire to see infill development or new construction adjacent to existing residential nodes. Infill housing options such as secondary suites are seen as one opportunity to potentially increase the availability of rental housing stock in the area without the need to develop and service bare land... When planning for new residential development, some principles were universally supported during public consultation for this plan: A mix of residential densities (single, two and multi-family); infill development; community water and sewer should be provided for existing and future resident; new residential developments should include opportunities for non-motorized transportation and establish non-motorized connection between communities, open space, recreational amenities and commercial services and the; rural character of the area should be preserved. I note that there is no universal support stated for development of large tracts of land outside of existing communities, but there is universal support stated for infill development. How is it then that the goals of the OCP gloss over this need completely, and that it seems to so strongly support the one kind of development that was NOT universally supported? This must be addressed by the Board. 4.3 (g) Conservation Subdivision Design has been entered into this document as if it is a well understood development typology that will somehow maintain the ecological values of the westside of the lake while allowing for (on page 15) that “the number of parcels in development clusters should be approximately the same as the number of parcels that would be provided on the parent parcel through a conventional rural subdivision”. What exactly IS conservation subdivision design? I have studied with the author of the design concept – but I don’t believe that most people in this valley know, nor, likely, do the board members – how is it to be assessed? – there is no “develop a CSD policy assessment process” noted in the implementation plan for the OCP – it is just assumed that everyone knows and should accept that when the developer applies to the RDEK for subdivision approval and the RDEK wants to allow development on the westside it will somehow be a “conservation” subdivision, and we should just trust that the astounding ecological values on the westside will be left intact at the hands of a developer who, to date, has actively denigrated the very ecological values we are being asked to assume they will “developprotect”. This is, to be blunt, entirely in-credible. 4.3 (5) Westside (a) any policy that begins with the word “despite” should be examined closely. In this case, the word despite fatally undermines the stated 120 hectare parcel minimum for the westside and lays out 2.5 pages of exceptions to that rule, with 1.5 pages overtly pertaining to land where 120 hectare parcels are possible. Section 4.3 (5)c begins by stating the amazing ecological values and sensitivity of the land in question, and then goes on to state “....Rezoning may be supported in this area if the proponent can demonstrate how development impacts, traffic concerns and existing recreational potential

is maintained and enhanced through application of the following...” . The land in question is the size of Invermere! By protecting some viewscapes, providing a big road and some trails, not developing in undevelopable sections (!), providing a report that promises that the development will not destroy Invermere’s water supply, and giving a bit of free stuff that we will decide about later, the developer wins the right to vastly transform the future of this region permanently and forever, despite the fact that there is no visible public or market demand for what the developer proposes to offer. This section even goes so far as to show the developer the path to success – Conservation Subdivision Design!! If you call it CSD, surely we the public will say yes. But we are not saying yes. We are still saying no. 6.3.(1)(b) Agricultural Land use. Fragmentation or parcelization of agricultural lands in the plan area is generally not supported. This is an example of where the document indirectly undermines the policies elsewhere around ecological integrity etc.. The use of the word “generally” allows ample room for interpreting this policy to mean that parcelization of large tracts of land is really an option that is very much on the table. Why not just say it is “not” supported, and require developers to make the case, do the agricultural consultation, and CONVINCING the people of this region that their plans do not, in fact adversely impact ag values? 7.3 (2) The policies in this section on collaborative planning for locating a viable light industrial land base are very positive. 9.0 Open Space recreation and trails (OSRT) There is a clearly stated public desire for recreational trails in the region. This OCP draft directly references the opportunities associated with the Westside Legacy Trail (I think it has a different name as a result of sponsorship and should be properly identified in the OCP), the Old Coach Greenway, Windermere beach Park, Cross Road Ball Park, and communities along the east side of lake Windermere. Appropriately, there is NO mention of developing new facilities on the westside of the lake, however, the westside development policies themselves seem to indicate that OSRT development is on the table there. Instead, what about highlighting the westside, conservation based recreation opportunities that are already existent on both public and private lands such as through NCC, the Nature Trust, and SRL, as well as one amazing provincial park site. None of these amenities have required that we trade development rights at the expense of ecological integrity in order to achieve some trails. There is AMPLE recreation on the Westside and grizzly ridge recreation “opportunities” come at too high a price. 11. Environmental considerations This section seems well thought out at first glance, until it is read with the westside development policies close at hand, and the caveats are properly understood. The language in this section is inherently permissive of development – simply stating that something is been measured, mapped, and recognized as having ecological value will not protect it. We must also say that we must not, except in the most extraordinary circumstances, allow for degradation of our remaining intact ecosystems. This section does not meaningfully or effectively impede development in ESAs. For example: section 11.1(2)c talks about maintaining habitat connectivity, and very next paragraph at (3)a begins “where intensive development is proposed in a

wildlife corridor...” again – this lacks credibility. This policy statement opens a wildlife/human interaction AND wildfire nightmare! Under what conditions would the board be willing to consider “intensive development” in a wildlife corridor, for goodness sake?! Why bother mapping the corridors at all? Then, just to confuse matters, just 5 paragraphs later (f), the document swings back to say “future land uses should promote habitat connectivity and discourage fragmentation of contiguous ecosystems”. So are we developing the corridors or not? Well, just a few paragraphs later, we see why it will be ok to develop the corridors... “because “education programs such as WildSafe are encouraged”. Thank goodness. Once we put the people with the wildlife, then the people can learn about how not to get in the wildlife’s way. Simply put, the number one strategy for reducing wildlife-human conflict is not to develop in wildlife corridors. Later, at section (o), where a policy is established stating that “preservation of wildlife connectivity corridors is encouraged and supported by the following:” the third and fourth sub-policies talk about how extensive development should be avoided, but if it can’t, it should be done so as to “limit the impediment of wildlife movement”. There is a profound and inherent contradiction in this section about environmental considerations. If this section is intended to limit development in ecological valuable and sensitive areas, it is unlikely to be effective, and is more than likely to allow room for people to find ways to continue business as usual development. Ironically, section 11.2(1) states clearly that the number one threat to biodiversity is habitat loss. This document doesn’t really seem to be bothered by this fact – it is designed to get around it. Section 11.4 highlights the contiguous ecosystems on the westside of the lake that allow critical habitat connectivity from north to south and from east to west. So WHY, for goodness sake, so much deference to the one developer who stands willing and able to destroy these values? DPA #2 Protection of ESAs This section does not meaningfully or effectively impede development in ESAs The objective of Development Permit Area #2 is the protection, preservation, restoration and enhancement of the significant ecosystems, habitats and features identified in 19.3(6)(a)(i)-(vi) and on Schedules I1 to I4.... Followed by the caveat that “The intent is not to preclude all development in these areas, but to provide notice that the areas include unique characteristics that warrant special review and consideration and to ensure appropriate mitigation measures are prescribed where appropriate.” Essentially, business as usual. Or more cynically, as long as a QEP can provide a report that the land on either side of the road you pushed in really no longer has ecological values, you can go ahead and develop – you just need an appropriately named Development Permit first. Again, the ESA DPA section is fatally undermined by shoulds and mays, and is terribly lacking in should nots and may nots. Given that it has been identified in the document, for example, that grasslands are critically endangered ecosystems, it is disheartening to find policies beginning “If development is proposed within grassland ecosystems...” and ending “...should minimize negative impacts”. How about “development in grassland ecosystems is strongly discouraged and there must be no net negative loss of the current extent of grasslands in the plan

area as a result of human development”? Later in this DPA, we see a strange collision of wildsafe and firesmart policy failures: at section (e) there is yet another allowance that there could be extensive development in a wildlife corridor, but this time pruning of underbrush and removal of forest cover is discouraged to support wildlife movement, thereby exacerbating the risk of BOTH of wildlife/human conflict and wildfire in new residential areas. At section (d) we see allowance for the possibility of road building and industrial activity in mountain goat habitat – again the language is permissive, not prohibitive. With respect to the deferral to QEPs, I would like to reflect back to you a brief story about a land use application that came across my desk years ago. Upon having been directed to provide an environmental impact assessment report for a proposed development, I received from the developer’s QEP a 1 page report stating, literally, that after the property was developed, it would no longer have ecological values and wildlife should be prevented from accessing the property in order to minimize human-wildlife conflict. The property in question was ultimately approved under similarly permissive ESA policies, and was, sadly, formerly grassland and mixed IDF, as well as a mountain goat corridor. If this LW Draft OCP is going to defer so clearly to a QEP, the expectations for ecological PROTECTION must be far more clearly and prohibitively stated. Finally, Implementation Strategy, section 20.5: I do not see any staff action identified to handle the major development implications of development on the westside – a tract of land equal in size to the District of Invermere. I have to assume that once an application comes in for this massive land development area, the implications and work load will be handled on an ad hoc basis. I believe that the rationale for NOT including Westside development in the implementation strategy despite the VERY permissive nature of the document in this regard, is that there is no public mandate for allocating staff and financial resources to the task. All of the other projects identified in the implementation strategy have a clear public mandate that has been developed and matured over time. No similar mandate exists for the Westside of the lake and yet the document gives abundant, repeated, and permissive consideration to development of the area. As stated at the outset of my comments, I do not support westside development and feel comfortable stating that there will be strong and broad public opposition to it. I am terribly disappointed to be making these comments yet again after so many years. Very insulting is the glaring re-introduction of the very same Grizzly Ridge development proposal just to the south of Invermere that was so recently rejected by the Board of Directors. On what grounds has the RDEK OCP effectively re-invited that proposal? Please consider the following comments respecting the proposed policies for Section 5 Westside Sub-Area: A. I notice that in other sections of the OCP the RDEK is clear on what they support and what they do not support. Section 3 relating to the Windermere South Area as an example says the following subdivisions "are supported". Section 5 pertaining to the Westside Sub-Area references subdivisions that subject to specified criteria "may be supported". Why is there this language difference? If the specified criteria are met, what other conditions would prevent subdivision in the Westside Sub-

Anonymous

6/23/2019 03:42 AM

[REDACTED]
6/23/2019 09:16 AM

Area? B. Section 5 (e) (ii): Why is subdivision focused between Johnston Road and the Toby Creek Haul Road? There are beautiful areas south towards the waterfall park area and up towards the Toby Creek Escarpment that would create great acreage areas. I would encourage acreages to be allowed throughout the Figure 9 area; C. Section 5(e) (viii): The RDEK proposes that 50% of the developable land not be parcelized. While I support the concept of trails and park areas, I think that this policy is not well founded. The provision is onerous for the developer and not consistent with policies that I have seen in other areas. In order to make up for this restriction, the developer will be forced to create high density development nodes. There are lots of high density development areas within the Town of Invermere. People are looking for rural acreages of 2.5 to 10 acre parcels where they can create their own privacy, have animals and perhaps small farm operations. I do not think that people are looking for small lots set out in the wilderness. Is this truly the design principle that the RDEK wants?

My wife and I own a home in Larch Point on Ruault Road. After attending the OCP meeting on June 9th, we have a strong position about the Grizzly Ridge properties - Page 13/14 Figure 7 and Figure 8. Grizzly Ridge has proposed inclusion into the Castlerock development of approx 500-600 acres of Grizzly Ridge lands directly to south of Castlerock and to west of west Side Road to allow significant expansion of Castlerock to provide single family as well as duplex, multi family type homes. These properties should NOT be subdivided by RDEK while annexing discussions take place between the District of Invermere and the developer.

I am strongly opposed to grizzly ridge/castle rock annexation, south of Invermere on west side.

Anonymous
6/23/2019 12:36 PM

I strongly appose the development on west side. Specifically 5.C and 5.D

Anonymous
6/23/2019 12:45 PM

I am against the development and sprawling on the west side of lake Windermere!!! Specifically 4.3 4.5

Anonymous
6/23/2019 01:51 PM

I am against development and annexing grizzly ridge properties on the west side of lake Windermere. 4.3 and 4.5

Anonymous
6/23/2019 01:52 PM

It would appear that the RDEK are again revisiting the Grizzly Ridge development proposal on the west side of Windermere Lake. I would like to voice that I am strongly opposed to this or any other development of this nature on the west side of Windermere Lake. Please listen to the people of the valley as opposed to developers. Thanks [REDACTED] Area F

Anonymous
6/24/2019 11:44 AM

In short, I am opposed to all of the many and extensive policies in the draft OCP that overtly and indirectly allow for sprawling development (by any name) on the westside while compromising the ecological integrity and viability of the rich and rare natural resource that is the westside of Lake Windermere. This document is in many ways custom-crafted for westside sprawl in the best interests of a single large land owner. The OCP is fatally inconsistent, on the one hand claiming to champion environmental responsibility and value, while on the other hand very effectively undermining

Anonymous
6/24/2019 11:48 AM

Anonymous

6/24/2019 02:36 PM

the possibility of maintaining those ecological values and resources into the future. The rationale for this is never made clear in the document – there is NO statement provided that there is any public demand for this type of development, and yet, there are whole sections of the OCP that support it. The introduction of “conservation subdivision design” is a poor effort to rationalize development that the public is not demanding in that face of a clear public demand for the very opposite – protection of the westside as a large landscape. [REDACTED] RDEK Area F

I'm writing to express my wish for the valley to remain free of urban sprawl such as we see in the Okanagan and neighbouring Canmore, which has become the most expensive place to live in all of Alberta, with tens of thousands of empty weekender trophy homes and condos adding to the housing shortage, while pumping greenhouse gases into the atmosphere year round. I've read through the OCP in a vain attempt to find a sanctioned study proving there is enough ground water contained in the aquifer of the Columbia River headwaters for existing, let alone future residents of the valley. This, in light of province-wide drought brought on by escalating climate change. By definition, the headwaters of any river contain the least amount of water in the entire system. We only need to look downstream in order to see signs of over development and over consumption. In theory, there should be more water available in the Golden area since several major tributaries enter the Columbia between here and there. Anecdotal accounts confirm that wells on the bench land south of Golden and in the Blaeberry valley that have supported rural homes for decades are drying up, forcing residents to seek costly alternatives. One of many gripes I have with the document is the preponderance of empty rhetoric in anything that references environmental impact, when in fact there are blatant violations already occurring within the boundaries of the proposed development area. For instance, under 19.3 Development Permit Area #2 – Protection of Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESA), pg 62: "In order to promote conservation of the goat herd and their habitat, decreasing human disturbance along the Toby Creek Escarpment is necessary. A buffer should be established along the length of the Toby Creek canyon edge to ensure development activity is set back from the canyon edge and to enable unimpeded movement of goats along the canyon. The width of the buffer should extend a sufficient distance from the canyon edge to respect the goats need for security during occasional travel along the canyon." There is already a land developer's structure and road into an overlook in Toby canyon that disregards this so-called buffer zone, which points to an inability, or perhaps deliberately ignored by law enforcement. Many thanks in advance for taking the steps necessary to limit commercial/speculative growth and help maintain the high quality of life in our valley.

Anonymous

6/24/2019 06:58 PM

I am writing with regard to Section 6- Agricultural Land Use. While I am pleased to see emphasis on our local food supply and the objective to “support local food production” I can't help but feel that these are empty goals, as there has been very little, if any, effort to “support local food production” by the RDEK since 2008 when that OCP also included the

objective to “support the local production and distribution of food products.” Please refer to the information below. As a community member who has devoted countless volunteer hours over the past 15 years to bolstering our local food system and, in particular, to support the farming community, I can assure you that the efforts being made to “support local food production” have been spearheaded and undertaken almost exclusively by a small group of volunteers in the Columbia Valley and not, I am sad to say, by the RDEK. In fact, a strategic objective in the current East Kootenay Agricultural Plan, Section 3,4,1 Public Awareness of Local Agriculture, identifies the need to support “resources for residents who want to connect to local agriculture, such as the seasonal East Kootenay Local Food Guide.” To date, we have not seen any on-going funding for an East Kootenay or Columbia Valley Local Food Guide despite it being identified as a “high” priority item. Inclusion of an objective to support local food production is heartening, but valueless unless the RDEK puts these objections into action. I would also like to draw your attention to Section 6.1- second paragraph. It is the Windermere District Farmers’ Institute and not “The Windermere Valley Farmers Institute.” The abattoir, which is operated by the WDFI and, incidentally, came to fruition after much work to convince members of the public and some local Directors of the RDEK of its value, is now a thriving entity. The abattoir supplies locally produced and processed meat products to Valley homes, restaurants and retail operations and not simply “farm gate sales.” Please also refer to Section 6.1 below. In closing, please take the time to consider the sincerity of “Objectives” included in the 2019 Lake Windermere Official Community Plan. It is disingenuous to include them without the intention to follow through. Thank you, Alison Bell Lake Windermere Official Community Plan BYLAW no. 2061, 2008 Section 13- AGRICULTURE 13.2 Objectives (1) To preserve agricultural land with agricultural potential and to protect this land from uses which are inconsistent with agricultural uses. (2) To minimize conflicts between agriculture and other land uses. (3) To identify areas that may be suitable for exclusion from the ALR, due to low agricultural potential, or because agricultural considerations are out weighed by community or development needs; provided that there is no negative impact to lands remaining within the ALR. (4) To outline the conditions under which subdivision within the ALR will generally be supported and discourage subdivision elsewhere. (5) To support the local production and distribution of food products. Draft Lake Windermere Official Community Plan BYLAW NO. XXXX 2019 Section 6 Agricultural Land Use 6.2 Objectives (1) Support a working landscape by preserving contiguous areas of agricultural and range land. (2) Outline conditions under which subdivision within the ALR will generally be supported and discourage ALR subdivision that does not meet these conditions. (3) Minimize conflicts between agriculture and other potentially incompatible land uses on adjacent lands. (4) Support local food production, local distribution of food products, and diversification of agricultural uses. 6.1 Background- Paragraph 2 “The Windermere Valley Farmers Institute operate an abattoir which supports local producers in being able to offer farm gate sales.”

6/24/2019 09:09 PM

I am very much opposed to allowing any development of urban sprawl on the west side of Lake Windermere, as is proposed in the draft OCP. There is no benefit at all to the community of Invermere, nor is there any demand for it. Repeatedly in the past when the landowner proposed similar development, the public clearly stated that it does not want urban sprawl to the west and south of Invermere. The area on the west side of the lake is valued for its wide open spaces and ecological integrity. There are sensitive grasslands, as stated in the OCP, and there should be no small parcel development. It looks to me that the current zoning is minimum 120 hectare parcels, and the developer wants small parcels, according to the draft plan 1 hectare. That is a preposterous 120 times increase in housing density. There is no mitigation possible of environmental impact for that kind of density. The potential for wildlife-human conflict is huge and impossible to mitigate with that many people. Wildlife corridors are another area of concern. There is language about preserving wildlife corridors and maintaining habitat connectivity in section 11.1(2)c, and yet the language around development is lax, and undermines any meaningful environmental considerations, stating in 11.1 (o)ii "structures and barriers that impede wildlife movement such as exclusion fencing should be avoided." That implies that development can occur in a wildlife corridor, and barriers could be erected but shouldn't be. The language used needs to be decisive and prohibitive about development in environmentally sensitive areas. Another area of concern in Toby Canyon. There is an endangered goat herd there, already down to 15 individuals from 60. There has been development of a viewing platform and a road down to the edge of Toby Creek by the landowner that clearly do not respect the guidelines for goat habitat as outlined in the OCP. Are those structures illegal, and if so, why was it allowed, and why has the land developer not been held accountable? It is a complete mystery to me why RDEK is considering the developments that will benefit only the developer, to the detriment of the residents of Invermere and the environment for all time. To allow small parcel development goes against many of the stated goals of the OCP, such as supporting agriculture, maintaining ecosystem function including grasslands, sensitive habitat, and connectivity corridors, recognizing the risk of interface fire, conserving cultural resources, reducing greenhouse gas emissions, and recognizing the environmental importance of Lake Windermere. Imagine hundreds more home owners wanting to put boats on an already over-used Lake Windermere. And where will the water come from for all the new homes? Who will pay for fire protection? In this age of climate change, our best protection is undisturbed nature to maintain our air and water quality. Please respect the wishes of the people of the Columbia Valley instead of caving in to the demands of a land developer who is the only one who will benefit from developing the west side of Lake Windermere.

Invermere

Anonymous

6/25/2019 07:52 AM

My husband and I are residents of Invermere and we do not wish for concentrated urban development especially along the environmentally sensitive area in the Columbia valley.

Anonymous

I live in Pineridge and am interested in an acreage on the west side of

6/26/2019 05:11 AM

Anonymous

6/26/2019 05:18 AM

Pineridge when they become available. I am very familiar with the land and believe that acreages close to Town and the Toby Creek Escarpment will be an attractive amenity. I also look forward to the establishment of formalized bike trails. My concern relates to the conservation of 50% of the land and the concentration of density in clusters. I am interested in a 5 acre parcel of land where I can create my own "paradise". I am very concerned that by only allowing the developer to develop only 50% of their land, you are forcing them to create smaller lots. While having green space has some attraction, I do not think you are creating the type of development, I and others want. I would ask you to please reconsider the forced retention of 50% of the lands. I live in Invermere and am looking for a lake view lot in Castlerock when they become available. Section 5 e) of the Draft OCP encourages annexation of these lands into the District of Invermere. I agree that these lands are best developed as part of Castlerock within the District. However, I am also aware of the politics in town and know that a plebiscite will have opposition. I would encourage you to allow potential development of these lands into acreages if the lands are not annexed into the District. I am concerned that the language, as drafted, creates only the alternative of developing these lands within the District. These are great lands and ought to be allowed to be developed as higher density in the District or as acreages within the Regional District. In short, I am opposed to all of the many and extensive policies in the draft OCP that overtly and indirectly allow for sprawling development (by any name) on the westside while compromising the ecological integrity and viability of the rich and rare natural resource that is the westside of Lake Windermere. This document is in many ways custom-crafted for westside sprawl in the best interests of a single large land owner. The OCP is fatally inconsistent, on the one hand claiming to champion environmental responsibility and value, while on the other hand very effectively undermining the possibility of maintaining those ecological values and resources into the future. The rationale for this is never made clear in the document – there is NO statement provided that there is any public demand for this type of development, and yet, there are whole sections of the OCP that support it. The introduction of "conservation subdivision design" is a poor effort to rationalize development that the public is not demanding in that face of a clear public demand for the very opposite – protection of the westside as a large landscape. The details of my statement above are outlined below. 1.1.1 ...[this] document is intended to reflect the collective vision of the plan area for the future. I do not agree that the draft reflects the collective vision with respect to the Westside. On this topic, I feel that the plan defers almost entirely to a vision of the future being driven by a single developer that I believe is still Grizzly Ridge. I am baffled as to why this deference has been given to the developer – at every single public process to date since the former Hoffert Properties were purchased by the current owner, the public in our area has spoken clearly that sprawl development that wraps around our community to the south and west is not in our best interest. This section states further that "RDEK Board has considered the interests of the individual landowners and residents within the plan area and balanced those interests

with the needs of the community and region as a whole". I do not agree on this point with respect to the westside. I feel very strongly that the OCP has given a single large landowner a trump card that cancels out the public voice of the residents of the Lake Windermere Area.

1.1.8 Relationship to the District of Invermere The OCP also establishes policies that recognize potential opportunities for boundary expansion by the District of Invermere. Where the DoI Official Community plan references boundary expansion, it SPECIFICALLY and principally references the need to consider an Urban Containment Boundary, and states clearly that there are limited rationale that should be considered for expansion. It makes no reference to development of estate residential as a rationale to expand the boundary of the municipality. The draft Lake Windermere OCP language cited above seems to infer that the District of Invermere is seeking potential opportunities for boundary expansion, which is not the case.

1.1.9.(3) Westside The owners represent a range of interests including conservation, resource management, development and agricultural interests. I believe I am accurately aware of who the major land owners are and I am also aware that 3 have not been consulted directly by the RDEK about westside development. These three are also opposed to development on the wide-open spaces that is the westside of Lake Windermere, of the type allowed in this draft OCP.

3.0 Goals of the OCP Of the list of 13 goals of the OCP, it is my assessment that the policies that have been proposed respecting development on the westside will negatively influence achievement of at least 6, and will positively influence only 1. The Other 6 are not influenced by, nor do they influence the westside.

- Westside development policies will negatively affect:
 - o Supporting agriculture
 - o Recognizing the environmental importance of lake Windermere
 - o Maintaining ecosystem function including grasslands, sensitive habitat, and connectivity corridors
 - o Recognize the risk of interface fire
 - o Conserve cultural resources
 - o Reduce greenhouse gas emissions
- It seems that the only overall OCP goal that could possibly be interpreted as supporting the policies that have been drafted that allow extensive development on the westside is:
 - o "Encourage residential development that reflects the diverse interests and lifestyles of resident and non-resident homeowners and recognizes the need for a variety of housing types"

This policy seems custom crafted to allow for westside expansion and development. I ask, where is the overall housing goal that says "encourage residential development that meets the needs of the emerging workforce and families in the region, while also taking into consideration that not all residents are homeowners, and there is a devastating crisis in the housing market that makes it almost impossible find a place to rent affordably"? In short, in the goals of the OCP there is almost nothing that leads logically to the incredible breadth of permissive policies, exceptions, and loopholes that have been embedded throughout in support of westside expansion.

4.1 Residential land use, background First paragraph: Throughout the planning process, residents and non-residents expressed a desire to see infill development or new construction adjacent to existing residential nodes. Infill housing options such as secondary suites are seen as one opportunity to

potentially increase the availability of rental housing stock in the area without the need to develop and service bare land... When planning for new residential development, some principles were universally supported during public consultation for this plan: A mix of residential densities (single, two and multi-family); infill development; community water and sewer should be provided for existing and future resident; new residential developments should include opportunities for non-motorized transportation and establish non-motorized connection between communities, open space, recreational amenities and commercial services and the; rural character of the area should be preserved. I note that there is no universal support stated for development of large tracts of land outside of existing communities, but there is universal support stated for infill development. How is it then that the goals of the OCP gloss over this need completely, and that it seems to so strongly support the one kind of development that was NOT universally supported? This must be addressed by the Board.

4.3 (g) Conservation Subdivision Design has been entered into this document as if it is a well understood development typology that will somehow maintain the ecological values of the westside of the lake while allowing for (on page 15) that “the number of parcels in development clusters should be approximately the same as the number of parcels that would be provided on the parent parcel through a conventional rural subdivision”. What exactly IS conservation subdivision design? I have studied with the author of the design concept – but I don’t believe that most people in this valley know, nor, likely, do the board members – how is it to be assessed? – there is no “develop a CSD policy assessment process” noted in the implementation plan for the OCP – it is just assumed that everyone knows and should accept that when the developer applies to the RDEK for subdivision approval and the RDEK wants to allow development on the westside it will somehow be a “conservation” subdivision, and we should just trust that the astounding ecological values on the westside will be left intact at the hands of a developer who, to date, has actively denigrated the very ecological values we are being asked to assume they will “developprotect”. This is, to be blunt, entirely in-credible.

4.3 (5) Westside (a) any policy that begins with the word “despite” should be examined closely. In this case, the word despite fatally undermines the stated 120 hectare parcel minimum for the westside and lays out 2.5 pages of exceptions to that rule, with 1.5 pages overtly pertaining to land where 120 hectare parcels are possible. Section 4.3 (5)c begins by stating the amazing ecological values and sensitivity of the land in question, and then goes on to state “...Rezoning may be supported in this area if the proponent can demonstrate how development impacts, traffic concerns and existing recreational potential is maintained and enhanced through application of the following...”. The land in question is the size of Invermere! By protecting some viewscapes, providing a big road and some trails, not developing in undevelopable sections (!), providing a report that promises that the development will not destroy Invermere’s water supply, and giving a bit of free stuff that we will decide about later, the developer wins the right to vastly transform the future of this region permanently and forever, despite the fact that there is no visible

public or market demand for what the developer proposes to offer. This section even goes so far as to show the developer the path to success – Conservation Subdivision Design!! If you call it CSD, surely we the public will say yes. But we are not saying yes. We are still saying no. 6.3.(1)(b) Agricultural Land use. Fragmentation or parcelization of agricultural lands in the plan area is generally not supported. This is an example of where the document indirectly undermines the policies elsewhere around ecological integrity etc.. The use of the word “generally” allows ample room for interpreting this policy to mean that parcelization of large tracts of land is really an option that is very much on the table. Why not just say it is “not” supported, and require developers to make the case, do the agricultural consultation, and CONVINCING the people of this region that their plans do not, in fact adversely impact ag values? 7.3 (2) The policies in this section on collaborative planning for locating a viable light industrial land base are very positive. 9.0 Open Space recreation and trails (OSRT) There is a clearly stated public desire for recreational trails in the region. This OCP draft directly references the opportunities associated with the Westside Legacy Trail (I think it has a different name as a result of sponsorship and should be properly identified in the OCP), the Old Coach Greenway, Windermere beach Park, Cross Road Ball Park, and communities along the east side of lake Windermere. Appropriately, there is NO mention of developing new facilities on the westside of the lake, however, the westside development policies themselves seem to indicate that OSRT development is on the table there. Instead, what about highlighting the westside, conservation based recreation opportunities that are already existent on both public and private lands such as through NCC, the Nature Trust, and SRL, as well as one amazing provincial park site. None of these amenities have required that we trade development rights at the expense of ecological integrity in order to achieve some trails. There is AMPLE recreation on the Westside and grizzly ridge recreation “opportunities” come at too high a price. 11. Environmental considerations This section seems well thought out at first glance, until it is read with the westside development policies close at hand, and the caveats are properly understood. The language in this section is inherently permissive of development – simply stating that something is been measured, mapped, and recognized as having ecological value will not protect it. We must also say that we must not, except in the most extraordinary circumstances, allow for degradation of our remaining intact ecosystems. This section does not meaningfully or effectively impede development in ESAs. For example: section 11.1(2)c talks about maintaining habitat connectivity, and very next paragraph at (3)a begins “where intensive development is proposed in a wildlife corridor...” again – this lacks credibility. This policy statement opens a wildlife/human interaction AND wildfire nightmare! Under what conditions would the board be willing to consider “intensive development” in a wildlife corridor, for goodness sake?! Why bother mapping the corridors at all? Then, just to confuse matters, just 5 paragraphs later (f), the document swings back to say “future land uses should promote habitat connectivity and discourage fragmentation of contiguous ecosystems”. So are we developing the corridors

or not? Well, just a few paragraphs later, we see why it will be ok to develop the corridors... “because “education programs such as WildSafe are encouraged”. Thank goodness. Once we put the people with the wildlife, then the people can learn about how not to get in the wildlife’s way. Simply put, the number one strategy for reducing wildlife-human conflict is not to develop in wildlife corridors. Later, at section (o), where a policy is established stating that “preservation of wildlife connectivity corridors is encouraged and supported by the following:” the third and fourth sub-policies talk about how extensive development should be avoided, but if it can’t, it should be done so as to “limit the impediment of wildlife movement”. There is a profound and inherent contradiction in this section about environmental considerations. If this section is intended to limit development in ecological valuable and sensitive areas, it is unlikely to be effective, and is more than likely to allow room for people to find ways to continue business as usual development. Ironically, section 11.2(1) states clearly that the number one threat to biodiversity is habitat loss. This document doesn’t really seem to be bothered by this fact – it is designed to get around it. Section 11.4 highlights the contiguous ecosystems on the westside of the lake that allow critical habitat connectivity from north to south and from east to west. So WHY, for goodness sake, so much deference to the one developer who stands willing and able to destroy these values? DPA #2 Protection of ESAs This section does not meaningfully or effectively impede development in ESAs The objective of Development Permit Area #2 is the protection, preservation, restoration and enhancement of the significant ecosystems, habitats and features identified in 19.3(6)(a)(i)-(vi) and on Schedules I1 to I4.... Followed by the caveat that “The intent is not to preclude all development in these areas, but to provide notice that the areas include unique characteristics that warrant special review and consideration and to ensure appropriate mitigation measures are prescribed where appropriate.” Essentially, business as usual. Or more cynically, as long as a QEP can provide a report that the land on either side of the road you pushed in really no longer has ecological values, you can go ahead and develop – you just need an appropriately named Development Permit first. Again, the ESA DPA section is fatally undermined by shoulds and mays, and is terribly lacking in should nots and may nots. Given that it has been identified in the document, for example, that grasslands are critically endangered ecosystems, it is disheartening to find policies beginning “If development is proposed within grassland ecosystems...” and ending “...should minimize negative impacts”. How about “development in grassland ecosystems is strongly discouraged and there must be no net negative loss of the current extent of grasslands in the plan area as a result of human development”? Later in this DPA, we see a strange collision of wildsafe and firesmart policy failures: at section (e) there is yet another allowance that there could be extensive development in a wildlife corridor, but this time pruning of underbrush and removal of forest cover is discouraged to support wildlife movement, thereby exacerbating the risk of BOTH of wildlife/human conflict and wildfire in new residential areas. At section (d) we see allowance for the possibility of road building and industrial

activity in mountain goat habitat – again the language is permissive, not prohibitive. With respect to the deferral to QEPs, I would like to reflect back to you a brief story about a land use application that came across my desk years ago. Upon having been directed to provide an environmental impact assessment report for a proposed development, I received from the developer's QEP a 1 page report stating, literally, that after the property was developed, it would no longer have ecological values and wildlife should be prevented from accessing the property in order to minimize human-wildlife conflict. The property in question was ultimately approved under similarly permissive ESA policies, and was, sadly, formerly grassland and mixed IDF, as well as a mountain goat corridor. If this LW Draft OCP is going to defer so clearly to a QEP, the expectations for ecological PROTECTION must be far more clearly and prohibitively stated. Finally, Implementation Strategy, section 20.5: I do not see any staff action identified to handle the major development implications of development on the westside – a tract of land equal in size to the District of Invermere. I have to assume that once an application comes in for this massive land development area, the implications and work load will be handled on an ad hoc basis. I believe that the rationale for NOT including Westside development in the implementation strategy despite the VERY permissive nature of the document in this regard, is that there is no public mandate for allocating staff and financial resources to the task. All of the other projects identified in the implementation strategy have a clear public mandate that has been developed and matured over time. No similar mandate exists for the Westside of the lake and yet the document gives abundant, repeated, and permissive consideration to development of the area. As stated at the outset of my comments, I do not support westside development and feel comfortable stating that there will be strong and broad public opposition to it. I am terribly disappointed to be making these comments yet again after so many years. Very insulting is the glaring re-introduction of the very same Grizzly Ridge development proposal just to the south of Invermere that was so recently rejected by the Board of Directors. On what grounds has the RDEK OCP effectively re-invited that proposal? In short, I am opposed to all of the many and extensive policies in the draft OCP that overtly and indirectly allow for sprawling development (by any name) on the westside while compromising the ecological integrity and viability of the rich and rare natural resource that is the westside of Lake Windermere. This document is in many ways custom-crafted for westside sprawl in the best interests of a single large land owner. The OCP is fatally inconsistent, on the one hand claiming to champion environmental responsibility and value, while on the other hand very effectively undermining the possibility of maintaining those ecological values and resources into the future. The rationale for this is never made clear in the document – there is NO statement provided that there is any public demand for this type of development, and yet, there are whole sections of the OCP that support it. The introduction of “conservation subdivision design” is a poor effort to rationalize development that the public is not demanding in that face of a clear public demand for the very opposite – protection of the westside as a

Anonymous

6/26/2019 11:04 AM

large landscape. The details of my statement above are outlined below. 1.1.1 ...[this] document is intended to reflect the collective vision of the plan area for the future. I do not agree that the draft reflects the collective vision with respect to the Westside. On this topic, I feel that the plan defers almost entirely to a vision of the future being driven by a single developer that I believe is still Grizzly Ridge. I am baffled as to why this deference has been given to the developer – at every single public process to date since the former Hoffert Properties were purchased by the current owner, the public in our area has spoken clearly that sprawl development that wraps around our community to the south and west is not in our best interest. This section states further that “RDEK Board has considered the interests of the individual landowners and residents within the plan area and balanced those interests with the needs of the community and region as a whole”. I do not agree on this point with respect to the westside. I feel very strongly that the OCP has given a single large landowner a trump card that cancels out the public voice of the residents of the Lake Windermere Area. 1.1.8 Relationship to the District of Invermere The OCP also establishes policies that recognize potential opportunities for boundary expansion by the District of Invermere. Where the DoI Official Community plan references boundary expansion, it SPECIFICALLY and principally references the need to consider an Urban Containment Boundary, and states clearly that there are limited rationale that should be considered for expansion. It makes no reference to development of estate residential as a rationale to expand the boundary of the municipality. The draft Lake Windermere OCP language cited above seems to infer that the District of Invermere is seeking potential opportunities for boundary expansion, which is not the case. 1.1.9.(3) Westside The owners represent a range of interests including conservation, resource management, development and agricultural interests. I believe I am accurately aware of who the major land owners are and I am also aware that 3 have not been consulted directly by the RDEK about westside development. These three are also opposed to development on the wide-open spaces that is the westside of Lake Windermere, of the type allowed in this draft OCP. 3.0 Goals of the OCP Of the list of 13 goals of the OCP, it is my assessment that the policies that have been proposed respecting development on the westside will negatively influence achievement of at least 6, and will positively influence only 1. The Other 6 are not influenced by, nor do they influence the westside. • Westside development policies will negatively affect:

- o Supporting agriculture
- o Recognizing the environmental importance of lake Windermere
- o Maintaining ecosystem function including grasslands, sensitive habitat, and connectivity corridors
- o Recognize the risk of interface fire
- o Conserve cultural resources
- o Reduce greenhouse gas emissions

• It seems that the only overall OCP goal that could possibly be interpreted as supporting the policies that have been drafted that allow extensive development on the westside is: o “Encourage residential development that reflects the diverse interests and lifestyles of resident and non-resident homeowners and recognizes the need for a variety of housing types” This policy seems custom crafted to allow for westside expansion and

development. I ask, where is the overall housing goal that says “encourage residential development that meets the needs of the emerging workforce and families in the region, while also taking into consideration that not all residents are homeowners, and there is a devastating crisis in the housing market that makes it almost impossible find a place to rent affordably”? In short, in the goals of the OCP there is almost nothing that leads logically to the incredible breadth of permissive policies, exceptions, and loopholes that have been embedded throughout in support of westside expansion.

4.1 Residential land use, background First paragraph: Throughout the planning process, residents and non-residents expressed a desire to see infill development or new construction adjacent to existing residential nodes. Infill housing options such as secondary suites are seen as one opportunity to potentially increase the availability of rental housing stock in the area without the need to develop and service bare land... When planning for new residential development, some principles were universally supported during public consultation for this plan: A mix of residential densities (single, two and multi-family); infill development; community water and sewer should be provided for existing and future resident; new residential developments should include opportunities for non-motorized transportation and establish non-motorized connection between communities, open space, recreational amenities and commercial services and the; rural character of the area should be preserved. I note that there is no universal support stated for development of large tracts of land outside of existing communities, but there is universal support stated for infill development. How is it then that the goals of the OCP gloss over this need completely, and that it seems to so strongly support the one kind of development that was NOT universally supported? This must be addressed by the Board.

4.3 (g) Conservation Subdivision Design has been entered into this document as if it is a well understood development typology that will somehow maintain the ecological values of the westside of the lake while allowing for (on page 15) that “the number of parcels in development clusters should be approximately the same as the number of parcels that would be provided on the parent parcel through a conventional rural subdivision”. What exactly IS conservation subdivision design? I have studied with the author of the design concept – but I don’t believe that most people in this valley know, nor, likely, do the board members – how is it be assessed? – there is no “develop a CSD policy assessment process” noted in the implementation plan for the OCP – it is just assumed that everyone knows and should accept that when the developer applies to the RDEK for subdivision approval and the RDEK wants to allow development on the westside it will somehow be a “conservation” subdivision, and we should just trust that the astounding ecological values on the westside will be left intact at the hands of a developer who, to date, has actively denigrated the very ecological values we are being asked to assume they will “developprotect”. This is, to be blunt, entirely in-credible.

4.3 (5) Westside (a) any policy that begins with the word “despite” should be examined closely. In this case, the word despite fatally undermines the stated 120 hectare parcel minimum for the westside and lays out 2.5 pages of exceptions to that rule,

with 1.5 pages overtly pertaining to land where 120 hectare parcels are possible. Section 4.3 (5)c begins by stating the amazing ecological values and sensitivity of the land in question, and then goes on to state “....Rezoning may be supported in this area if the proponent can demonstrate how development impacts, traffic concerns and existing recreational potential is maintained and enhanced through application of the following...”. The land in question is the size of Invermere! By protecting some viewscales, providing a big road and some trails, not developing in undevelopable sections (!), providing a report that promises that the development will not destroy Invermere’s water supply, and giving a bit of free stuff that we will decide about later, the developer wins the right to vastly transform the future of this region permanently and forever, despite the fact that there is no visible public or market demand for what the developer proposes to offer. This section even goes so far as to show the developer the path to success – Conservation Subdivision Design!! If you call it CSD, surely we the public will say yes. But we are not saying yes. We are still saying no. 6.3.(1)(b) Agricultural Land use. Fragmentation or parcelization of agricultural lands in the plan area is generally not supported. This is an example of where the document indirectly undermines the policies elsewhere around ecological integrity etc.. The use of the word “generally” allows ample room for interpreting this policy to mean that parcelization of large tracts of land is really an option that is very much on the table. Why not just say it is “not” supported, and require developers to make the case, do the agricultural consultation, and CONVINCING the people of this region that their plans do not, in fact adversely impact ag values? 7.3 (2) The policies in this section on collaborative planning for locating a viable light industrial land base are very positive. 9.0 Open Space recreation and trails (OSRT) There is a clearly stated public desire for recreational trails in the region. This OCP draft directly references the opportunities associated with the Westside Legacy Trail (I think it has a different name as a result of sponsorship and should be properly identified in the OCP), the Old Coach Greenway, Windermere beach Park, Cross Road Ball Park, and communities along the east side of lake Windermere. Appropriately, there is NO mention of developing new facilities on the westside of the lake, however, the westside development policies themselves seem to indicate that OSRT development is on the table there. Instead, what about highlighting the westside, conservation based recreation opportunities that are already existent on both public and private lands such as through NCC, the Nature Trust, and SRL, as well as one amazing provincial park site. None of these amenities have required that we trade development rights at the expense of ecological integrity in order to achieve some trails. There is AMPLE recreation on the Westside and grizzly ridge recreation “opportunities” come at too high a price. 11. Environmental considerations This section seems well thought out at first glance, until it is read with the westside development policies close at hand, and the caveats are properly understood. The language in this section is inherently permissive of development – simply stating that something is been measured, mapped, and recognized as having ecological value will not protect it. We must also

say that we must not, except in the most extraordinary circumstances, allow for degradation of our remaining intact ecosystems. This section does not meaningfully or effectively impede development in ESAs. For example: section 11.1(2)c talks about maintaining habitat connectivity, and very next paragraph at (3)a begins “where intensive development is proposed in a wildlife corridor...” again – this lacks credibility. This policy statement opens a wildlife/human interaction AND wildfire nightmare! Under what conditions would the board be willing to consider “intensive development” in a wildlife corridor, for goodness sake?! Why bother mapping the corridors at all? Then, just to confuse matters, just 5 paragraphs later (f), the document swings back to say “future land uses should promote habitat connectivity and discourage fragmentation of contiguous ecosystems”. So are we developing the corridors or not? Well, just a few paragraphs later, we see why it will be ok to develop the corridors... “because “education programs such as WildSafe are encouraged”. Thank goodness. Once we put the people with the wildlife, then the people can learn about how not to get in the wildlife’s way. Simply put, the number one strategy for reducing wildlife-human conflict is not to develop in wildlife corridors. Later, at section (o), where a policy is established stating that “preservation of wildlife connectivity corridors is encouraged and supported by the following:” the third and fourth sub-policies talk about how extensive development should be avoided, but if it can’t, it should be done so as to “limit the impediment of wildlife movement”. There is a profound and inherent contradiction in this section about environmental considerations. If this section is intended to limit development in ecological valuable and sensitive areas, it is unlikely to be effective, and is more than likely to allow room for people to find ways to continue business as usual development. Ironically, section 11.2(1) states clearly that the number one threat to biodiversity is habitat loss. This document doesn’t really seem to be bothered by this fact – it is designed to get around it. Section 11.4 highlights the contiguous ecosystems on the westside of the lake that allow critical habitat connectivity from north to south and from east to west. So WHY, for goodness sake, so much deference to the one developer who stands willing and able to destroy these values? DPA #2 Protection of ESAs This section does not meaningfully or effectively impede development in ESAs The objective of Development Permit Area #2 is the protection, preservation, restoration and enhancement of the significant ecosystems, habitats and features identified in 19.3(6)(a)(i)-(vi) and on Schedules I1 to I4.... Followed by the caveat that “The intent is not to preclude all development in these areas, but to provide notice that the areas include unique characteristics that warrant special review and consideration and to ensure appropriate mitigation measures are prescribed where appropriate.” Essentially, business as usual. Or more cynically, as long as a QEP can provide a report that the land on either side of the road you pushed in really no longer has ecological values, you can go ahead and develop – you just need an appropriately named Development Permit first. Again, the ESA DPA section is fatally undermined by shoulds and mays, and is terribly lacking in should nots and may nots. Given that it has been identified in the document, for example, that

grasslands are critically endangered ecosystems, it is disheartening to find policies beginning “If development is proposed within grassland ecosystems...” and ending “...should minimize negative impacts”. How about “development in grassland ecosystems is strongly discouraged and there must be no net negative loss of the current extent of grasslands in the plan area as a result of human development”? Later in this DPA, we see a strange collision of wildsafe and firesmart policy failures: at section (e) there is yet another allowance that there could be extensive development in a wildlife corridor, but this time pruning of underbrush and removal of forest cover is discouraged to support wildlife movement, thereby exacerbating the risk of BOTH of wildlife/human conflict and wildfire in new residential areas. At section (d) we see allowance for the possibility of road building and industrial activity in mountain goat habitat – again the language is permissive, not prohibitive. With respect to the deferral to QEPs, I would like to reflect back to you a brief story about a land use application that came across my desk years ago. Upon having been directed to provide an environmental impact assessment report for a proposed development, I received from the developer’s QEP a 1 page report stating, literally, that after the property was developed, it would no longer have ecological values and wildlife should be prevented from accessing the property in order to minimize human-wildlife conflict. The property in question was ultimately approved under similarly permissive ESA policies, and was, sadly, formerly grassland and mixed IDF, as well as a mountain goat corridor. If this LW Draft OCP is going to defer so clearly to a QEP, the expectations for ecological PROTECTION must be far more clearly and prohibitively stated. Finally, Implementation Strategy, section 20.5: I do not see any staff action identified to handle the major development implications of development on the westside – a tract of land equal in size to the District of Invermere. I have to assume that once an application comes in for this massive land development area, the implications and work load will be handled on an ad hoc basis. I believe that the rationale for NOT including Westside development in the implementation strategy despite the VERY permissive nature of the document in this regard, is that there is no public mandate for allocating staff and financial resources to the task. All of the other projects identified in the implementation strategy have a clear public mandate that has been developed and matured over time. No similar mandate exists for the Westside of the lake and yet the document gives abundant, repeated, and permissive consideration to development of the area. As stated at the outset of my comments, I do not support westside development and feel comfortable stating that there will be strong and broad public opposition to it. I am terribly disappointed to be making these comments yet again after so many years. Very insulting is the glaring re-introduction of the very same Grizzly Ridge development proposal just to the south of Invermere that was so recently rejected by the Board of Directors. On what grounds has the RDEK OCP effectively re-invited that proposal? Thank you [REDACTED] Westside Road Invermere BC

OCP Draft Open House Sunday – June 9, 2019 Good morning, I strongly believe that the OCP draft presented has some revisions that require some

Anonymous

6/26/2019 12:53 PM

attention. Please see my comments and concerns listed below: 1 - The Westside plan is being based on the fact that the adjacent property was subdivided into small holdings. The subdivision on this parcel was solely given to family to help assist with the care of aging parents. According to the OCP there is no provisions/protection to what this will look like and how will it effect lands with respect to erosion and the water table levels. 2 - In the OCP the roads are to be discussed with the appropriate dept., but the said developer has built many roads within these proposed lands and has already taken undisturbed lands and completely alternated them with no regard to your OCP plan. 3 - The said one owner has been given Carte Blanche and the one already has taken raw land and developed over 100 lots outfitted with water and sewer and to date the large majority is still unsold within the District of Invermere. 4 - The world is urging us to be careful with our environment as the Forests provide many ecosystem services. They support biodiversity, providing critical habitat for wildlife, remove carbon dioxide from the atmosphere, intercept precipitation, slow down surface runoff, and reduce soil erosion and flooding. These important ecosystem services will be reduced or destroyed when forests are converted to development. 5 - There was an email sent out for our preliminary views on the said proposal – they are currently 35 homes hence 35 emails surrounding proposed development, my question is how did the RDEK receive 70 response (approx.) this was not a true representation of what the present homeowners feel. 6 - Lastly to quote the letter to the Editor written in the Pioneer by Pat Morrow dated May 2019 - “all of this for the almighty dollars” with no consideration for the long-term effects. Thank you for your time on this matter, Kind regards, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Coy Rd. Invermere, BC

1.Nothing in this plan addresses the need for affordable housing. In fact it is the opposite. All of the land use restrictions make it next to impossible to develop anything which is economically viable let alone affordable. 2. There is no mention of tiny houses in the OCP and no zoning that allows tiny houses. This could create a way to provide affordable housing but first you need to provide a new zoning or amend current ones to allow same. 3. The restriction within the development permit areas not to allow secondary suites or auxiliary housing also reduces the amount of rental or owned real estate further exacerbating the lack of affordable housing. It's long overdue to address this urgent need instead of adding more bureaucratic red tape. Please consider amending the LWOCP to provide: a. the owner/developer is required to post a significant bond/deposit to cover the cost of screening/landscaping and that if owner/developer fails to screen/landscape adequately in a timely way the RDEK will do so and any costs exceeding the amount of the bond/deposit will be paid by the owner/developer with accrued interest and failure to pay resulting in a charge registered against the land; b. that the owner/developer is required to maintain the screening/landscaping with failure to do so resulting in RDEK doing so with the cost to become a charge against the land; c. both conditions should be part of the Development Permit

Good afternoon, Firstly, I want to commend you on the draft OCP. This a

[REDACTED]
6/27/2019 12:01 PM

[REDACTED]
6/27/2019 02:33 PM

Anonymous

6/27/2019 03:37 PM

much-needed and well thought out document! As a professional consulting archaeologist, I was most interested in section 13, and was greatly impressed with it. I suspect my colleagues at Tipi Mountain were involved in its drafting, so kudos to them as well. My only comment is with regards to 13.3 (2): "Impact management should be discussed with the Ktunaxa Nation Council as per the Ktunaxa Nation Archaeological Engagement Guidelines". I believe this statement should be expanded to include "... the Shuswap Indian Band, and any other affected First Nations" as all of the OCP area is within SIB traditional territory, and some of it overlaps with the claimed traditional territories of the Adams Lake and Neskonlith Indian Bands. Thank you again for all your work, and please don't hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or wish to discuss the above comment. Best, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
6/27/2019 05:29 PM

Please amend LWOC to require bond/deposit by owner/developer to ensure screening and landscaping with RDEK to contract out screening/landscaping, forfeiture of bond/deposit by owner and any excess costs to become a charge on property; also require ongoing maintenance (watering) of landscaping with failure resulting in RDEK contracting it out and financial charge registered against property. Also, consider removing boat/RV/self storage from C-2 zoning.

Anonymous

6/27/2019 08:46 PM

Testing LOREE

[REDACTED]
6/28/2019 12:59 PM

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Lake Windermere OCP. I have lived in Windermere for thirty years and have enjoyed all the benefits of living in our beautiful valley. I have watched the landfill grow from a transfer station into a Regional Landfill. The RDEK approved residential development along the Windermere Loop Road and then allowed the expansion of the Landfill without any consideration to the impact to the homeowners. All of which has happened with very little consultation or public input. I would like the OCP to reflect public concerns regarding the impact the landfill has on air quality, water quality. Is the RDEK following it's own Bylaws and restrictions? Will the height of the landfill continue to grow? Will the RDEK start the process of finding an alternative location? Could there be restriction on vehicles heading to the landfill from the North entrance of Windermere Loop Road? Could trees be planted so we aren't looking at a gravel Mountain? Dust control? Noise control? Are the gases and liquid coming off the landfill, monitored? As a consumer, I understand the need for waste management, and ask that it be closely monitored. Thank you.

[REDACTED]
6/28/2019 01:07 PM

Thank you for allowing feed back for the Windermere OCP. Affordable housing is needed in the Columbia Valley. Will the OCP reflect changes to allow secondary suites? I understand the problems that come with AirB&B transient renters, so would like to see changes to OCP that would allow secondary suites that are long term. This would give minimum wage workers affordable housing and extended family members housing. Thank you.

Anonymous

6/28/2019 01:24 PM

222

Anonymous

6/28/2019 04:02 PM

I am opposed to future developments along the Toby Creek and West Side of Lake Windermere as proposed in the OCP document. I have significant concern about water security for the community and have not seen any evidence of a sanctioned study that proves there is enough ground water contained in the aquifer of the Columbia River headwaters for existing, let alone future residents of the valley. This, in light of province-wide drought brought on by escalating climate change. Additionally, I wish for the valley to remain free of the urban sprawl such as we see in the Okanagan and neighbouring Canmore. Please know that I am opposed to this development. Thank you, [REDACTED] Invermere BC

Anonymous

6/29/2019 09:20 AM

The lake is at capacity for number of boats the lake can handle. Safety and environmental issues must take higher importance and priority. An additional development of any kind, west side or otherwise, can only be approved if it is not compromising the carrying capacity and safety of the lake. The highly destructive, wave producing boat technology currently in vogue has already forced me off the lake. My 16 foot aluminum boat is simply no longer safe nor enjoyable. I have been forced to confine my use of the lake for boating to before 8am. It has become simply unacceptable and must be addressed.

Anonymous

7/01/2019 07:40 AM

I am commenting on Section 5 c) of the draft OCP. I am interested in acquiring a lot overlooking Lake Windermere to replace my present lot on the east side of Lake Windermere. I am familiar with this land and would like to purchase there. I know that the developer will do a great job. However, I am also aware that there is a group of individuals in Invermere opposed to any development on the Westside and that they will try to defeat the plebiscite required for annexation. By stating that development of these lands in the RDEK is not generally supported, I think the RDEK is negatively affecting the outcome of the plebiscite that the RDEK supports being necessary for annexation to occur. Would it make more sense simply to eliminate the language stating subdivision of these lands in the RDEK is not supported?

Anonymous

7/01/2019 08:41 AM

As a resident of the west side area I strongly oppose any new development on the west side of the lake. I do not believe that it will benefit the community in any way and I believe that the environmental impact of building and having new residents in this area is too great to proceed with any new project

Anonymous

7/01/2019 08:49 AM

I oppose new development on the west side of lake Windermere. I think that any new development would be a waste of time and money, and would be too invasive on the surrounding environment to ethically make sense. There are existing properties and land within existing developments to allow for expansion of the area, new developments are unnecessary

Anonymous

7/01/2019 08:53 AM

I strongly oppose any new developments on the west side of Lake Windermere. I hope you consider the negative impacts they would have on the local environment before you wreck it for economical gain.

Anonymous

7/01/2019 09:23 AM

Comment Re: Residential Land Use plan for Westside area highlighted in 4.3 (5) As a 30 year residents of 13th Avenue between Eileen Madson School and JA Liard School we do not support further urban sprawl into the lands described in sections 4.3 (5) (c), (d) and the southern portions of (e) along Johnston Rd. The basis for the objection is: 1. unneeded or unwarranted back-country or lakeside urban sprawl and further degradation of natural

landscapes and wildlife movement corridors. The rural character of the area is disappearing. 2. Numerous unsold lots within adjacent Pineridge, Castlerock and internal Invermere areas and unsold existing housing stock currently on the market indicate that more sprawl is not sustainable. Catering to a home construction industry is not a reason to support urban sprawl. 3. proximity to Paddy Ryan Lake water reservoir (water quality and security). 4. significantly increased road traffic along 13th Avenue that cannot take higher traffic volumes without posing a safety hazard for children and other foot traffic and damage to the currently installed ancient and decrepit water and sewer mains. It is after all a residential area. Water main on 13th Avenue is ancient and of substandard material and always breaking, causing flooding. Floods have occurred twice on our property from breaks in the main. Talk of a major infrastructure pipe replacement has existed for DECADES but due to financial limits, the Village is continuing to have to spend money elsewhere on new things before fixing up existing 13th avenue pipes. Added heavy construction traffic will only make the road crenulations and patch architecture deeper and more pronounced. We strongly endorse spending tax dollars on enhancements to quality of life within the Village of Invermere (e.g. community center, fitness and rec facilities, Athalmer property purchase etc) but not forced annexation and development of areas dedicated to urban sprawl on the fringes that make the valley a nosier, less rural and less desirable place to visit and live.

Anonymous

7/01/2019 10:15 AM

No more sprawl. Please consider the cost to the community over the benefit of a single developer.

Anonymous

7/01/2019 04:03 PM

To whom it may concern I believe Taoya Schaefer's June 27th letter to the editor in The Columbia Valley Pioneer very clearly articulates the reasons why the community is not supportive of the urban sprawl that would result from higher density development on the west side of Lake Windermere and along the Toby Canyon. Sincerely [REDACTED]

Anonymous

7/02/2019 12:00 PM

It appears that under Landuse Windermere East D3 the Upper Windermere Creek is not condisered a WP area. Please reconsider putting this important Creek in a WP area. In the past, Private individuals have redirected the Windermere Creek to suit their needs. Access to the Creek should be by professionals only and not private citizens. Please reconsider this oversight and include Windermere Creek in the WP zone of the LWOCP The is also an important and established Elk Wildlife Corridor running north /south across the Windermere Valley Golf course that has been cutoff by Elkhorn Ranch fencing. The elk have to cross the Windermere Loop Road twice to get to their water source at Windermere Creek. This corridor should be officially recognized by the LWOCP and the fencing issue addressed.

Anonymous

7/03/2019 07:44 PM

I strongly oppose any development in this area because of the negative impact on the environment and ecosystems, as well as because it would create urban sprawl. With so many areas in Invermere and Windermere still available for development, development in this area and the resulting sprawl would be the result of poor planning, and short sightedness and would be a decision based on ignorance and lack of appreciation of the environmental integrity of the area.

Anonymous

7/03/2019 07:49 PM

I strongly oppose any more development on the west side of the lake!!! The reasons? we already have enough developed empty lots available, the impact on the lake, wildlife and the very reason we all live here is being overlooked!!! Please listen to the people and one developer!! \$\$\$

Anonymous

7/04/2019 09:44 AM

Hello Thank you for sending around the OCP plan and seeking input. It is my view that the economic future of the Columbia Valley and Invermere /Windermere areas in particular is tied to recreational development primarily from Alberta residents. You may also find that many visitors who recreate here also want to retire in the area to become permanent residents because of the connections they have made over the years. In short, attractive development from reasonably wealthy citizens who will buy local at least while they are here should be encouraged. I found some confusing details in your plan. For example, the plan states that development in accordance with the plan are supported, but this is weakened later by "may" be supported. Which is it ? Regarding section 5(C), are single family homes supported ? And does the OCP support annexation of these lands into Invermere ? The views would be breathtaking. Also, in section 5(e) (viii) you are proposing to sterilize 50% of lands. Will this not make development virtually impossible economically ? That seems to be a particularly high given the vast acreages of land in the Valley that are Crown and not developed and the limited population density. I also think that many people are looking at acreage lifestyle for 5-10 acre lots with the possibility of a large garden and perhaps horses etc. Can these be accommodated ? These sorts of properties can be very beautiful where new residences are constructed and will bring in employment for trades, tax dollars and fire prevention/breaks. Your ideas regarding trails/walking areas are important. The Westside trail is excellent, and is a good example of what can be done. In closing, the problem with too many restrictions on development is that \$ and people will go elsewhere. Look at what has happened to commercial development in Invermere with the migration to band lands. So as a longtime Valley fan I say encourage high end development.

[REDACTED]

7/04/2019 12:32 PM

I feel it is important to keep the west side of Lake Windermere as a wild and undeveloped resource. This area is ecologically rich and diverse and is important for the environmental integrity of Lake Windermere and the Columbia valley.

Anonymous

7/05/2019 02:15 PM

I support the development of acreages on the backside of Pineridge and Castlerock. Great location and proximity to town. Do not think that a request for 50% land dedication or no development is reasonable but do agree with integration of a bike/walking trail into the development. I also support development of acreages on the East side of Westside Road.

[REDACTED]

7/06/2019 10:40 AM

I support managed development along the west side of Lake Windermere. While mitigation for wildlife concerns and other ecological issues should be strongly taken under consideration, there is room for development. Gauging from the turn out at the open houses and the opposition to managed development, it has been upgraded to Urban Sprawl and devastation of untouched, pristine land that will bring about the end of endangered species - while the hyperbole is effective to bring about a strong emotional response,

there are plenty of examples where careful and thoughtful human development can take place without the catastrophic and terminal effects stated, mostly by folks who already have acreages on the westside of the lake and simply don't want neighbours! Further, we need to get a strong grip on reality as it applies to our region. Every effort has been made to make access to the lake unsafe, unsightly, inconvenient and downright appalling! There is literally NO day use areas on our entire lake! NOW - there is a push to even squash any type of boat storage. We need to realize that the opposition to any of this type of land use is a pointed effort to get rid of boats on Windermere with absolutely NO consideration for how it will crush our economy, kill jobs for families and force us all back to the cities where so many of these "environmental groups" want us! Please ensure when you are submitting final touches to the OCP that you are in TOUCH with reality of what greases the wheels of our economy and that we ALL want to see our economy grow while maintaining the wonderful ecological diversity around us.

Anonymous

7/06/2019 12:08 PM

Just want to register my opposition to any developments on the West side of Lake Windermere. By that I mean subdivisions and developments of any size aimed at the recreational market. If some developers have already made large investments in raw land, and are complaining about not being able to move forward, too bad. That is a risk that every businessperson takes, and RDEK owes them nothing. The best interests of the public dictates that the West side remain undeveloped and in as natural a state as possible. There are still lots of development opportunities on the east side. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Windermere Road, Windermere

Anonymous

7/06/2019 10:14 PM

We are interested to find a small acreage close to Invermere. Glad to see this is being considered. The market is currently lacking this. Not everyone wants to live in town, such as ourselves. We've lived west of Calgary on a small acreage. There were other developments near us that consisted of higher density properties. We enjoyed the rural lifestyle and added space was ideal. It seems the Invermere area has a large amount of undeveloped land. Yet we haven't been able to locate an ideal small acreage close to town. Not certain about the requirement to conserve 50% of developable land. It would make more sense to have a provision on each acreage that states only certain percentage of the parcel can be developed. Most of the land would remain in a natural state.

Anonymous

7/06/2019 11:23 PM

Hello, I am supportive of seeing acreages developed around Invermere. I believe this would fill a void that is much needed. I know numerous people in Invermere that would be interested in owning an acreage within close proximity to town. I find it interesting that people who have commented publicly against any development are those that have what others are seeking...a small parcel of land close to town. I get that they are trying to protect their territory, however, why should everyone else be denied the same privilege. How did the surrounding land owners feel before them! A couple notes with respect to the draft: Do the provisions accord to what has been granted previously, i.e., the conservation of lands 50% requirement. This seems like a big ask...have other developments in the region had to do

Anonymous

7/07/2019 06:41 AM

this? The provision to keep cattle off private land...shouldn't the responsibility to incorporate sufficient controls be the cattle owners responsibility? Why should a private land owner be responsible and have the expense to keep cattle off their land? That's archaic....it would be similar to requiring all my neighbors to fence their yards to keep my dogs off their property versus me fencing my yard to retain the dogs! Thanks

My husband and I live in Windermere and do not want more ugly storage facilities built in this lovely village! Stop boat, and other storage buildings!

Anonymous

7/07/2019 09:39 AM

Dear Mr. Belanger, Ms. Clovechok, and the RDEK Board, I am writing to voice my concerns about certain sections of the draft Lake Windermere Official Community Plan. (OCP) The draft OCP has addressed pressure to develop land on the Westside as outlined in figure #7 in what I feel is an appropriate manner. The draft OCP states that it does not support subdivision of lands in figure #7 but should the District of Invermere request annexation to support appropriate levels of community services things could be addressed then. Nicely done. What is concerning is that the draft OCP has a different view of development land for the plot just across the street outlined in figure #8. The draft OCP states support for rezoning of land in this section subject to water, sewer and minimal parcel size. This different position seems against the principles of the OCP and is inconsistent with the reasoning and logic used for the land outlined in figure #7. What happened here? Did lobbying from developers over-ride the principles and thinking process used for the plot of land just across the street? Several sections of the OCP clearly outline that that striking a balance between development and minimal ecological damage is key to a successful plan. The Westside area of this OCP jurisdiction contains one of the last sections of wonderful low level of developed land remaining. Encouraging development to proceed as the draft OCP outlines in the Westside area is an inappropriate decision and is against the principles of the OCP. Keeping Westside with minimal development would remain true to the principles of the OCP. This area is premium low developed land and is a significant reason why we all enjoy living in the Columbia Valley. Allowing further development of the Westside should not be supported in this OCP. The draft OCP allows for development in other areas of its jurisdiction. This should be sufficient to ward off the continual pressure to grow and allow for a reasonable ecological balance. There is currently under-developed land in other areas of this OCP jurisdiction and in the District of Invermere. Please consider amending the current draft to limit Westside rezoning and subdivisions. Members of the community enjoy wild undeveloped areas. As a concerned member of the community, I applaud your efforts to review the Lake Windermere Official Community Plan and I hope the results of this will bring forward better protections for the Westside of Lake Windermere. Thank you, [REDACTED] Invermere, BC V0A 1K0 Canada

Anonymous

7/07/2019 10:48 AM

I would like to oppose the potential building of an RV/Boat storage facility on North Street at the entrance to Windermere. Please register my opposition to Policy 5.3(3)(d). Regards, [REDACTED]

Anonymous

7/07/2019 04:26 PM

Policy 5.3(3)(d) I object strongly to permitting the addition of this policy. The entrance to Windermere should not be used for storage facilities. Commercial use which benefits residents and visitors is acceptable. The recent Bad Toro decision shows that we do not want the entrances to our towns disfigured by industrial uses. Policy 5.3(3)(d) should be removed.

[REDACTED]

Anonymous

7/07/2019 09:50 PM

Looking for an small Acreage with Town Service for a long period of time,for more priveci,some gardening,there is to many high densety Lots avabel ,but there is a need for avorable Acreages, hope to see same coming soon,it also will a better fit in this unique Landscape. [REDACTED]

Anonymous

7/08/2019 11:14 AM

-Throughout the commentary on the Westside the tems "Are supported", "may be supported" and " is not generally supported are used. Is this directed to the view of the RDEK or the public? Secondly ,if conditions set forth are met does this mean then "supported"? Section 5(c) is a good example where it is stated that"subdivision of these lands is generally not supported within the RDEK". -Section 5(e)-You indicate development should occur between the Toby Creek Haul Road and Johnston Road. I am interested in purchasing an acreage on the west side in this area proposed. These Lands have few amenities or views and have little attraction. I prefer south of Johnston Road which has a great road network and great access to the Westside Road. - Section 5(e) viii -One cannot help but conclude that these provisions are obvious political concessions made to a fringe political group that have been active in Windemere for some time. There is all kinds of high density development in the area of the DOI. Why more of this product? I for one want privacy and perhaps some horses. - One of the objectives articulated in the OCP was to create business opportunities for the construction trades and business in the community. I have knowledge of the shareholders in Grizzly Ridge and they now number about 20 and most put up their entire savings to invest in this Valley Community. With all the land dedications , amenity contributions, servicing requirements and financial expectations to be assumed by the company I cannot see any future for this developer. _ I would sincerely hope the RDEK exercises its mandate for the benefit of the majority of the community to create work and a future for the young people so they have the opportunity to remain in the community. It is not always easy to leave an enduring legacy. Thankyou

Anonymous

7/08/2019 11:40 AM

I am opposed to allowing more storage facilities on the highway corridor around the entrance to Windermere. This a general comment for any proposed storage businesses but the immediate concern is a portion of the draft OCP that identifies a parcel on page 19 that will allow a storage facility under policy 5.3(3)(d). This is the parcel on the NW corner of North Street and the highway. This type of business detracts from the visual appeal of the town entrance. This type of business should be located in an industrial area, not at a high profile location. I believe having a storage business at this location would negatively impact both my property values and the operations of my existing business. [REDACTED]

Anonymous

7/08/2019 01:51 PM

I grew up in this valley and currently live in the Cowichan valley, and I return yearly to visit the valley I love and grew up in. Along with another family we

Anonymous

7/08/2019 03:41 PM

aspire to one day retire back in this area. In the Cowichan valley there are many acreage/hobby farm lots which are very popular for people wanting a rural lifestyle but connection to an urban centre. I am specifically referencing section 5 of the report and the Westside sub-area. As potential buyers in this area we seek acreage type lots in this area, as it is easy access to town, with a connection to a rural lifestyle. Development needs to be supported in this area to entice families like mine to settle in this area and I advocate for the proposed zoning to support the development of such lots.

Please remove policy 5.3(3)(d) - no more storage facilities on this property

Anonymous

7/08/2019 03:48 PM

The area residents have stated VERY CLEARLY that we do not want storage facilities at the intersection of Highway 93 and North Street, which is the entrance to Windermere. The proposal to add 2 more buildings to the ugly gray one that was approved a few years ago must be stopped. Will the RDEK not listen to its constituents??

Anonymous

7/08/2019 04:13 PM

4.3(5) Westside: I believe any future subdivision of any lands should be avoided or seriously limited. We already have a lot of homes and condos which sit empty a lot of the year with seasonal residents. Also there is nothing to rent, seems like most residences are in AirBNB. Why expand on more part-time and extravagant home space when we seriously need more low income housing. It's a shame there are lots of jobs locally and nowhere for people to rent, thus employers are short workers and folks are forced to move away. In summary we need less development, there are enough condos and townhomes and big homes sitting vacant most of the year and they create very limited benefits to the community. 11.1(3) Wildlife Habitat and Corridors: need more serious attention to helping wildlife and avoiding human conflicts, they bear the brunt of incidents and not humans, that's wrong in so many ways. Culling deer and shooting/killing bears should not happen -- need to be more proactive and address the issues and help the animals rather than terminate their lives to fix a blatant human issue. We live in the mountains and while we embrace it, we also need to defend those animals who share our spaces. Corridors and other answers need more attention, let's be proactive and not reactive. 15.3 Solid waste and utilities: subdivisions outside of Invermere and Windermere lack utilities access. Residents either have their own home personal services (eg. Water well servicing only their personal home), or are part of a strata that provides same. What about those of us that can't access Windermere Warer and Sewer? Going forward how do we know we can count on services? Currently services through the Band's subsidiary is limited and cannot take on more customers. Lakeview Meadows is able to access that service but not the other neighbourhoods near Lakeview Meadows. Water and sewer should be provided to all Valley residents, it should be our right and privilege. Thank you for asking for comments and appreciate your consideration.

Anonymous

7/08/2019 04:16 PM

I am really dismayed by this OCP as it seems to focus on more development on the west side of the lake which is such an amazing natural area and should be left as it. I am very much against further development. Sincerely,

██████████

Anonymous

7/08/2019 04:37 PM

As an investor in lands located in Lake Windermere (Grizzly Ridge and Castlerock), the following are my comments to the draft Lake Windermere OCP: 1) The draft OCP generally includes reference to subdivision and development policies and states that those policies set forth “are supported” however there are references where the RDEK states a number of conditions and states that subject to meeting these conditions a proposed subdivision “may be supported”. This type of language creates uncertainty and we wonder if this is the intent of the RDEK. 2) Section 5 (c) - North Leg: The RDEK supports annexation of these lands into the District of Invermere. We agree that these lands are best developed within the District as a component of CastleRock. However, the RDEK does not support subdivision of these lands. We think that this will allow a first line of defence for the people opposed to annexation. It would be better for the RDEK to simply state that if high density single family or multiunit developments are proposed for this land, annexation by the District of Invermere is supported. If the proposed annexation does not occur, we would suggest that the RDEK ought to consider development options that work based upon the servicing option(s) provided by the developer. As an example, acreages could work on this land with appropriate water and sewer. As drafted “single family homes” are not supported. This language should be deleted; 3) Section 5 (e): The language pertaining to proposed acreages on the West side of PineRidge and CastleRock is problematic in a number of respects. The two most significant issues are: Section 5 (e) (ii) – Focusing Development: The RDEK proposes that development be focused within areas lying south of the Toby Creek Haul Road and North of Johnston Road. The premier portions of the lands in Figure 9 lie South of Johnston Road towards the Goldie Creek Waterfall Park and North of the Toby Creek Haul Road towards the Toby Creek escarpment. As with the area between Johnston Road and the Toby Creek Haul Road, both of these areas are also served by existing road networks. We submit that the RDEK ought not to propose “focusing development” between Johnston Road and the Toby Creek Haul Road; Section 5 (e) (viii) – 50% Land Sterilization: This is the most problematic provision within the OCP as it pertains to the Grizzly Ridge lands. The RDEK is proposing that in order to develop acreages on the West side of Invermere 50% of the developable lands in Figure 9 must be left undeveloped and not parceled. The RDEK is contemplating some form of conservation development guidelines originating in North Carolina where a large population expansion and a very robust development market is resulting in the urbanization of the landscape. In order to retain green space, the authorities in these jurisdictions provide tax incentives and density credits (numerous units per acre) to entice developers to preserve undeveloped areas in return for concentrating development in higher density development nodes with surrounding greenspace. There is some merit in this development approach in high population areas with a development explosion. However, Invermere is not North Carolina.

Anonymous

7/08/2019 06:33 PM

Our friends live in Castlerock and we love the area. We are looking to retire to the valley and would be interested in an estate lot or small acreage near town. We've been keeping an eye on the resales and have not found a

Anonymous

7/08/2019 06:53 PM

suitable property. We would like to see the District or county open up more land so that there are opportunities to get an acreage close to town. We support the concept of small parcels close to Invermere. A comment about the OCP that we have is that rather than require 50% of land to be conserved, which seems very high, why not create corridors of park space and pathways throughout the properties. If you utilized 20% of the lands would seem sufficient. Our community in Calgary has nice pathways and green spaces, but it doesn't comprise 50% of the development....wouldn't be practical. The Langton's Calgary

Policy 5.3(3)(d) I totally disagree with this proposal for more storage on this property. It is poor planning choice. Storage facilities should not be visible at the entrance to the community. A plan should be made for a proper industrial area away from the highway and entrances to our communities. Area 4.4.3(2) Windermere North. The area of Upper lakeview Rd, Highlands community and Lakeview Road should be a priority for community water. If any development to increase density close to Athalmer Road the whole area should be connected to water services. This is a common sense for health of the area. Climate change policies 16 page 48 should have economic considerations, a main priority is affordable housing. The added costs of these expensive and often inefficient energy are a negative toward this struggling community. We already pay too much!

Anonymous

7/08/2019 07:57 PM

I am providing feedback specifically to Section 4: 4.3 (5) (C) (D): I live in CastleRock Estates; our property backs the proposed subdivision in Figure 7. At the risk of having NIMBY syndrome, the parcels of lands noted in Figure 7 were protected for Rural Resource Zones and to prevent urban sprawl. I strongly believe there is no need to subdivide this particular area as there is currently sufficient land for subdivisions within the RDEK and areas of the District of Invermere. Furthermore, Figure 7, proposed by Grizzly Ridge Properties, backs onto a current development, i.e. CastleRock Estates, which has many lots still available for sale. I also do not support a potential annexation to the District of Invermere for this specific area of land.

Anonymous

7/08/2019 07:57 PM

I have the following comments to provide in relation to items 4.3 (5) (C) & (D) This is nothing more than urban sprawl and an initiative being proposed by a developer who already has more land and lots that he can sell. There is already more available land for development than the market can support. Wild, forested lands adjacent to the border of the District of Invermere should not be available for urbanization when there is already available land the developer proponent has available for sale and cannot sell. The proposal to allow the subdivision of these lands is death by a thousand cuts. The lands should never have been sold off by the province, do not allow the destruction of these lands now through subdivision. The people of Invermere are not supportive of this proposal and have made their feelings known in the past. It will be the homeowner taxpayer who will have to pay for the fiasco the annexation of these lands by the DOI will result in. Stand by sound land management principles and do not facilitate this destruction of wild land and urban sprawl in order to enrich a developer.

As long term residents, parents, local business owners and ranchers, my wife

7/08/2019 08:50 PM

and I are opposed to further subdivision of properties on the west side of Lake Windermere for the following reasons: 1. it would negatively impact the environment - break up wildlife corridors - damage native vegetation, landscapes and lake access used by native animals - wildlife generally suffers even with the most "environmentally sensitive" development - increase our carbon foot print, ie more driving vs densification 2. it would negatively impact agriculture - reduce potential grazing land - increase the likelihood of negative human/cattle interactions 3. it would negatively impact the community - not driven by need/demand in the community, it is driven by the developer - still approx. 25 years of infill potential within town boundaries, densification better than sprawl - increasing urban sprawl would strain municipal resources and increase traffic through school/playground zones - negative impact on the rural/natural character of the west side [REDACTED]

Anonymous

7/08/2019 10:00 PM

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments. Would like to add our support behind the initiative to develop acreages close to Invermere. We moved to the valley from the Cowichan Valley. We lived in a newer development (Mill Springs) on a single family lot. Located beside us was a node of 1- 1.5 acre lots. In addition to that the surrounding area is comprised of small acreages and hobby farms. Everything blended in nicely. It was great to walk from my home along the streets and see properties with horses, small hobby farms, etc. Invermere lacks a diversity of property offerings. There are too many condo and townhome developments in town. It would be nice to have more acreages available that are located within proximity to town. Our family would be interested in owning a small acreage and know other would as well. We're pleased to see that this may be an option soon. Looking at the clause about parcelling 50% of land for natural area is a high proportion. To make the acreages attainable a lower proportion ought to be considered --- 20 to 25% would be reasonable. Thanks [REDACTED]

Anonymous

7/08/2019 10:17 PM

I filled in the survey last summer and will say the same thing again....there is a need for acreages around Invermere. Too many "nimby's" that have what they want and don't want to see the town progress. Look at all the empty retail spaces in town. We need a catalyst for growth in Invermere. There are people looking for small properties that want to be close to town. Do not stipulate that 50% of land must be rendered for parks. That's too much. Who would want to give up that much land!

Anonymous

7/09/2019 07:10 AM

I am opposed to policy 5.3(3)(d), specifically with respect to the parcel of land on North Street at the entrance to Windermere. [REDACTED]

Anonymous

7/09/2019 08:36 AM

Section 5 (a) viii (a) A minimum of 50% of the buildable area of the parent parcel remaining not parceled is a huge amount of land and I see no reason why this massive amount of land must remain undeveloped. The green space can be maintained by a less percentage of non development while still maintaining a very large amount of green space. These are exactly the types of homes people in our community are looking to support and are exactly the types of homes we need in our community.

Anonymous

I have to say I was rather disturbed by Director Clovechok's opening

7/09/2019 09:04 AM

comments at the recent open house wherein she stated that she wasn't really familiar with the OCP and had only attended one meeting. This will be her legacy, one of the more important issues she will undertake in her term, I hope that she will take the time to familiarize herself with the document. I am appalled at the lack of involvement of the local First Nations - both Shuswap and Akisqnuq. Just sending a referral is not sufficient. There should be a representative from both bands on the steering committee. I hope to see this rectified. I understand the Lake Windermere Water Ambassadors are going to be the Director's representatives with regard to the issue of signage for public access on Lake Windermere. I hope this will be approached with a 'can do' attitude as these already are public accesses and residents are entitled to know where they are and to use them. I am excited for this initiative to come to fruition so that lake access can be enjoyed beyond the public beaches. I am sure you have had sufficient comments on future land use for the west side of the lake. I won't reiterate those, but hope that they will be given serious consideration as it is an issue of great importance to the future of the valley.

Anonymous

7/09/2019 09:28 AM

RDEK's suggestion that 50% of the land be untouched is problematic to me. It seems excessive seeing how close the land is to Invermere and it would force any developer into creating very high density areas on small lots which is not something that suits the area. Having some area designated as a green area obviously is a given but 50% is excessive.

Anonymous

7/09/2019 11:16 AM

I am a resident of Invermere and the owner of a parcel of land just south of Invermere and west of the Westside road. I am therefore primarily concerned with the proposed policies affecting the Westside area, namely paragraphs 4.3 (5) (d) and (e), figures 8 and 9. WESTSIDE AREA I am opposed to all proposals allowing "urbal sprawl" in this environmentally sensitive area and in particular I am vehemently opposed to any housing development in the area identified in figure 8. In paragraph 4.2 Objectives you express a concern for "viewsapes". You may or you may not be aware of the fact that this development (figure 8) will obliterate the "only panoramic view" of Lake Windermere left in the entire valley. This is outrageous and should not happen under any circumstances. This viewpoint is one of the few public treasures left in the Valley bottom and should be preserved at all costs. I urge you to visit the area and see for yourself. It looks like he has already staked it out ...which stakes clearly indicate what is to come and how it will eliminate the view. The viewpoint is located immediately south and east of the cattleguard on the Westside Road on the southern boundary of Invermere. Many residents park here or drive by to enjoy the view on a daily basis. To take this away from the public is way beyond reprehensible. And for what...so a few wealthy individuals can have a lovely view from their luxury second homes and the public loose out for all timeit's unspeakable. This is not a "local vision" ...it is a blinding of the locals vision - literally Surely it is your job to ensure that things like this don't happen and the interests of the public are protected. The proposal for housing development in figure 9 is also outrageous and egregious on many many levels and raises some very serious questions with respect to your independence and objectivity with

respect to the owner of this property. Your ongoing efforts to afford him some sort of development makes a mockery of your stated goal to develop a "local vision" for the area. You have been told repeatedly by the people in the area who have had the time and inclination to consider the ramifications that they do not want housing developments down the Westside road. So the only public consensus is against these proposalsyet here you are with yet another one. Why??? An in depth analysis has been provided to you by Meredith Hampstead and I would adopt her comments as well as those of Wildsite, Westside Story: Proposed Sprawl on Lake Windermere found at: <https://secure.wildsight.ca/windermeresprawl>. The comments contained in these two documents should be more than sufficient to shut down any further consideration for housing development in figures 8 and 9 or anywhere else in the Westside area. With respect and objectively speaking, the only morally justifiable reason for allowing housing development in this environmentally sensitive area would be a "pressing public need"....and in this day and age even that may be questionable. Having said that, you seem to acknowledge the need to work with or defer to the District of Invermere in so far as new housing in this area is concerned. Apparently, there is enough empty space within the District of Invermere to last for the next 25 years. So, there is absolutely no need for housing development in this area. Once again, the only real question is why you continue to keep proposing housing development in this area at the behest of the owner? It is my understanding that the owner of these lands also owns the numerous remaining lots in Castlerock but has not sold any of them for some time.....more cogent evidence that there is no "need" for housing in this area. The bottom line here is that there is no "need" for housing development in this area other than the need of the owner....which as I understand it is not a financial need but some other irrational need which is clearly beyond my ability to comprehend. However for you to continue to facilitate this irrational quest is clearly contrary to the public interest and should be stopped now. What you seem to fail to comprehend is that the owner of this land has no inherent right to development any more than I or anyone else along the Westside road. When we bought our land we also bought the zoning. The owner of this land was a big boy and could read English when he bought it..... indeed as I understand it he also had a law degree....meaning.... he should have understood even better than most what he was buying. Clearly,,,,,, he knew exactly what he was buying and did so anyway. Presumably, he must have done so believing that he could probably bamboozle, cajole, bully or manipulate the RDEK into allowing him to do what the zoning which he bought clearly says he could not do. For you to knuckle under to his irrational demands for development in the face of these facts is incomprehensible: especially when the informed public generally doesn't want it, the fact that it is clearly contrary to many of the stated policies of the RDEK, the fact that it is simply not needed, the fact that it would be only for the wealthy elite and the fact that you would be lining the developers pockets while trashing the environment and the ecosystems. The facts speak for themselves...this needs to be stopped. COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT Urban planning has clearly recognized the need for

industrial parks to contain commercial development. This principle is even more relevant to a scenic mountain setting like ours. The commercial development along the Athlmer highway and the main highway from the traffic lights down to the southern entrance to Windermere is unfortunate to say the least, unspeakably ugly to say the most. It brings to mind the stinging phrase written and made famous by Joni Mitchell "Take paradise and put up a parking lot." The phrase succinctly encapsulates everything which is wrong with unbridled capitalism and public officials who cow-tow to the lust for profit of the supposed movers and shakers. The public end up with a vision forced upon them by the wealthy elite. Any efforts to stop this process and mitigate the damage already done would be highly recommended and strongly supported. PROCESS As a citizen of this supposed democracy and a resident of this area I cannot leave this submission without commenting on this issue. You have had months and months to work on this document. It is your job and you are well paid to do so. I for one do not begrudge you that. But for you to turn around and give the public a paltry one month to try to absorb it all and then try to comment on it in any informative or intelligent way is absolutely egregious and needs to be condemned in the most stringent terms. It certainly would appear to be either not thought out or at worst a deliberate attempt to restrict the public's ability to comment in any meaningful way. Whatever reasoning is behind this process ...it clearly needs to be rethought. [REDACTED] Invermere, B.C.

Anonymous

7/09/2019 12:00 PM

Hello. Thank you for providing a format for thoughts and responses. I am a resident of Invermere and very familiar with the Grizzly Ridge lands surrounding the Town. I use and value the trail network that the landowner has allowed Invermere residents to use. I support the creation of acreages with an integrated trail network and parks. I have read the letters to the editor and other comments by those opposed. I would encourage the RDEK to make it known to people that this is private land and if we are to secure trails and parks we need to accommodate development so that both the public and the landowner benefit. It is in my mind reasonable to allow rural properties to be developed on these lands. I think acreages would be well received by the market and would provide a good compliment to Invermere. It would also be great to secure a trail network. As an outside observer I am concerned that the 50% greenspace requirement is onerous and may backfire since the land owner also requires an incentive to develop. Again, thank you for allowing me to comment.

Anonymous

7/09/2019 01:10 PM

3(1) Goal 1. I strongly believe that this goal should explicitly attach priority to meeting the needs of valley permanent residents over the needs of wealthy non-residents. Without such priority, the added profitability of expensive and luxury homes will always result in the needs of non-residents being met while severe housing shortages persist for working class residents. Furthermore, property developers not only seek to meet the needs of existing non-residents, but market the valley in such a way as to perpetuate the arrival of waves of new non-residents while resident needs remain unmet. Please send a strong signal in this goal that residential needs of residents is the top priority; after all, without the local residents how are the non-resident

homeowners going to receive the services they've come to expect? 3(5) I strongly support the objective of connecting neighbourhoods with non-motorized trails. 3(6) I support providing public access opportunities for non-motorized uses only. Our lake is absolutely overrun with motor boats to the point where I no longer enjoy going to the lake in summer. This plan needs to recognize the need for a cap on motorized use of the lake, and the way to do this is not to keep attempting to provide access to meet demand as non-resident boaters keep pouring into the valley. I support the stewardship portion of this goal, however. 3(7)(11) These need to be a top priority. 4.1 Regarding the question of whether developers should provide improvements to boat launch facilities... the last thing this lake needs is more and improved public boat launch facilities. Instead, any new developments should only be approved with the stipulation that there will be no boat facilities provided. 4.2(1) As stated above, the needs of resident homeowners need to be prioritized ahead of non-residents, otherwise we will continue to see expensive, luxury homes built for non-residents, and affordable housing in existing communities will continue to be neglected. 4.2(2) I do not see a convincing case in this plan that there is a need for new rural residential development. Infill development within existing communities can provide sufficient opportunities. There is no way to create new rural residential developments without having a substantial and unnecessary impact on the remaining ecological value of our rural areas. 4.2 There needs to be an additional objective here that provides that all future development, to the extent possible, will be within and adjacent to existing communities, rather than dispersed through the rural areas, in order to reduce urban and suburban "sprawl", maintain ecological function of rural areas, maintain views, and maintain availability of compatible recreational activities. 4.3.1(e) I agree with development of internal non-motorized trails, however, these need to be designated as open to the public. It is extremely unfortunate that in some developments (eg, Lakeview Meadows) the pathway system is off-limits to the public. Additionally, some recognition needs to be given to the fact that walking and cycling are often not compatible depending on terrain, pathway surface, volume of use, and cycling behaviour. 4.3(1)(f) As stated above, Lake Windermere is already filled to the brim with motor boats that are becoming larger and more numerous each year. We cannot simply keep providing new access and facilities to accommodate more and more motorboats. A better approach would be: (1) not to allow more residential parcels if those are going to create more demand for boating and access. (2) use amenity contributions to create/upgrade/convert new or existing public access into non-motorized access and use only. (3) develop education and awareness programs for the public, visitors, developers, and the real estate industry to promote non-motorized use of the lake only. A majority of lake users are non-motorized users, and yet only something like 1% of the lake is available exclusively for non-motorized recreation. This needs to be turned around. 4.3 (1)(g)(iii)iv) Agreed – important. 4.3 (2) Windermere North. This seems to be a better choice of a residential area than rural areas, since it's embedded within existing residential and commercial areas, except that (a)

as an undeveloped area it may support ecological processes that occur in adjacent woodlands and Copper Point golf course, and it may serve a role as part of a north-south wildlife corridor. Of particular concern is the high suitability of the area as habitat for endangered BC badgers. See the following for additional information: <http://jem-online.org/index.php/jem/article/viewFile/566/500>

4.3 (3) (c) The parcels mapped in figure 4 run along the north bank of Windermere Creek and would be a natural area for wildlife movement and habitat. This is another reason, along with agricultural objectives, not to allow intensive development of these lots.

4.3 (5)(a)(b) and (c) Agree strongly that subdivision within the Westside subarea should not be approved. The lands in Figure 7, 8, and 9 are too far outside of existing undeveloped lands within the District of Invermere and should not be developed, at least not until there is a much higher utilization of lands within Invermere. Developing/subdividing these parcels would violate ecological planning principles and would propagate "suburban sprawl".

4.3 (5)(d) The lands shown in figure 8 should not be rezoned or subdivided. These lands are close to the lake and, notwithstanding the railway, provide support to shoreline ecological processes. For example, breeding waterbirds likely have nests in the adjacent forest area. Furthermore, the proximity of this area to the lake would create demands for lake access and the addition of still more motorboats to an already ridiculously busy lake.

5.1 I agree with many of the views apparently expressed during the previous public engagement process. However, I do want to point out that while there was a preference expressed for "tourism-oriented services", in fact tourism-related activities can have serious environmental impacts unless carefully and strictly managed, particularly if those activities result in large numbers of people being placed into sensitive areas, or simply dispersed broadly such that wildlife have fewer places to avoid human activity.

5.2(2) As per my comment on 5.1, I don't agree that the plan should give such carte blanche support to commercial recreation and tourism land uses. At the very least, re-word this to state "Commercial recreation and tourism land uses within the plan area MAY be supported where compatible with adjacent land uses AND where impacts on wildlife and ecosystems are non-existential or minimal."

5.2(2)(e) (ii) Would point out that a wide range of tourism activities describe themselves as "ecotourism", even those with significant and serious environmental impacts. Oftentimes, tourism operators are unaware that activities that place large numbers of people on the landscape have serious deleterious disturbance effects on wildlife, even if the activities appear to be creating no physical damage.

5.2(2)(h) I believe that we shouldn't be having commercial development sprawl along highway 93/95. Businesses that provide essential services could be permitted, but only within existing commercial /industrial nodes.

6.3(1)(i) I support the existence of the ALR and most of the provisions of 6.2(1). However, I think RDEK should be careful about generally supporting Licenses of Occupation for grazing tenures on Crown land, particularly new ones. I would suggest rewording this clause to "New and continued Licenses of Occupation for grazing tenures on Crown Land are generally supported provided the tenures are not associated with

wildlife fencing and the lands are not prime ungulate winter range". 6.3(1)(m) I suggest this be changed to: "Ecosystem restoration efforts that enhance grasslands and rangelands and reduce impacts from motorized vehicles are supported..." 6.3(2)(d) Yes! 9.1 The ecological impacts of motorized recreation are enormous, including soil damage, vegetation damage, disturbance of wildlife, spread of non-native plants, and air pollution including contributions to greenhouse gas emissions. There are also serious social impacts including conflicts with non-motorized users and noise impacts on adjacent neighbourhoods. Most motorized recreation in the Columbia Valley is by non-residents from Alberta who either own or rent second homes here. RDEK needs to take significant steps, working with the provincial government, to reduce the prevalence and impacts of motorized recreation within the plan area. In Alberta the government has wisely taken steps to substantially reduce the areas in which motorized recreation vehicles can be used. However, this means that more and more Albertans are coming to our unregulated crown lands to use their motorized toys. This plan should be taking active steps to reduce motorized recreation, not simply turning a blind eye to it. Continuation and even growth of motorized recreation in our valley is simply not compatible with ecological objectives and with the plan's commitment to reducing greenhouse gas emissions. 9.2 At the very least, you need an additional objective in here to promote non-motorized recreation as a healthy and less environmentally damaging form of recreation, but preferably to include closing lands to off-road motorized recreation. 9.3(1) Please note that there are dangers inherent in creating trail systems in which cyclists and walkers use the same paths. I think the plan needs to address somewhere that these safety concerns, as well as social considerations, need to be considered. The cycling community is very well organized and active in planning processes, with the result that often the needs of walkers/hikers are not fully considered in trail planning. 9.3(6) As mentioned above, more lake access needs to be dedicated to the majority of users who do not use motorized craft. New and changed access via right-of-ways should only be for non-motorized uses. 10.2 Please add the following objective: "(5) Over time phase out private docks and boat houses that encroach below the high water mark, with the ultimate aim of achieving a shoreline that is accessible to all." The first step should be to stop allowing new private docks and not to approve changes to existing docks. 10.2 Another objective is needed that recognizes that it is completely unsustainable for developers to keep marketing the lake to boaters, leading to a steady growth in the size and number of boats each year. We have to figure out how to stop the growth of motorboating on the lake, and fast. 10.3 (1) (2) I agree wholeheartedly with this. 10.3 (4) No, this only encourages the marketing of new developments to the motor boat crowd. Developers need to start telling buyers that there is no on-site boat storage, and that it is going to be difficult to keep a boat here. 10.3 (5) I agree 100% with this but can it explicitly state that this includes docks? Some of the ones either side of Kinsmen's beach are among the worst examples of docks preventing or impeding public access, but I am sure there are many more examples on the Windermere side. 10.3 (13) Are these

“established individual moorages” in Rushmere currently legally authorized? If not, and these are just the result of people constructing docks without permits, I think it should be required that a group moorage be created or, better still, remove the nonconforming docks. 11.1 Wildlife Habitat. - Glad to see the considerations for mountain goats in Toby Creek, long overdue. I am concerned that mountain bikers in particular will be reluctant to alter their use of this area to accommodate mountain goats, however. - The issue of endangered BC badgers is serious enough that I think you should include a paragraph about the issue in the background (11.1 (1)). - Bighorn sheep occur on the east side of the valley in the Shuswap-Windermere Creek areas, and occasionally come right down to highway 93/95. Of particular concern is whether land owners within or adjacent to wild sheep range keep domestic livestock such as domestic sheep or goats. These animals have the potential to spread catastrophic disease to wild sheep, a major cause of the decline of wild sheep populations in North America in the 20th century. A consideration for agricultural lands, particularly those east of highway 93/95 is whether they would or could be used for domestic sheep. This clearly need to be prohibited. You may want to talk to the provincial wildlife section in Cranbrook about this issue. 11.1 (3)(h) This statement doesn't seem as strongly worded as previous paragraphs regarding the potential impacts of wildlife fencing. Note that another impact if wildlife fencing occurs near roads or highways is that wildlife crossing the road can be blocked by the fence and then “bounce back” onto the road and get struck by vehicles. Also, fencing that is tall but not quite tall enough to exclude all wildlife can end up causing separation of family groups (ie, mother and young). 11.3 Surely this section should mention the water quality issues around having hundreds of high powered motorboats on the lake each day, and identify the problem that continued growth of this activity will lead to the worsening of the situation. 12.2 Is there such a thing as an Interface Fire Hazard plan for the whole plan area? Do we know what the risks are to communities and rural areas from potential wildfire, and have priority areas for fire-smarting been established? Are there some rural locations where the risk of wildfire (and the cost of fuel modification) is simply too high to allow development? 14.1 A few years ago I visited Lake Lucerne in Switzerland. This beautiful lake is larger than Lake Windermere and has a vastly larger human population around it and in the region. On a hot summer day I remarked to my hosts that I was amazed and delighted to see such a beautiful lake and almost no recreational boating or jet-skiing use. The reason for this, I was told, was that there was so little public access to the lake. This should be a lesson to us; if we build access, they will come. If we are concerned about the ecological, social, and safety aspects of so much motorized use on Lake Windermere, then the last thing we should be doing is to provide more and larger boat launches, marinas, etc. We need to start moving away from pandering to the minority of lake users who operate motor boats. 14.3(3) If these rights-of-way provide motor boat launches, then yes, closure of them should be supported, or at least conversion of them to non-motorized use only. 16 Greenhouse Gas Emissions. I support the objectives here, but I think any of the suggested

reductions to emissions will potentially be resoundingly negated if unchecked growth of the non-resident population continues. Consider the huge amount of gas consumed by motorists coming from Alberta, many of them driving large vehicles and towing huge boats or other recreational vehicles. Consider the inefficiency of thousands of non-residents maintaining heated homes year-round that are only used a few weeks a year. And consider the high rates of emissions coming from the motorized recreational toys that so many of the non-residents bring to the valley. If RDEK is serious about reducing GHG emissions then it really needs to start trying to move us to a sustainable economy, not one that depends on more and more and more visitors and non-resident homeowners year after year. 18. Crown Land Management. Please see my comments above about reducing motorized recreation on crown land. I recommend changing 18.2(3) to "Preserve public access to Crown land for NON-MOTORIZED recreation purposes", or at least "Preserve public access to Crown land with the preference being on non-motorized activities." 18.3(5) I suggest adding: "The RDEK encourages... that: (h) emphasizes non-motorized forms of recreation." 19.3 I recommend adding a sub-paragraph that pertains to protecting bighorn sheep from coming into contact with domestic sheep or goats.

Anonymous

7/09/2019 02:35 PM

I do not agree with allowing storage facilities at the entrance of our beautiful windermere town this type of facility is very ugly and should put in the industrial area tourist is a big driver of our economic health and aesthetics should be given the utmost priority cheers and thanks [REDACTED]

Loree Duczek

7/09/2019 02:42 PM

This is just a test LOREE

Anonymous

7/09/2019 03:29 PM

1) I believe that the July 10th deadline for comments that you have set does not provide sufficient time for most people to thoroughly examine the draft OCP. Having had two eye surgeries since the Draft plan was released, I have personally struggled to read the plan with the degree of attention I would have wished. 2) I am very concerned that the process followed in developing this plan has not ensured the involvement of First Nations people or provided sufficient opportunity for non-resident property owners to participate. Your own statistics acknowledge that 75% of the residential land in the Windermere area is owned by non-residents. Why did you not schedule summer meetings when these people are most likely to be in residence? That certainly happened when the 2008 OCP was developed and the methods followed in the meetings in 2007/8 allowed for a healthy exchange of ideas between "locals" and the non-residents - something that sticking post it notes on poster boards did not. It seems important for future planning to know more about the demographics of this non-resident population in order to determine what services might be needed for them to make this area their permanent home in future and/or place of business now. 3) You have also failed to consult with organizations whose interests are directly implicated by certain policies. In particular Policy 8.3 (6) directly targets a building owned by the Windermere Community Association - an organization that was founded as a Society in 1953 in order to provide buildings and facilities for community meetings, entertainment, educational

activities and support. This included operating the Windermere Beach park for more than 50 years and finding the funds to build the current change room/bathroom facilities, the play structures and the concrete benches at that park that were turned over to the RDEK in 2005 when insurance costs made it prohibitive for the WCA to continue operating that facility. The WCA was also responsible for finding funds and volunteers to do an extensive restoration of the Windermere Cemetery but had to turn the maintenance over to the District of Invermere because the WCA has never had sustaining funds to manage any of its projects or maintain any of the facilities it has built. This includes Windermere Hall. The original part of the current hall was built with volunteer labour and money raised locally. Further extensions and upgrades were made with grants and donations after the WCA obtained Charity Status in 1997. To ignore or overlook this history also means that you have failed to access a wealth of information about the community and its needs. That includes activities and studies done by the WCA or its committees that are directly pertinent to some of the goals in the current draft OCP: e.g. a trail network plan. 4) Another organization that you should also have consulted is the Windermere Area Historical Society. The history of the area that is included in the Draft OCP ends about 1910. The impacts of the arrival of the railway in 1912, the building of the Kootenay highway in the 1920s and the construction of myriad downstream dams on the Columbia river are all highly significant elements in the development of the area - as is the current renegotiation of the Columbia River Treat. Having failed to do any significant historical research also means that you have sadly underestimated the value that the "built" history of this area might play in enhancing tourism opportunities and creating a greater sense of community for locals and non-residents alike. The Windermere Cemetery and the Stolen Church may be referenced in your document but what about the part of the original hotel at the S/E corner of Government and Sinclair? What about the North West Mounted Police Barracks or the home of [REDACTED] (now the White House Pub). That house got dismantled in Donald and brought to Windermere before the Kimptons stole St. Peter's Church. Some of these building are surely worth preserving as provincial or even federal heritage sites. Could that not be an objective for the OCP? 5) Although I am pleased to see the issue of Climate Change being addressed in the OCP, I believe that there should be more detailed consideration given this issue. More attention needs to be paid to the impact that back country roads and clear cuts for forestry, recreation or housing have already had on silt loads in the creeks and streams that feed into both Lake Windermere and the Columbia River south of the lake. Silt loads from the flooding that occurred in 2013 noticeable affected the main channel of the Columbia River between Fairmont and the south end of Windermere lake. One can no longer rent a canoe or kayak for unguided travel on that area of the river because there is no longer a clear channel. There was in 2012. Local people also now complain that they cannot use anything other than very small watercraft in large areas at the southern end of the Lake. Similarly, silt loads from Windermere Creek significantly increased the delta at the mouth of the creek

in 2013. Ice formation in that area is no longer stable - as witnessed by a near drowning that prompted the community to start the fund raising campaign that ultimately allowed the Windermere Fire Department to purchase a rescue hover craft. While there are some flood mitigation strategies mentioned in your plan there needs to be more. Relatively simple strategies such as using either above or below ground tanks to capture rain from residential, commercial and institutional buildings can be used to mitigate flood potential at the same time as providing another source for water during periods of drought. Construction of "green" driveways and parking lots help to reduce heat island effects as well as mitigate flood potential. They also help to beautify commercial and industrial areas - something that I believe your plan does not consider enough as it relates to the commercial and light industrial areas on Highway 93/95. They are an eyesore. That includes the property specifically recognized by Policy 5.3 (3) (d). If this policy is meant to allow the current storage facility to expand, I wish to add my voice the considerable number of people in Windermere who find this an intrusion into our community. It certainly does not conform with the Vision Statement of the Windermere Community Association: "The people of Windermere envision their community as primarily residential with artisans and artists, as well as a tourist destination for persons of all ages where individuals and families are able to realize their lifestyle needs and desires with opportunity for education, business, recreation and social integration in a rural village ambiance, affording a clean, safe, attractive environment which includes wildlife, gardens, green space and walkways." Endless storage units does not fit that bill. Finally, there are other aspects of the Plan that I would like to address and reiterate my statement that I feel that the time line for submission of comments is too short. Although I have only been a permanent resident of Windermere for 10 years, my family has owned property here since before I was born. My grandfather travelled here at the end of the 1890s and brought his family (including my father) here for holidays before the railway was built. My husband and I joined the Windermere Community Association as soon as we purchased property in the village in 1992. I began served on the Board of the WCA within days of beginning construction of our home. I am deeply committed to this community and hope that this OCP can be significantly improved before it is adopted.

Anonymous

7/09/2019 03:45 PM

July 9, 2019 Comments Related to the Lake Windermere Official Community Plan Thank you for reviewing the Lake Windermere OCP, and for the work involved in suggesting revisions and updates. I was pleased to see the following concepts identified as being important within the document: - ensur(ing) the long-term sustainability and protection of District of Invermere community watershed. - Support agriculture through the protection of agricultural resources and the promotion of opportunities for local food production, diversification and value added agricultural activities. - Recognize the recreational and environmental importance of Lake Windermere by supporting public access opportunities and promoting environmental stewardship initiatives aimed at protecting water quality, fish and wildlife habitat and a naturally functioning shoreline. - Maintain ecosystem functions

and important natural systems and features such as riparian areas, grasslands, sensitive habitat and connectivity corridors by avoiding and mitigating development impacts in identified areas. Reduce greenhouse gas emissions created within the plan area in order to mitigate impacts to climate change. Section 4.1 states that "Throughout the planning process, residents and non-residents expressed a desire to see infill development or new construction adjacent to existing residential nodes. Infill housing options such as secondary suites are seen as one opportunity to potentially increase the availability of rental housing stock in the area without the need to develop and service bare land." Given the values in the plan that I have highlighted above and given the expressed desire of residents and non-residents to see infill development, I find it contradictory to then see the proposed further development of the westside of Lake Windermere. During the recent revisions to the Fairmont and Columbia Lake OCP the same arguments were used (residents desire to see infill development) to support increased residential development on the west side of Columbia Lake. I then questioned whether residents truly wanted to see the outcomes accredited to them and I once again ask that question – do we want to see increased urban sprawl that further stresses the landscape that we value? In the case of Columbia Lake, the protection of the east side of Columbia Lake will help temper the effects but Lake Windermere is already facing enormous developmental pressure. Can it handle more? To truly achieve your stated goal of mitigating impacts to climate change, the eco-system must be protected and enhanced, and opportunities for local agriculture must be increased. The proposed increased human footprint on the valley bottom will not accomplish these objectives. Rather it will increase negative pressures on an already stressed ecosystem (wildlife habitats and corridors, watersheds, agricultural land use etc.). One of the most important things we can do to fight climate change is to preserve functioning, intact ecosystems and all future development should be done with zero ecosystem impact, preferably with a positive ecosystem restoration outcome. The people of the Columbia valley are often seen as forward-thinking leaders in ecological stewardship. I believe this document, and future land use direction should reflect those aspirations and values. Now is the time to have our public policy documents reflect and support our desire, indeed our necessary imperative to protect our diverse ecosystems. Without supporting and protecting them, we are short-sightedly contributing to the factors that are accelerating the disastrous effects of climate change. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. [REDACTED] Upper Lakeview Road Invermere, BC V0A 1K3

Anonymous

7/09/2019 03:57 PM

Section 5 C I think the RDEK should support the annexation. If the proposed annexation does not occur, the RDEK should consider development options on these lands. Section 5 E ii) As long as a development area has existing roads, these lands should not be excluded. Section E viii) I strongly disagree with sterilization 50% of the the lands. Working with the land owner on trails and networks of trails is far more important with 25 to 35% seeming like a better option. I don't like high density developments outside of the town and think acreages are far more appealing.

Anonymous

7/09/2019 04:09 PM

To whom it may concern: I am a new resident of Invermere. My wife and I recently purchased a home on Coy road just East of Westside road. We considered many variables when deciding where to purchase the home that we intend to retire in. One of our the primary factors in selecting our home was the beauty of the low density developments in the area that promote that natural beauty of the region and provide habitat for a diverse array of wildlife. We are deeply concerned that the proposed development plan will negatively affect the very rare natural beauty and charm that we love about Invermere and area. Over the past two years we have viewed what I can only describe as reckless and aggressive development tactics utilized by the proposed developer in advance of being permitted to create a large-scale high density development. Examples include clearing high volumes of forested areas to build roadways that appear to lead to nowhere, the destruction of sensitive ecological areas including multiple bald eagle nests, elimination of walking and mountain bike trails that have been freely frequented by locals and tourists for decades, messy constructions sites with abandoned heavy equipment with total disregard for the concern of the residents of Invermere. The rural appeal and beauty of the lands on the westside of Lake Windermere should be preserved for future generations and protected from high density development plans that appear to have little to no regard for the ecological beauty of the region. We are proponents of strategic, calculated development; we don't feel this exists with the current OCP. We also don't feel that there has been full community-based transparency in the process that can be easily understood and accessed by all interested members of the Invermere community. The eventual development of these lands is certain; lets ensure the planning is done right the first time with a rigorous and transparent approach that will benefit all of us for decades to come.

Anonymous

7/09/2019 04:42 PM

To whom it may concern: I am a new resident of Invermere. We recently purchased a home on Coy road just East of Westside road. We considered many variables when deciding where to purchase the home that we intend to retire in. One of our the primary factors in selecting our home was the beauty of the low density developments in the area that promote that natural beauty of the region and provide habitat for a diverse array of wildlife. We are deeply concerned that the proposed development plan will negatively affect the very rare natural beauty and charm that we love about Invermere and area. Over the past two years we have viewed what I can only describe as reckless and aggressive development tactics utilized by the proposed developer in advance of being permitted to create a large-scale high density development. Examples include clearing high volumes of forested areas to build roadways that appear to lead to nowhere, the destruction of sensitive ecological areas including multiple bald eagle nests, elimination of walking and mountain bike trails that have been freely frequented by locals and tourists for decades, messy constructions sites with abandoned heavy equipment with total disregard for the concern of the residents of Invermere. The rural appeal and beauty of the lands on the westside of Lake Windermere should be preserved for future generations and protected from high density development plans that appear to have little to no regard for the ecological beauty of the region.

Anonymous

7/09/2019 06:28 PM

We are proponents of strategic, calculated development; we don't feel this exists with the current OCP. We also don't feel that there has been full community-based transparency in the process that can be easily understood and accessed by all interested members of the Invermere community. The eventual development of these lands is certain; let's ensure the planning is done right the first time with a rigorous and transparent approach that will benefit all of us for decades to come. Thank you for considering these comments.

The area on the south border of Invermere should remain free of development. It is beautiful green space, a valley resource as an open space, and should remain so. The area within Invermere's borders offers plenty of development space, and planners conscious of the environment will recognize that and wait until that space is filled before any more residential development is allowed on the west side of Lake Windermere.

Anonymous

7/09/2019 06:40 PM

After visiting Invermere for years and loving the community I feel that this development on the west side is a travesty. The West Side of Invermere is pristine and with the development going on it is losing its very personal and community feel that I have come to love. Keep the west side of the Lake clean and simple with little development in my opinion.

[REDACTED]

7/09/2019 08:03 PM

I do not support extensive development on the west side of Lake Windermere. Development under current zoning is acceptable. The OCP revisions under consideration are not consistent with the stated and accepted values of environment and ecology. I object to the process that took place for collecting public input on the OCP, and I believe the criteria for determining the revisions and interests of residents were flawed. [REDACTED]

Anonymous

7/09/2019 08:31 PM

I offer the following comments as a shareholder of GrizzlyRidge Properties: The draft OCP generally includes reference to subdivision and development policies and states that those policies set forth "are supported" (Please refer to Section 4.3 (3) referring to the Windermere South Area" as an example). In each case referencing the Westside Sub-Area the RDEK states a number of conditions and states that subject to meeting these conditions a proposed subdivision "may be supported". I am unsure why this difference in language occurs. If the RDEK sets forth conditions they ought to be clear that they support subdivisions meeting these conditions. "Section 5 © - North Leg": The RDEK supports annexation of these lands into the District of Invermere. I agree that these lands are best developed within the District as a component of CastleRock. However, the RDEK also states that subdivision of these lands is "Generally not supported within the RDEK". Recognizing that the annexation of these lands into the District requires a public plebiscite, I think that the language stating that subdivision of these lands within the RDEK is not supported creates a first line of defence for the people opposed to annexation. It would be better for the RDEK to simply state that if high density single family or multiunit developments are proposed for this land, annexation by the District of Invermere is supported. If the proposed annexation does not occur, we would suggest that the RDEK ought to consider development options that work based upon the servicing option(s) provided by the developer. As an example, acreages could work on this land

with appropriate water and sewer. As drafted “single family homes” are not supported. This language should be deleted. “Section 5 (e)”: The language pertaining to proposed acreages on the West side of PineRidge and CastleRock is problematic in a number of respects. The two most significant issues are: Section 5 (e) (ii) – Focusing Development: The RDEK proposes that development be focused within areas lying south of the Toby Creek Haul Road and North of Johnston Road. The premier portions of the lands in Figure 9 lie South of Johnston Road towards the Goldie Creek Waterfall Park and North of the Toby Creek Haul Road towards the Toby Creek escarpment. As with the area between Johnston Road and the Toby Creek Haul Road, both of these areas are also served by existing road networks. I suggest that the RDEK ought not to propose “focusing development” between Johnston Road and the Toby Creek Haul Road; “Section 5 (e) (viii) – 50% Land Sterilization”. The RDEK is proposing that in order to develop acreages on the West side of Invermere 50% of the developable lands in Figure 9 must be left undeveloped and not parceled. The RDEK is contemplating some form of conservation development guidelines originating in North Carolina where a large population expansion and a very robust development market is resulting in the urbanization of the landscape. In order to retain green space, the authorities in these jurisdictions provide tax incentives and density credits (numerous units per acre) to entice developers to preserve undeveloped areas in return for concentrating development in higher density development nodes with surrounding greenspace. There is some merit in this development approach in high population areas with a development explosion, but Invermere does not have the density to require this. Additional comments pertaining to Section 5 e) (viii) include: (i) There are a great number of high density developments in Invermere for those looking for this type of product; (ii) There is a relatively large/ unlimited amount of undeveloped lands surrounding Invermere and throughout the Columbia Valley; (iii) People looking for acreages outside of Invermere are looking for proximity to Town services, but a rural lifestyle of 2.5 to 10 acre parcels where they can build their “lifestyle home and amenities” with a degree of privacy and have room for animals and perhaps a small farm operation. They are not looking for a quarter or third acre parcel of land like they would get in a traditional urban subdivision; iv) The RDEK’s proposed “conservation guidelines – non parceled” result in the sterilization of 50% of GrizzlyRidge Properties in Figure 9 in not consistent with nor expected of any other rural development within the RDEK; (v) If Grizzly Ridge is required to sterilize 50% of the developable lands they, like any developer, will be forced to develop high density nodes of small lots. This is clearly not what the market wants nor is it the look and feel that I suspect the RDEK or Invermere residents want for this land. I support the concept of maintaining and including walking/mountain bike trails and parkland throughout the acreage development but I think that these can be accommodated in a traditional subdivision without specified “undeveloped land commitments”. If the concept of undeveloped land is to be maintained, it ought to be limited to 30% of the entire lands in Figure 9, and the 30% ought to be allowed to include land not

Anonymous

7/09/2019 09:20 PM

parceled as well as land within acreage lots but with "no development" caveat areas. Thank you for your considerations of these comments. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Hi! As a long time homeowner & resident of the Windermere Valley (Swansea Rd) I am quite disturbed by the recent OCP plans to develop huge tracts of the west side of the lake south of town. We need to keep the west part of the valley wild & natural not only for animal corridors but for the sake of own sanity. It already feels like Las Vegas every summer weekend & the impact of the busy volume of human development of the east side of the valley is indeed visible & tangible. For example because of the high fences over wide tracts of private land the migratory elk & deer populations have narrower corridors to move through where they are hit by vehicles or preyed on by predators & they are noticeably overgrazing certain areas. This never happened before. I've also noticed a much reduced winter migratory population. We've already put tremendous negative stress on all the natural ecosystems of the valley! We don't need to put more negative impact to satisfy a land developer with infinitely deep pockets! Please reconsider. Sincerely, [REDACTED]

Anonymous

7/09/2019 09:23 PM

This is [REDACTED] Thank you for the opportunity to sit on the committee, I have enjoyed the process and hope that I have added something to make the plan better. This process has not achieved the outcomes that I hoped we would achieve when we first started. I had hoped that we would further refine the vision for the community. The document holds out lots of ideals for protection of the environment and building the community of tomorrow with non-motorized lanes and encouragement of future developments to have water and sewer systems which handle our limited resources wisely. Unfortunately in my area, the westside, these ideals are being compromised significantly to allow hundreds of acres to be turned from valuable undeveloped lands into at best a sprawl of development that is not being done with vision or with the benefit of the greater community in mind. There are currently hundreds of lots for sale in the valley, a supply that many have said will last the community 50 years. The lots in the westside area have not sold well with only a handful of sales in the Pineridge properties and marginally more in Castlerock over the past 10 years. This is not a problem with views or anything else on these lands, there is just not a significant demand for single family housing on the westside of the lake. So there is not a strong land demand and further unlikely significant economic advantages to the valley to allow subdivision of satellite lands that are further from the town centre. There are costs to planning for subdivision of these lands. I have heard loud and clear from my neighbors that they do not desire the effects that subdivision of these lands would have on the use and enjoyment of their own lands. For my family further densification costs us in reduced opportunities to interact with our environment by allowing less space for animals, spoiling the stars and northern lights with more light pollution, increasing the ambient sounds with more vehicle traffic and many more ways. Some of this subdivision is being planned with a dependence on ground water. No one can guarantee for me when my aquifer might meet its

maximum draws, but I fear adding 19 one hectare lots on the land [REDACTED] may effect water availability or quality - this is more than twice the number of household that are currently living on Coy Rd. There are costs to the environment as well because any land that is being used for urban sprawl will effect our natural values in this valley. This process has polarized me to say no development because working towards a compromise that is guided by a vision of what would improve the community has not been achieved. I believe that the westside policy should be no development of the lands to the south and west of Invermere until they are required by and annexed by Invermere. This may be the devil I don't know, but I can only hope that Invermere has to go through a much more rigorous planning approach than what is available through the RDEK and that this will result in responsible development that is ultimately best for the community. It is irresponsible for us to lay out a plan for hundreds of acres of development with the limited data available from the community for need or desire, and without the tools to properly manage that same growth. Thank you for considering my thoughts.

Anonymous

7/09/2019 11:52 PM

Commenting on Section 5 Westside - (E) (ii) - would support development south of Johnston Road. There is an existing road (Goldie Creek?) that leads to existing parcels south of this large parcel. We've have walked and biked along this route. There are many outstanding areas which would bode well for small acreage development. Area in the ravines could be utilized as wildlife corridors or non disturbance zones. The road infrastructure already exists. Regarding (viii) (A) 50% of buildable area to retained as undeveloped space and not parcelized. Is this consistant with requirements for other developments in the RDEK region. If not why is it required here? Would think that 20 - 25% would be sufficient. Doesn't the DOI require 15%? There is a lack of small to large acreage parcels available on the westside of Invermere. Fully support the rezoning of these lands. [REDACTED]

Anonymous

7/10/2019 12:52 AM

We are considering a move to BC to be closer to family. We currently reside on an acreage near Hayden, Idaho. We enjoy the serenity of the rural lifestyle, and convenience of only being minutes from the city. We've scouted many areas and found that Invermere checks most of the boxes for what we're after. We stay current on the area by reading the Pioneer online. We can speak of our experience and search for a 1.5 - 3 acre parcel close to town. In contrast to comments we've read in the paper, we think there is a need for such properties as we have not found anything that checks the boxes in this regard. It would be a great benefit (and need) to the region to allow for subdivision of lands on the Westside of Invermere. We support this 100%!

Anonymous

7/10/2019 07:05 AM

The current OCP plan is not conducive with balancing the unique regional beauty with responsible development. I am a repeat visitor of the area, and a prospective home owner. The low density environment is what has attracted us to the area. The current plan lacks proper consultation. I am a pro development person, but taking our time to ensure we understand how best to manage this area is required. Thx.

This policy should be removed for the following reasons: All the public input on the LWOC clearly indicated that we do not want storage facilities at the

[REDACTED]
7/10/2019 07:17 AM

entrances to Windermere, Invermere and along highway #93/95. This sentiment was confirmed again at the recent application by Bad Toro Properties Ltd. where the developer was forced to remove the boat and RV storage from the frontage road to Invermere. The public believes Boat and RV storage is an industrial use and should be located in an industrial area. Boat and RV storage does not belong on the entranceway to Windermere or any other municipality, town or village as this area should be attractive and welcoming. Canal Flats, Fairmont and Radium all have policies that prohibit industrial uses at their entrances. These lands should be used for commercial purposes which provide services to local residents, second home owners and tourists. More jobs are created by commercial uses and the businesses contribute more to the local economy than boat and RV storage. Tourism is very important in the Windermere Valley. Visitors are attracted to beautiful natural scenery and appealing built environments. Boat and RV storage are neither.

[REDACTED]
7/10/2019 07:19 AM

I have been made aware that the plan includes extensive development on large tracts of land on the West side of Windermere Lake. In the current state of species extinction and habitat degradation. I believe it is prudent to limit development to give wildlife in the district an opportunity to maintain and possibly restore numbers as opposed to continually being subjected to unrelenting development and habitat degradation. [REDACTED]

Government Street Windermere BC. 250 342 3021

[REDACTED]
7/10/2019 09:20 AM

policy 5.3.1(i) can you provide a date as to when this policy will be implemented? As to when the RDEK will remove mini/boat/RV storage from permitted and accessory uses in C-2. Thank you. Can you make another comment asking that a date be set for when policy 5.3(3)(c) will be implemented?

[REDACTED]
7/10/2019 09:41 AM

I am opposed to an expansion of the Invermere Boundary. The infrastructure already cannot support the current residents and I feel that more attention should be paid to fixing what we have and creating higher density within the town.

[REDACTED]
7/10/2019 09:43 AM

I feel that our community needs to put more funds into maintaining the infostucture and areas that we already have rather than expanding. There are roads that need fixing and pipes in town that are breaking. We do not need an expansion at this time.

Anonymous
7/10/2019 10:06 AM

1. The language throughout the OCP draft is not always consistent when describing support of development and subdivision policies. It seems that most polices set forth "are supported" unless it's speaking about GRP lands; it then states "may be supported". This is not consistent, nor is it fair treatment of all lands with the RDEK. 2. Section 5: Annexation of portion of GRP lands into DOI. I agree that these lands referenced for annexation are best developed in the DOI, however, it is not reasonable to "generally not support" development of these lands within the RDEK. This provides the small, loud negative voices ammunition to prevent annexation, and if successful, sterilizing the land. The landowner should always have the right to develop at some form. If annexation is unsuccessful, why would it not be reasonable to develop acreages similar to all the surrounding acreages? 3.

Reference to "well loved trail" networks. This is not proper language for a legislative document. The trail networks referenced are on private land. It is highly unprofessional and unreasonable to give the public the impression that these trails will be open for their use if no development occurs. I understand it does not explicitly state this, but I believe this is how the public will generally interpret this. The trails will only remain usable if proper development planning occurs whereby the landowner can develop to reasonable densities for the area, and design green space that incorporates both existing, and upgraded trails into plan. 4. 5 (e)(viii) - 50% land sterilization: This provision is highly problematic and unprecedented and only appears to pertain to GRP land. The land to which this pertains is not being considered for high density. The RDEK seems to be applying a unique development guideline that is designed to protect green space in high densified, booming areas. This proposed area will never be high density, and Invermere does not have a boom issue anymore. This is particularly troubling when considering that refers to non-parcelized land. It feels like this is another attempt to "reclaim" land that the public considers their own for public use. The type of development proposed in this corridor will have an incredible amount green space, and dedicated trails systems for public use, if allowed to proceed with proper, well thought out planning. 50% as written essentially sterilizes large tracts of land, and would force development to occur in higher densified clusters; something no one wants for this area, nor is demanded by the market. Overall, I think the RDEK is trying to put forth a well thought out planning document, however, I do find it troubling how a single landowner seems to have a separate set of guidelines. I don't believe that "no development" should be even considered as an option on anyones lands. Every landowner big or small should have the right to develop their land in a form consistent with the area and the goals of the region. The goal of the region however cannot be to sterilize private land for assumed public use. I urge the RDEK to continue to work closely with GRP to develop a strong planning framework so that proper development can occur which will result in beautiful green space and trail networks that will be for public use. I also urge the RDEK to do its best to drown out the negative noise around everything GRP tries to do. There is a small, yet very loud group who will oppose everything GRP tries to do no matter how big or small. Their goal appears to be to keep all GRP land undeveloped, so they, and others can use it for their own benefit. For full disclosure, I am a GRP shareholder, albeit quite small, and a landowner in the RDEK. I tend to take great offence with public use of GRP lands when development is not being allowed, and everything we do is opposed no matter what. I believe with proper planning, GRP lands can be developed into a beautiful area to be enjoyed by all. My views do not necessarily reflect those of GRP, its management or other shareholders. Thank you for considering my comments. I look forward to the next draft.

Anonymous

7/10/2019 10:17 AM

I am not in favour of boat/rv/ mini storage on any entrance to Windermere or Invermere. These facilities belong in industrial settings.

My input to regarding the Lake Windermere Draft OCP is that Invermere

7/10/2019 10:22 AM

should not expand at this point in time. We need to improve the existing infrastructure that we have, before expanding. Many areas within town could be improved with higher density, affordable housing and some areas in town desperately need upgrades. I would like to see the rural areas around Invermere preserved as beautiful, natural forests for as long as possible. It is the natural areas on the boundary of Invermere that make the town so special, especially along Westside Rd (in my opinion). I am against the expansion.

Anonymous

7/10/2019 11:36 AM

The rural appeal and beauty of the lands on the westside of Lake Windermere should be preserved for future generations. I like the density the way that it is. As an aspiration buyer, my plans to purchase property might change with increased density. I'm also concerned about local wildlife.

Anonymous

7/10/2019 12:08 PM

I would like a date be set for when policy 5.3.1(i) will be implemented. Storage needs to be removed from C-2 zoning. This policy needs to take effect asap . There is too much at risk for our community.

Anonymous

7/10/2019 12:56 PM

I do not want storage facilities at entrances to Windermere , or Invermere or along Highway 93/95. This should be located in an industrial area. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Ridge Way Invermere, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Anonymous

7/10/2019 01:08 PM

I am a long-term resident of the Westside Road area south of Invermere. I do not agree with any of the policies in the Draft OCP that encourage, or even permit urban sprawl on the west side of Lake Windermere while compromising the ecological integrity of what remains of the rich, rare, but rapidly-disappearing natural environment of the area under consideration. In many ways this OCP seems to have been created to encourage large-scale development in what little remains as "natural landscape" and wildlife habitat in our area. It appears to support environmental responsibility and values, but in fact it effectively undermines the maintenance of those ecological values for future generations. Most of the local residents with whom I have discussed the OCP are opposed to it, and they would strongly demand that it be changed to support the protection of the disappearing environmental values of the "Westside". Thank you for inviting public input. Respectfully,
[REDACTED]

Anonymous

7/10/2019 02:40 PM

Policy Number 10.3 (3) Lake Windermere has been infested with new buoys since the aerial photo registration in 2012. There needs to be enforcement of unregistered buoys. All buoys should conform to the Private Buoys act and be registered with RDEK before 2012 and if they are not there should be someone going around every year pulling the buoys that don't conform. This issue is only going to get worst if it is not regulated and enforced properly. We need enforcement!

Anonymous

7/10/2019 03:16 PM

Submitted by: [REDACTED] Westside Rd. Invermere Policy 4.2.3 Biggest concern I have is maintaining the rural character of the Westside area. I would not like to see higher density development such as on the Eastside of the lake. Policy 5(d)(iv). Figure 8 Grizzly Ridge Properties has plans to develop small holding parcels on their 38 ha, (approx) property between the road and the lake, south of the cattle guard. If the minimum parcel size of 1 ha. is followed, this could result in homes being built fairly

close to each other on long, skinny lots that run down the hill towards the lake. You would only be able to build on a small percentage of the lot. The visual result is an area of high density housing, not in keeping with the rural character you are trying to preserve as per Policy Objective 4.2.3. Perhaps a minimum separation distance, regardless of the 1 ha. parcel size should be established between homes to maintain the rural character. Right now there are 21 existing houses on RDEK land south of District of Invermere, on the lake side of Westside road and north of Goldie Creek. The Grizzly Ridge development has the potential to add another 19 houses in a much smaller parcel of land than that which houses the existing 21 homes if the 1 ha. rule is followed. Prior to approving development on the Grizzly Ridge lands please consider the rural character of the area that is so important to those of us that live here.

Anonymous

7/10/2019 07:43 PM

I do not support the further development of the lands on the West side of Invermere lake. The beauty of the area will be negatively affected by the proposed construction plans. Please do not allow this aggressive building plan to take away from the natural splendour we know and love.

As a citizen of the valley who has been born and raised here I disagree with the OCP to increase Invermere's urban sprawl. Invermere is a unique and special place that is at risk of losing it's charm due to sprawl. It is both detrimental to the environment and completely unnecessary. There is no need for it since the town already has room to grow within the current boundaries. It also limits potential grazing opportunities for local farms who are already under pressure. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal. [REDACTED]

Anonymous

7/10/2019 08:08 PM

Lake Windermere OCP comments July 7, 2019 Dear Mr. Belanger, Ms. Clovechok and the RDEK board, Thank you very much for the opportunity to comment on this important guiding document. First off, we would like to commend the inclusion of the objective of connecting communities on the east side of Lake Windermere with a trail system (9.3.1). During public consultation this was strongly supported and there are organizations in the community that support this as well. We would encourage stronger wording around this objective so that it is a priority for action and it is clear that the RDEK has a lead role to play in making this a reality. We support the maintenance of existing lot sizes in Windermere in the area along Dell Rd. for local agriculture. We support a recognition that the south end of Lake Windermere is an important area for birds and other wildlife. In addition, the mouth of Windermere creek is an important area for migrating birds, but receives very high public use. We do, however, have concerns around the proposed exemptions to parcel size limitations and the potential for subdivision and fragmentation on the Grizzly Ridge properties on the west side of Lake Windermere. We do not support this type of development where large parcels are subdivided to smaller parcels in this area. Such development does not help the area meet the critical shortage for affordable housing. As the OCP recognizes, the ecological values are high, including grassland habitat and wildlife connectivity. The priorities for the west side should be to maintain the rural and natural character and to avoid any

decisions that would compromise this, including the proposed parcelization of the Grizzly Ridge properties. While we recognize that this is meant as a broad guiding document, the wording in the OCP should be stronger to make it clear that: 1. Disturbance or loss of grassland habitat is not acceptable and any loss should be replaced with restoration elsewhere recognizing that this is very difficult to achieve. 2. Disturbance of mountain goats and their habit is not acceptable. 3. Parcelization or fragmentation of agricultural land, with the exception of infill opportunities within communities, is not acceptable. 4. Intensive development in wildlife corridors should not be allowed. 5. Leaving oversight to a QEP hired by a developer is not a sufficient safeguard. Thank you in advance for considering our comments. Sincerely, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Galena St Windermere, BC

Anonymous

7/10/2019 08:47 PM

It is clear that this plan is to move forward with the development and sprawl throughout the westside of our lake. Our # 1 attraction to this area is the environment, unspoiled views, and wildlife. This plan will reduce those assets. Please consider sprawl as a slow (not that slow) death for this valley's permanent residence, businesses and wildlife. Please look past the end of your nose and see the big picture. Sincerely, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Windermere B.C.

[REDACTED]

7/10/2019 10:29 PM

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft OCP. In short I feel the draft OCP seems to favour the single large landowner of Grizzly Ridge and does not go far enough to support conservation values of the west side of the lake. There should be no further expansion of the Dol boundary. The Dol cannot currently support existing services in town. There is absolutely no economic or environmental argument that can be made for sprawl. The notion of conservation subdivision used as a tool to protect values is misguided. I have seen this used as a tool in heavily threatened and impacted areas, not in relatively intact areas. Subdivision in this area can potentially lead to the very poorly planned communities in the Okanagan that currently have low environmental value. Why would the Regional District support sprawl and subdivision in an area that supports intact systems? Intact systems is what draws people to the area, not sprawl and poorly planned communities.

Anonymous

7/10/2019 11:35 PM

I am commenting on section (5) - Westside - viii - A and B. 50% of buildable area to be retained as undeveloped space. In comparison to other developments in the region, why is this so high? All should be on level playing field. Hope this area is not being targeted to make up for the neighbouring property to the east which has shut out all access to their lands. We've never been denied access to the subject property. Owner is very accommodating in permitting various uses on the Land. Friends of ours were even permitted to get married on the property. Conserving around 20% of the parcel would be more reasonable. We also support the inclusion of allowing for development of small acreages on these lands and off Westside Rd. These would be ideal locations, appealing to many people.

(121 responses, 0 skipped)

The below comment is provided on behalf of the Lake Windermere Management Committee (LMC). Overall we found the draft Official Community Plan for Lake Windermere to supports the health of Lake Windermere, and are happy to support this document with some minor improvements.

Section 4: Residential Land Use

In relation to section 4.1 we agree that discretion should be used with infill development. The promotion of multi-family residential units over single family homes may improve rental opportunities. We would support infill development in existing developments over developing new parcels of land and creating increased urban sprawl and deforestation.

We would like to ensure that language surrounding development in all sections include negotiated community amenity contributions be explicitly public with no opportunity for restriction of public access. Language surrounding the negotiated community amenity contributions should reflect the values of controlling over use of Lake Windermere while still promoting access. We would be comfortable to support further development of non-motorized boat launches, and improvement of the current motorized boat launches. To this point we would support clarification of non-motorized and motorized boats throughout the entire document. Further voluntary community contributions should include the suggestion of improving current infrastructure, rather than providing new, and restoration efforts (ex. Ministry of Transport Right of Ways).

As recognized in section 4.3 (1) (f), rezoning to create new residential parcels within the plan area or to increase on water boat moorage/storage could increase use and associated impacts. Although community amenity contributions may be negotiated with developers to reduce the impact we feel that extra care must be taken when rezoning. We would be more inclined to support increased boat storage facilities off the lake, rather than mooring directly on the lake itself to better support increased public access.

The LMC appreciates the level of detail the RDEK has taken in Section 4.3 (5) (e) to mitigate fragmentation and development in sensitive wilderness areas. We do however have concerns as it relates to:

- 4.3 (5) (c)
 - Current wording in the document is “Connectivity to community sewer system is strongly encouraged”, we would like to see this wording changed to connectivity to a community sewer system is mandatory unless extenuating circumstances do not allow.
 - Having properties that close to the lake on private sewerage systems aren’t ideal as they are often hydraulically connected to the lake water. If they malfunction, there is the opportunity for the sewage to enter Lake Windermere without the property owner noticing

Lake Windermere Official Community Plan

Lake Management Committee Comment

- Additionally, there should be discretion used when creating a community sewer system to ensure the effluent does not directly enter Lake Windermere.
 - Would like to see the word “generally” removed from this section as much as possible to state directly if actions are supported or not supported.
- 4.3 (5) (d)
 - (i) The Lake Management Plan should be referenced in this section as the guiding document that must be adhered to for any lake development

Section 9: Open Space, Recreation and Trails

The LMC is pleased to see a desire to maintain and enhance public access to Lake Windermere, specifically 9.3 (6). We would like to ensure that wording such as “cannot restrict public access” is included when referring to these sites. Additionally we support statements in 9.3 (7) regarding primary use of Windermere Lake Provincial Park to protect native grassland and riparian habitat with day use opportunity as a secondary role.

Section 10: Lake Windermere

The 2006-2009 SHIM of Lake Windermere is referenced in section 10.1, and many consecutive times throughout this section. We would like to ensure that once the 2020 Re-SHIM of Lake Windermere is completed that an amendment will allow it to be the guiding document on all of these policies. To see that the updated SHIM and all related documents would take the place of the outdated SHIM we would propose that any reference to SHIM use generalized language to ensure that there is no confusion.

Improvements the LMC would like to see in this section include:

- 10.3 (1)
 - Additionally, there should be a responsibility of landowners to ensure that any deteriorating structures that cause an environmental hazard be removed/de-constructed and replaced by the suggested methods to reduce environmental impact and safety hazards
 - We see the opportunity to provide support for rehabilitation projects rather than just addressing new developments
- 10.3 (3)
 - Any opportunity to move from a complaints based system to a monitored system by paid personal would be preferred
- 10.3 (13)
 - (b) would like this to be “confirmation of *public* legal access”
 - Add the yellow shoreline mapping to the J1-J3 maps. Yellow shoreline is indicative of very high and high current ecological values, low risk development may proceed, high risk development will trigger the requirement for an environmental assessment (Lake Windermere Management Plan, Section 2.3

Shoreline Management Guidelines, page 29). By not representing the yellow zones there may be a misconception of habitat values.

In addition to these changes we would like to see considerations for:

- Support for gaining a greater understanding of the water quantity in and flowing into/out of Lake Windermere. Additionally support to not further impede the flow of water into/out of Lake Windermere without adequate information that there will not be an effect on the health of Lake Windermere. This should be accompanied by the development of a plan to address water shortages should research show a need (as currently suspected due to historical data) to ensure community preparedness.
- Support for a program to require the timely removal of docks that use styrofoam floats and replaced with modern more environmentally sustainable methods

Section 11: Environmental Considerations

The LMC is supportive of the objectives and policies indicated through this section. We would like to see an objective that supports public education and awareness of critical habitat, connectivity and, native wildlife species through a variety of methods. This would support policy number 11.1 (3) (I), and additional passive education programs (ex. signage). Section 11.2 (3) (b), we would like to see the definition of boats expanded to include all recreational water vessels (ex. motorized boats, non-motorized boats, hip/chest waders, all floatation devices).

This same section could include that all development permits or variances in riparian areas are to be assessed by a Qualified Environmental Professional, as per the [Riparian Areas Regulation](#). Although Riparian Areas Regulation does not apply to the RDEK we would support non-regulatory compliance with the regulation

Section 20: Implementation

The LMC would suggest including the East Kootenay Invasive Species Council (EKISC) as a partner for section 11.2 (3) (c).

RECEIVED

JUL 09 2019

Regional District of
East Kootenay

Windermere, BC

VOB 2L2

July 9, 2019

RDEK Board

Dear Mr. Belanger, Ms. Clovèchok, and the RDEK Board:

We are writing to express our concerns about the draft Lake Windermere Official Community Plan where numerous sections allow for greater development on the west side of Lake Windermere.

We are particularly concerned that this Plan will have negative impacts on the biological diversity of a rare grassland area despite the fact that the OCP states in the beginning that the area is biologically diverse, culturally important and critically endangered and that these values need to be protected. The new draft Plan allows developers to interpret the plan to suit their needs.

We have been residents of Windermere for over 40 years and have seen many changes to the communities and landscapes. To this point in time, however, the Valley has been able to retain the beauty and lifestyle of a rural community, one that attracts visitors and supports our economic life-blood. Tracts of undeveloped land to the north and south of Invermere and Windermere communities adds much to the attractiveness of our area. The west side of Lake Windermere is such a vital natural environment and now needs our protection to ensure that the quality of life and appreciation for nature is maintained for visitors and residents alike.

We believe that this draft Plan meets the needs of one or a few developers rather than the needs and priorities of our community as a whole. For example, the number one priority compiled by the Columbia Valley Community Foundation's Vital Signs of 2018 was environment. We also know that residents of Invermere have expressed a strong desire to see infill development or new construction adjacent to existing residential nodes, thus providing affordable housing with short commutes and walkability. Increased development on the west side of the Lake will not meet any of these priorities. It facilitates profit over the needs of people.

Allowing increased development on the west side of Lake Windermere will destroy a critical wildlife corridor and that, in turn, will lead to increased interaction and conflict between people and wildlife. In addition, development will destroy an endangered and rare grassland environment. Less than 1% of British Columbia is covered by grassland. Development could also lead to fragmentation of agricultural land in this area because the Plan seems to be open to exceptions to be made to the overall land use policy.

The Valley Community has worked hard to support the creation of our Legacy Trail. Increased development and vehicular traffic will contradict the very existence of the Trail, which was built to provide an opportunity for individuals and family to be active and enjoy the amazing natural environment.

We appreciate the work that has been put into the creation of the Official Community Plan but urge you to place a greater priority on protections for the environment of the west side of Lake Windermere. For us, the values of the ecosystem, wildlife and the quality of life for future generations is of vital importance.

Respectfully,

[Redacted Signature]

[REDACTED]
Invermere, B.C.

VOA IKO

July 7, 2019

Dear Kris Belanger + Susan Clouchuk,

This is my P.S. to the e-mail letter
I signed earlier today:

- the District of Invermere + the Villages
of Wendenmere, Radium + Fairmont all
have space available for AFFORDABLE
housing - if the will is there, no need
the start a fancy development.
- Recreational opportunities are readily
available in the Towns listed above
no need to add more tennis courts
or swimming pools or Golf courses
- I have often said that the C.P.R. tracks
+ property have kept waterfront
development to a minimum on the
west side, but development west of
the tracks will change that.
- Please do the right thing: Keep this
land for wildlife + grasslands +
future generations.

Yours Truly,
[REDACTED]



2-495 Wallinger Avenue Kimberley BC V1A 1Z6 • t 250.427.9325 • admin@wildsight.ca

Re: Lake Windermere Draft OCP Comment

Attention: Kris Belanger, Planner/Project Lead

CC: Susan Clovechok, RDEK Electoral Area F Director

Upon the review of the draft Official Community Plan (OCP) for Lake Windermere concerns arise regarding the protection of environmental integrity. Wildsight's concerns are centered around rare ecosystem loss, biodiversity impacts, wildlife corridors incursions and the degradation of water quality and availability. While the draft OCP acknowledges Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs), the language around the preservation of ESAs and other environmental attributes is very weak in retaining the values that are present. The OCP as written is open for interpretation that Wildsight feels will allow for the degradation of important natural areas and habitats.

The grasslands that are present in the Lake Windermere area represents an ecosystem that makes up less than 1% of BC's landbase.¹ The rare nature of grasslands means that the vegetation that makes up these ecosystems is also rare with nearly 40 red and blue listed plants that occur in the region². The draft OCP compromises these ecosystems by allowing for intensive compacted development within them. While there is a requirement for restoring comparable habitat the LW OCP needs wording that protects these areas as is and not allow for any development in these highly threatened ecosystems.

For badgers, urban development represents the greatest cause of habitat loss in BC.³ The three biogeoclimatic zones most preferred by Badgers (Bunchgrass, Ponderosa Pine, and Interior Douglas-fir) are among the most poorly represented by protected areas in B.C. and under the most intense development pressure particularly in the Columbia Valley. Development pressures and habitat loss also contributes to the increased risk of road mortality which is a leading cause of mortality in the Valley. The OCP lacks adequate planning to address habitat loss. In addition, mitigative measures such as badger or wildlife crossing structures among roads and highways are needed to address high road mortality. While the OCP acknowledges that "future land uses should not compromise the integrity of badger habitat" there are few substantive measures to ensure that high quality habitat is not compromised. The OCP needs wording that protects these areas that are identified as high or very high capability badger habitat. The OCP should not allow development in these highly threatened ecosystems. These areas typically overlap highly valued endangered grassland ecosystems

With an expanding human development and more pressures on water systems the need for clean water becomes increasingly important. Policy 6.2 (1)(j) states: Livestock and manure should be kept out of water bodies and watercourses to the greatest extent possible to avoid increased amounts of sediment and nutrient inputs to downstream water bodies. This policy

is not enough in protecting water resources. Manure and livestock must be excluded from waterbodies and watercourses and there should be protection of riparian vegetation that surrounds these areas.

The loss of riparian vegetation through agricultural practices contributes to biodiversity loss, reduction of water filtration, stream erosion and growth of invasive species.⁴ Riparian vegetation functions to defend from erosion, the introduction of sediment into streams and promote biodiversity.

The guidelines (19 (7) (d)) around development in mountain goat habitat are open to the point where development will impact local herds. The guidelines use wording such as “*When possible, development should be directed outside of Mountain Goat habitat*” and “*When industrial activity, road building or recreational trail development in Mountain goat habitat is unavoidable, it should occur between November 1 and July 15.*” All of the development activities listed in these guidelines can be designed to avoid mountain goat habitat. If the OCP truly has the interest in maintaining these habitats then no development should be permitted in goat habitat.

Mountain goats select areas with shallow snowpack on solar aspects with a mix of forest and steep escape terrain for wintering habitat, which describes the Toby Canyon. Wintering habitat is critical habitat for mountain goats⁵ and should be preserved to ensure the continuation of this species and in particular the population that exists in the Toby Canyon. Mountain goats are also particularly sensitive to long term human disturbance which can lead to habitat displacement.⁶ While avoiding construction during a critical period will help with short term impact mitigations the long-term impact of inhabiting critical habitats will result in displacement and potential loss of the population.

The protection of ESAs is a concern in many parts of the OCP. In Section 7(b)(v) the OCP allows for the in filling of lakes, ponds wetlands etc. with an assessment done by an QEP. As these areas are ESAs in filling should not be permitted. Wetlands provide many services such as habitat for an abundance of species, water filtration, flood mitigation and carbon sequestering.⁷ Filling in waterbodies of any kind leads to the degradation of the system as a whole through the loss of integral ecosystem service and should not be permitted in the wording of this OCP.

The objectives in Policy 11.1 (3) (b) aim to retain wildlife corridors but policy 11.1(3) a allows for intensive development in wildlife corridors. This is contradictory. The wording in this policy is also very loose in saying that studies and other measures may be required. If the objective is to retain corridors studies and mitigations must be required and development should not be permitted in wildlife corridors.

Over all the draft OCP does well to identify environmental attributes encompassed in the area but fails to deliver meaningful protections in the guidelines. The OCP is littered with caveats that will allow for development in rare grassland ecosystems, mountain goat habitat, ESAs, wildlife corridors and riparian areas. Wildsight requests revisions in the wording of the proposed OCP guidelines that ensure protection of ecosystem and community values.

- ¹ Wikeem, Brian and Sandra Wikeem. "British Columbia Grasslands" The Grasslands of British Columbia, Grasslands Conservation Council of British Columbia, Kamloops, 2004.
- ² Wikeem, Brian and Sandra Wikeem. "Grassland Ecosystems in British Columbia." The Grasslands of British Columbia, Grasslands Conservation Council of British Columbia, Kamloops, 2004.
- ³ Jeffersonii Badger Recovery Team. 2008. Recovery Strategy for the Badger (*Taxidea taxus*) in British Columbia. Prepared for the B.C. Ministry of Environment, Victoria, B.C. 45 pp.
- ⁴ Fortier, J. (2014). *AGRICULTURAL RIPARIAN HEALTH: THEORY, CONCEPTS AND POTENTIAL INDICATORS*. Retrieved from http://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2014/aac-aa/c/A59-14-2014-eng.pdf
- ⁵ Poole, K. G., Stuart-Smith, K., & Teske, I. E. (2009). Wintering strategies by mountain goats in interior mountains. *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, 87(3), 273–283. <https://doi.org/10.1139/z09-009>
- ⁶ Mountain Goat Management Team. (2010). *British Columbia Management Plan Series Management Plan for the Mountain Goat (Oreamnos americanus) in British Columbia*. Victoria BC. Retrieved from <http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/wld/recoveryplans/rcvry1.htm>
- ⁷ Wetland Stewardship Partners. (2009). *Wetland Ways: Interim Guidelines for Wetland Protection and Conservation in British Columbia*. Retrieved from <http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/wld/BMP/bmpintro.html>