

Facts in the City of Armstrong.

Fact - no property owner in the City has the right to expect that they can rezone their property for other uses. That is, anyone with a residential corner lot cannot expect they have the right to change zoning to have a convenience store. The Royal York property has been zoned as Recreational land and paid lower taxes accordingly for over 30 years. The City should not be influenced or pressured to change zoning on a vital asset to the all of the City property owners and in fact, people throughout the North Okanagan.

Fact - September 13, 2017 - in an interview with the media regarding growth in the City, Mayor Pieper stated:

Pieper says the land base is small and with a golf course, the fair grounds and a riparian area that can't be built on.

What has changed that would influence his position on this public statement?

Fact - over the years, the City must submit a 'Growth Study' to the Regional District. The City identifies land within the community with an aim to future development. In none of these previous submissions has the City ever considered the golf course as a potential future development site. There are other high priority areas of note and they should be pursued rather than destroy a major recreational green space in the City.

Fact - the City has spent an enormous amount of time and taxpayer's money to accommodate the developer associated with the Royal York Golf Course.

Fact - in contrast, even though the City Planner suggested that the Green Space Society submit a business plan to the City to support an alternative to destroying the golf course, there has been no visible or open discussion within City Hall to show even the slightest consideration of the idea to buy the golf course. That is, NO time has been spent to listen to the taxpayers despite numerous attempts to discuss points and the results of the initial OCP survey conducted by the City in early 2020.

Fact - Hyde Mountain Golf Course, a full 18 hole course in Sicamous, recently sold for 5.3 million dollars with 264 acres to develop housing around the course. The corresponding value of the Royal York 9 hole course property on about 50 hectares can easily be calculated.

Fact - the City paid for and completed a Sewer Flow Rate study in the fall of 2020 and the Mayor and City Council agreed that these numbers did not present the true flow rates as the study was done at a dry time of year. Subsequently, it was decided to extend and repeat the study again in the spring of 2021. As this spring was the driest spring ever on record in the Okanagan it could easily be determined that again the numbers from the study are not a true reflection of the capacity of our sewer infrastructure. These reports should NOT be considered as reliable information.

Fact - the initial proposal as supplied to the Public at the Open Meetings called by the developer showed a plan to create settling ponds to collect storm water from the development. This water would then be a regulated flow into Meighan Creek which is prone to flooding. The latest report, "Conceptual Servicing and Stormwater Management Plan - Kerr Wood Leidal - June 15, 2021" makes no mention of these ponds and all storm water would now flow into the City's existing storm water system and eventually into Meighan Creek. There are no engineering reports or up-to-date data to verify that the current storm water system can accommodate this increased volume of water. The climate experts in the country are predicting hotter and dryer summers and more violent storms in the wetter months. It is important for the City complete its Flood Mitigation plan to protect the other City taxpayers before any large development is approved.

Fact - According to the agenda for the July 12th, 2021 Regular Council Meeting the Public Works Manager reported:

Our system has been designed to allow our groundwater wells to supplement the treated water supply from Fortune Creek during periods of high demand, as was the case during this heat wave.

Using our alternative (emergency?) groundwater to supplement our Fortune Creek supply is unique this year. If we need this groundwater resource to meet current needs, just where will we get enough water to support the 141 homes in the proposed Royal York Development? The proposed treated water reservoir at Fortune Creek will merely hold our existing water and does not in any way increase our overall supply of water out of Fortune Creek. Also, are there any statistics to show how efficiently our groundwater resources are replenished? It should be noted we remain on Stage 1 Water restrictions as of Aug 23rd while we use our groundwater. Is there an open reason why we have not been put on Stage 2 restrictions as it has been a common practice in previous years?

Fact - the amount of time this project has been in City Hall and the amount of time and money spent by the developer should not be a consideration when you are making the final decision on whether this development is justified in the City.

Fact - several people have raised concerns about the major construction proceeding on an area of land between the golf course and Bradley Ave. It is obvious the developer has decided to preempt any formal decisions of our elected officials and begin work on the smaller golf course. Has City staff told the developer that a second reading and the final third reading are a 'done deal'? Between these two readings there is a mandatory Public meeting where the taxpayers can put forward their thoughts. Is it assumed these comments will be totally ignored by our elected officials?

Fact - the City of Armstrong has a population consisting of 41% seniors. For many, their summer outdoor activity is playing golf. Destroying this viable existing golf course would severely affect the seniors in the City.

Fact - in all the time since December 2018 when the proposed sale was publically announced, there has not been one (1) comment made by the owners, the developer, the City or our elected officials on how this proposal would benefit the City and its taxpayers. Councillor Wright has spoken several times about the disadvantage of such a large development in the City. Councillor Fisher also expressed her serious concerns about the effect this development will have on the overall City.

Fact - the Referral Response from the City's CFO, outlines the expected consequences of the new development on the City's finances. No mention of a windfall for the City and specifically the word 'should' is noted.

Taxation (quote) - Combined, the gross annual revenue increase *should* be sufficient to cover any increases in operational costs that are associated with the additional road, trail and park maintenance and administration costs.

Utility Revenue (quote) - The fees collected on the utility invoices *should* cover any additional costs associated with additional repairs, maintenance, and treatment costs.

Fact - the suggested 10 year plan for this development will clearly disrupt the traffic, lifestyle and the probability of a lower value of homes in the City.

Fact - to date, Aug 23rd, 2021, there is no posted response from the School District on the implications to our schools from this large development. Councillor Britton has supposedly asked for this report several times as it is a vital component for the City to consider before approving this development.

Fact - at the Regular Council meeting on July 12th 2021. the Shuswap Climate Action group submitted the Climate Action Possibilities for the City of Armstrong. The approved minutes included the Aug 9th agenda say:

Shuswap Climate Action

Re: Introduction to Shuswap Climate Action (Diana Dunlop and Julia Beatty)

Julia Beatty and Diana Dunlop presented Council with their Shuswap Climate Action Committee presentation.

Discussion ensued relative to:

- *The Mayor thanked the presenters for reaching out to City of Armstrong and encouraged future discussions outlining addressing climate change in the City*
- *The capacity to dedicate a Climate Action page on the City's website*
- *Planning staff encouraged to reach out during the Official Community Plan public consultation process.*

If the Mayor and Council are truly sincere with regards to the outline presented in the report, they should note one suggestion in the report which says:

Protect/enhance/increase green spaces and urban trees.

How can the City acknowledge this suggested climate action report and at the same time destroy the City's largest green space and all the 30 years old trees on the proposed housing area on the property. They should also wait until the public have had their say with regards to the changes in the Official Community Plan.

Fact - with reference to the various referral responses posted on the City's website, there are several issues raised by the various authorities. In brief, where is the Traffic Impact Assessment, the Archeology assessment, the final assessment of the Sage Environmental report by MoFLNROD as mentioned in the latest response of May 27th 2021? Who will be paying for the improvements brought up by BC Transit? Are the City and our elected officials ready to decide on this major development in the community without all the information and full details of costs to the taxpayers as brought forward by the concerned authorities?