

Mayor and Councillors,

Oct 5th, 2020

Following the four public meetings by the developer for the Royal York Golf Course and the receipt of the official application for an OCP change and rezoning of 2240 York Drive at City Hall, I would like to summarize the concerns expressed to us outside the gate to the Course during each session.

There were many concerns about all traffic from the homes coming out at the one corner of Bradley and York Drive. This would put a lot of pressure on the intersection of York Drive and Okanagan Street.

The closest exit to the highway is via Harding Road and the residents along Okanagan Street and Harding Road have already found the Tim Horton's traffic to be annoying and they expressed their concerns about the increase of traffic from the 180 homes in the proposal. The Harding Road and Highway 97A intersection is already prone to numerous accidents and the increased traffic will just aggravate the current issues. There was some mention of maybe getting the Highways department to add a merge lane on to the highway but as the two merge lanes from Smith Drive and Rosedale Avenue were removed as deemed unnecessary, it would seem the Highways department does not consider the safety of Armstrong residents when entering the 100 km traffic. The City must consider the three roads that access the highway and promote the need for safe merge lanes at all three locations.

Besides the eventual traffic from the families in the future homes, the City must also consider the noise, inconvenience, and traffic that will result from the movement of soil, gravel, cement, building materials that will be going on for up to 10 years during the construction period. I am sure the Mayor can make a comment about his quiet neighbourhood putting up with the recent development in his backyard and currently happening next door. Surely some empathy must exist for those residents in close proximity to the golf course property and the only two access roads into the neighbourhood from Harding Road to Rosedale Avenue.

The developer comments that he will supply \$582,250.00 to assist the City with sewer works required to support this large development. However, there are no actual costs that the City will need to accommodate this development with the current infrastructure. For example, if it will cost two million dollars to improve flow to the ponds near NorVal Arena, that means the current taxpayers have to pick up the extra 1.5 million dollars to accommodate this excessive development. The developer and city should provide a comprehensive cost analysis of this development on the sewer works. Making a decision without this valuable information is not responsible government.

The same can be said for the water contribution by the developer. There are no details of our available capacity to provide an adequate water supply to current taxpayers and these new homes. How much will the taxpayers be paying to meet the needs of the City? Recent water restrictions were needed to accommodate some repairs at Fortune Creek but we also seem to face water restrictions in the spring due to turbidity and in other dry periods. Where are the facts that show the City is prepared to handle the needs of this new development?

It should also be noted that these payments to the City are voluntary and at any time the developer can stop making payments and the City has no way to force any payment at all.

The current OCP not only outlines zoning within the City but also is a guide to the needs of the community. Seniors represent 41% of the population and the OCP states the City is responsible for providing adequate

recreational and others services for everyone including Seniors. Removing the only summer activity for Seniors that provides them with fresh air, exercise and companionship goes against that part of the OCP.

The environment within the City is also emphasized in the OCP and there are bylaws protecting all the trees in the City. This development will destroy over 300 trees on the course and there is no mention of the developer's responsibility to replace every tree taken out as per the bylaws in the OCP. Will this part of the OCP be ignored when this proposal is approved?

The homes are being suggested as family homes and one must realize the families in these homes are as far away as possible from schools, Memorial Park, the swimming pool, Nor-Val Arena and the skateboard park to name a few. Accessing these amenities means increased traffic on Okanagan Street and the busy intersection with Rosedale Avenue. A family development would serve the residents better if it was on the IPE grounds.

The application presents a lot of growth numbers created by the Regional District and the province. Every community in BC has its own unique issues when it comes to growth and the ability for the community to cope with growth. Generic formulas out of Victoria to create figures do not necessarily reflect these local issues. Also, existing residents who live in a community like Armstrong because of its small town atmosphere, are never consulted or asked their opinion about arbitrary growth requirements. Questions: Why does Armstrong have to grow? Does growth automatically outweigh the 'cost of growth' to the current community?

In an interview on Beach radio in 2017 about future growth in Armstrong the Mayor says growth must be on ALR land and is quoted: "the land base is small and with a golf course, the fair grounds and a riparian area that can't be built on." Nothing has changed since 2017, so the Mayor must stand by his comments made in the public interview.

The economic figures in the application relate to Vernon, a much larger city, and Salmon Arm, a tourist oriented city without figures from Armstrong. It should be noted that most of the benefit of jobs and subsequent money goes to out of town contracting companies so little economic benefits actually stay in the City of Armstrong itself.

A lot of City's time has been used to discuss, evaluate, and assist with the development of this proposal. This has cost the taxpayers a lot of money to date and as the proposal lacks a lot of relevant details, we feel it is time for the City to reject the proposal at the first reading rather than prolong the drain on City staff time and end the endless rumours and anxiety for those residents who are concerned about the loss of this valuable asset to the City.

The City Council cannot ignore the comments received from the taxpayers in the extensive OCP survey conducted in early 2020 and all the comments from the taxpayers feedback at the presentation meetings. The community has spoken. Your responsibility is to listen to the concerned community and not support this development which would have long term effects on the life style in Armstrong and the North Okanagan.

Lindsay Thachuk
President, Armstrong Green Space Society