

## **COLUMBIA SHUSWAP REGIONAL DISTRICT**

Notes of the Public Hearing held on Tuesday July 24, 2018 at 6:00 p.m. at the Carlin Community Hall at 4051 Myers Frontage Road, Tappen BC, regarding proposed Bylaw No. 725-12.

---

PRESENT: Chair Paul Demenok – Electoral Area C Director  
Dan Passmore – Senior Planner, Development Services  
23 members of the public

Chair Demenok called the Public Hearing to order at 6:00 pm. Following introductions, the Chair advised that all persons who believe that their interest in property may be affected shall be given the opportunity to be heard or to present written submissions pertaining to the proposed Electoral Area 'C' Official Community Plan Amendment (Shuswap Country Estates) Bylaw No. 725-12.

The Planner explained the requirements of Section 470 of the Local Government Act and noted that the Public Hearing Report will be submitted to the Board for consideration at its August 16, 2018 meeting. The Planner explained the notification requirements set out in the Local Government Act and noted the Public Hearing was placed in the Shuswap Market News on July 13 and 20, 2018.

The Planner provided background information regarding these proposed bylaw amendments and reviewed the purpose of the bylaws. At the Chair's request, the Planner also summarized the referral comments received by the CSRD to the public in attendance.

The Chair opened the floor for comments.

Tappen Notch Hill Road, read aloud the contents of a letter submitted to Development Services staff. He advised he was speaking on behalf of a number of local residents who had signed a petition, he presented the letter with the petition which contained 19 names of people who lived in the immediate area. These documents will be provided to the Board as correspondence received.

advised that the primary concern of the group was a noticeable groundwater depletion in the area since 2010, when the development was originally constructed. Since there is only the one new well in the area for the Shuswap Country Estates, they are concerned that the depletion is the result of the development. Further, any increase in the density will further deplete the aquifer they rely on. He indicated that since the bylaw would have the impact of increasing density of the development, that the CSRD should not approve it unless the groundwater source is proven to be capable of supplying the development by a hydrogeologist. He noted the well logs provided by the applicant was for a well drilled in 2004, whereas the well used for water supply for the development was not documented.

stated that a secondary concern for the group was the necessity to conduct significant blasting on the site to prepare for manufactured home sites in the planned expansion. The group was concerned over the safety aspects of the blasting site

preparation to the neighbouring properties, and to the impact that this blasting may have on neighbouring groundwater wells. He advised that the OCP requires a steep slopes Development Permit which requires a geotechnical review by a qualified professional, and that such a review should help the Board to determine whether the expansion of the manufactured home community is safe.

continued by advising that the group also had concerns with respect to sewage servicing. He noted that the treatment system is able to operate without needing to use the spray irrigation, which the treatment system and the ALR has approved. Should the proposed expansion occur, he foresees that the system will need to start using the spray irrigation component, and expressed concerns about overspray of the effluent onto neighbouring properties, and the impact this might have on their groundwater wells. He advised that spray irrigation can atomize and travel long distances in windy conditions.

He conceded that the area needs affordable housing but notes that the site preparation involving blasting to expand the community is expensive and will lessen the likelihood of affordable housing. He noted the relevant OCP policies as reported to the Board in the staff reports and advised that while the existing community was in place the rules have changed and any expansion would be contrary to policies directing such density of growth into Secondary Settlement Areas.

advised she lived right across the road from the sewage treatment facility and that her property and the facility are situated in a wind tunnel. She explained that the winds in the area are such that she was unable to put out lawn furniture as it would blow away. This situation raises major concerns should the spray irrigation disposal ever be started, as the wind will carry the spray long distances. She further advised that she is concerned about her property value, as a result of low income housing nearby.

questioned the referral response received from the Water Stewardship Officer or the Ministry of Forests, Lands, Natural Resource Operations, and Rural Development (MFLNRORD), which raised uncertainty because of the assertion of sufficient water from groundwater sources and the potential timelines for an application for a groundwater license, if required. She advised that if there is uncertainty, the CSRD should hold the applicant's feet to the fire. She stated that she had purchased 2 farms in the area 25 years ago and recently needed to drill a second well, because of the depletion of water in the first. Because of this she indicated that caution on the part of the CSRD is warranted. She asked a question about whether the proposed 3 new lots would be required to have a groundwater well for each.

Chair Demenok answered that this would be a requirement of the subdivision.

asked whether the CSRD has geotechnical or hydrogeological reports from the applicant to address steep slopes, blasting and groundwater issues.

The Planner answered no.

Chair Demenok further advised that should the Board decide that the land use requires provision of such information, they would ask for it.

advised that she had concerns over the runoff that comes off of the property currently. She stated that the runoff currently turns into a creek in the spring and goes down the driveway created erosion and flows into her hayfields creating a lake.

indicated that he had no issues with the proposed creation of 3 large lots, which is a component of the bylaw. However he was concerned over the density on the rest of the property. He advised that drilling and blasting and vegetation clearing for the proposed expansion will create a problem.

advised that as the applicant's engineer he has been working on the property to bring the site as it is currently developed into better compliance with the OCP. He reminded the audience that there was no zoning in this area. He stated that the essential infrastructure (sewer and water) is in place for the development currently and that the infrastructure has capacity to allow for expansion as proposed. He stated the sewage system is registered with the Ministry of Environment (MoE), and that the groundwater source is in place and operational. He advised that with the additional capacity available in the groundwater well the property owner could have been drawing that water to use for irrigation on the agricultural portion of the property. He advised that spray irrigation effluent disposal is a system of disposal that has been approved elsewhere, in addition to this property by the MoE. He advised that although the density allowable in the proposed OCP amendment would be for 120 units total, the development will not get that many units on it due to site topographical constraints. He stated that as the project engineer it is his responsibility to consider site drainage. He finished by advising that a hydrogeologist had reviewed the site.

The Planner asked if the hydrogeologist report was available to provide to the CSRD.

answered that the study had been done for the sewage treatment facility and wasn't sure if such a study had been done for the groundwater wells.

, asked who hands the legalities of wastewater

Director Demenok responded by indicating that matters regarding use of waste on Agricultural Land are under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Agriculture. Matters regarding permits to do sewage treatment are under the jurisdiction of the MoE. He advised that the CSRD relies on the Province in these areas to ensure that developers get the necessary permits.

stated concerns about blasting on the site and how this would impact her farm animals as well as wildlife.

advised that the CPR has a well in the immediate area that they pump a lot of water out of to spray the trains for coal dust.

advised that the Shuswap country estates development is there, but it is the proposed expansion which is the concern for the neighbourhood. He stated that this is the central problem and that if the CSRD limits the proposed growth, the groundwater will be protected. He advised that he does not agree with

assessment. He implored the CSRD to not allow the proposed expansion of the park.

expressed concern that the petition submitted would be enough to sway the mind of the CSRD Board.

Hearing no representations or questions about proposed Bylaw No. 725-12 the Chair called three times for further submissions before declaring the public hearing closed at 7:05 pm.

CERTIFIED as being a fair and accurate report of the public hearing.

Original Signed by

---

Director Paul Demenok  
Public Hearing Chair

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Paul Demenok', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

---

Dan Passmore  
Senior Planner

BL 725-12

[REDACTED]

July 20 , 2018

Pubic Hearing Submission -- Bylaw No.725-12

In Regarding Shuswap Country Estates 1885 Tappen Notch Hill Road

My name is [REDACTED] with my [REDACTED] own neighboring property to Shuswap Country Estates at

We have several concern about the proposal .

We have lived and owned this property since October , 2007 . When we first lived here the well water would flow right out of the top of the 500 ft. well . Now for the past five years we have noticed our well static level has gone down . And never getting close to the top of the well.

Taking that much more water out of the small aquifer , that the whole neighborhood is getting their water from , might be putting everyone in hardship with water levels going down.

Another issue I have problems with is living right below the acreage in question is the drilling and blasting will affect the water run off and the two residential water wells that are here. And blasting the road access is the same road that two of us have taken care of for the past ten years with no help from Shuswap Country Estates which they have an easement and use to access their reservoir .

Erosion and winter run off is a serious concern with all the vegetation removed in the blasting to level the hillside for the building sites . the whole hillside is all rock , so there will be drilling and blasting for most of the building sites and ditching for the water and sewer lines .

I also agree there is a need for lower cost housing but the cost of drilling and blasting is very expensive .

I have no problem leaving the land in question as five to ten acre lots .

Yours truly;

[REDACTED]

<input type="checkbox"/> CAO <input type="checkbox"/> Works <input type="checkbox"/> DS <input type="checkbox"/> Fin/Adm	<input type="checkbox"/> Agenda: <input type="checkbox"/> Reg Board <input type="checkbox"/> In Camera <input type="checkbox"/> Other Mtg.	Ownership:  File #
<b>JUL 24 2018</b>		
<input type="checkbox"/> Ec Day <input type="checkbox"/> IT <input type="checkbox"/> Parks <input type="checkbox"/> SEP <input type="checkbox"/> HR <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Received <input type="checkbox"/> Staff to Report <input type="checkbox"/> Staff to Respond <input type="checkbox"/> Staff info Only <input type="checkbox"/> Dir Mailbox <input type="checkbox"/> Dir Circulate	Ack Sent:  <input type="checkbox"/> Fax <input type="checkbox"/> Mail <input type="checkbox"/> Email

24 JULY 2018

TO: CHAIR: PUBLIC HRS ON  
CSRA ELECTR AREA C  
OCP PLAN AMMENDMENT  
SAUSNAK COUNTRY ESTATES) BL 725-12

FD:

DEAR CHAIR  
THIS LETTER IS IN FULL SUPPORT OF AFORE-  
SAID BL AMMENDMENT.

NEWS RECORDS

<input type="checkbox"/> CAO <input type="checkbox"/> Works <input type="checkbox"/> DS <input type="checkbox"/> Fin/Adm	<input type="checkbox"/> Agenda: <input type="checkbox"/> Reg Board <input type="checkbox"/> In Camera <input type="checkbox"/> Other Mtg.	Ownership: File #
JUL 24 2018		
<input type="checkbox"/> Ec Day <input type="checkbox"/> IT <input type="checkbox"/> Parks <input type="checkbox"/> SEP <input type="checkbox"/> HR <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Received <input type="checkbox"/> Staff to Report <input type="checkbox"/> Staff to Respond <input type="checkbox"/> Staff info Only <input type="checkbox"/> Dir Mailbox <input type="checkbox"/> Dir Circulate	Ack Sent: <input type="checkbox"/> Fax <input type="checkbox"/> Mail <input type="checkbox"/> Email

"Public Hearing Submission-  
Bylaw No.725-12"

In Regard to Official Community Plan Amendment (Shuswap County  
Estates) 1885 Tappen Notch Hill Rd.

<input type="checkbox"/> CAO	<input type="checkbox"/> Agenda
<input type="checkbox"/> Works	<input type="checkbox"/> Reg Board
<input type="checkbox"/> BS	<input type="checkbox"/> In Camera
<input type="checkbox"/> Enj/Adm	<input type="checkbox"/> Other Mtg
<b>JUL 24 2018</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> By Day	<input type="checkbox"/> Received
<input type="checkbox"/> By	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff to Respond
<input type="checkbox"/> Parks	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff to Respond
<input type="checkbox"/> STP	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff Info Only
<input type="checkbox"/> LIR	<input type="checkbox"/> Dir Mailbox
<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Dir Circulate

My name is \_\_\_\_\_ and I am in joint ownership with  
\_\_\_\_\_ of a neighboring property, address \_\_\_\_\_

We have several concerns with this proposal but the groundwater aquifer is our main reason for not wanting this amended Bylaw to be allowed to move forward.

We purchased this property October 2006. Our well log was for 8 US gallons per minute and our static level was 115' as stated by the well driller at the time of drilling and then pumped and certified again Static level 110' and Gal/per /minute at 8 by our pump install company J's Pumps and Plumbing. (Exhibit #1)

For the first four years we lived on this property we never had any issue with the well. The pump was designed to supply 5 gallons per minute and the well produced 8.

Then in 2011 if we ran our sprinkler for any length of time we would have what I thought was a pump problem as it would shut down. This continued so we got J's Plumbing in to test the pump. The next year we continued to have the same shut down problem so J's came in and pulled the pump. This was May 29 of 2012. It was at that time that J's determined that our well had lost 86' on the static level. (Exhibit # 3) J's Pumps invoices.

We also did a rough flow test and it was 2.5-3 gals per minute verses 8. Jerry of (J's Pumps asked if I had seen any wells being drilled close to us. And I had seen drilling / developing of the well and small white building you now see in the corner of Carlin Rd. and the CPR right away.

Prior to this well being established we all watched several loads of water being hauled daily from Bolton Creek with a pickup and a water tank to supply the extra need of the households of that time which is less than the 54 that is there now.

I am not trying to say you took my water I am just showing how happenings around you can change a well drastically.

So now switching to the well in discussion in the corner of Carlin Rd. and Railway right of way. Shuswap Country Estates supplied CSRD with a well log for a well drilled in 2004 done by Bud's water wells. This I believe is not the well log for that newest well that is the main or only source for the Estates. To raise that question I ask you to examine the Omega & Associates Engineering Ltd. Drawings (Exhibit #2). The date for these drawings with the location of the **proposed well water Source** is hard to read but I believe it is 08/28/2009. So I would suggest that the well log supplied, is for the old well marked ex4 on this drawing. This well is not far from the new well site. As you can see from this drawing there have been several wells drilled on the property that are scheduled to be closed down. So water has been a problem for a long time. On this drawing there is an info box close to the top of that report pointing to a spot near the railway property line. It **says Proposed Well Water Source**. So it is not clear what water they do have and is that well registered. Questions arising then are:

Does the well have its proper set back from property lines?

In fact is the well on their property? We all know of old fence lines not being on actual property lines so with this being so close we trust the CSRD will require that this is proven by survey and that a certified flow tested is done as well. We believe the new well was put into service in 2010 or 2011.

However if that 2004 well log is the correct one, then the well log states this well is producing 3.5 us gallons per minute and that is not enough water for the households there now, let alone increasing the size of this development to 2 ½ time it size of households now. Exhibit #4 Well Log

I looked up stats on average water used for a household with one person and that is 80-130 US Gallons. US gallons are how wells are measured.

So going by the 2004 well log at 3.5 gallons per minute = (3.5 US gal. per minute x 60 min. x 24 hr = 5040 US gallons) produced in 24 hrs. (54 units x 2 people x 80 = 8640 gallons. So the demand on the well is 71% over what it can produce if all is optimum with the well. So we ask that this gets reviewed as well.

The letter from Franklin Engineering Dated March 27, 2017 states the proposal is to raise the households to 125. So the math on 125 households with 2 people requires, (taking the lower volume of 80 gallons) = 125



households x 80 gallons x 2people = 20,000 US gallons per day. That is 7,300,000 gallons taken out of this aquifer annually.

All the wells in this area that I know of have limited flow rates and with our example, diminishing in flow already. We feel this additional flow of 11,360 US gallons daily is not able to be maintained within this aquifer.

So we ask, if the CSRD is going to continue researching this expansion that they would do their do-diligence and require that there is suitable testing done to establish if in fact this aquifer can handle the additional water demand long term for years to come.

Our well driller feels this aquifer area is all linked together with a network of small water flows. So with this in mind our second concern is the large amount blasting and development to accomplish this project. As this will be on the slopes and hillside that several of us get our flow of water from. This will put us at additional risk of losing our well capacity and the financial hardships of having to re-drill a well or wells as Shuswap Country Estates already have had to do.

The new regulations that came into effect in approximately 2007 regarding building sites, roads and driveways on steep ground, I believe would not allow this project to continue. We trust that this project will be governed by the updated Bylaw's / Regulations? This is a major **new** development.

#### Lagoon

To the best of anyone's knowledge there never has been any need to spray effluent from the lagoon with the units in the park now. However if the expansion were allowed to proceed there will be. So this again is **new** as it never has been done and that permit was done in 1997. This permit in place allows spreading to happen from April 1 to Oct. 30 each year. The permit is for Approx. 4,000 gallons per day during the dates above. If my math conversion is correct that would be approximately 783,000 gallons effluent at maximum per year. This creates big concerns for several properties close to this field. Pumping with sprinklers into the air is very poor efficiency but a real good way to have over spray drifted towards the close neighbours and along with that comes smell as well, depending on the product being spread. I personally can attest to the drift as we pumped liquid manure via a sprinkler as well. If there is any breeze at all the atomized part of the liquid

will travel a long way. For example we got a phone call from a neighbour whose elevation was at least 100' higher plus 6-800 ft. away saying we were over spraying their windows and to come and look. I did and it was correct. We all know that the winds in this valley will create movement at ninety degrees to the Carlin Rd. towards several neighbours at lot less than 6-800' away.

A secondary concern to this spreading is how close this is to the well in question in the corner of Carlin Rd. and the Railway. From the drawing it looks close enough that it could pollute the well described as the ground slope appears to be towards the well and railway property. I know there are **rules regarding distances away from wells** but I didn't get that looked up.

And last but not least all vegetation on that steep rock hill side will be damaged and lost within the construction area. We all know of what clear cut logging sites have created at times. This is no different as it will be years before there will be any amount of tree or vegetation growth to help with erosion. You can attest to this if you drive through the initial developed area. Lack of vegetation sets up for slides and extra water coming down to damage properties, driveways and roads below.

There has already been at least one bank sliding that was endangering a garage on the initial development.

None of us disagree with the need for affordable housing but the immense cost of developing this steep rock property will be far more costly than developing in other areas.

Hi density housing needs the support of community water and sewage systems as the Board Report states.

Go through highlighted Board and staff reports.

We support the Boards recommendation of this kind of development being in designated areas that are more able to handle dense housing and this area is not zoned for this. Yes years ago this was allowed, but this is 2018 and this is a new build.

So in summary:

- We the undersigned on this Petition dated July 24, 2018 respectfully but firmly say no to this proposal to amend Bylaw 725-12.
- We are ok with the area of the established mobile park that is on Small Holding zoned property to be re zoned to NE to allow compliance.
- We ask that the CSRD leave the remaining area in question Zoned as (RH & SH properties) to allow any future development to be governed by that.
- We trust that the CSRD will make the correct decision and not allow this expansion of intense housing development on this proposed site to create a negative impact in several ways but most importantly the negative effect on our groundwater resource that the CSRD has a mandate to protect.
- Petition supplied: The Petition supplied shows the unity of all neighbours surrounding the property in question.

Respectfully Submitted on behalf of the local land owners.

PETITION SUBMISSION – PROPOSED COMMUNITY PLAN AMENDMENT

We as a group of local property owners located near Shuswap Country Estates, address of 1885 Tappen Notch Hill Rd. wish to object to the proposed Community Plan Amendment of Bylaw No. 725-12. The undersigned names would be negatively impacted by this proposal so are signing this petition to say they do not want this to proceed for various reasons. Some will also give more written details of their individual circumstances.

PRINT NAME

SIGNATURE

PROPERTY ADDRESS

Dated: July 24<sup>TH</sup>, 2018

LIMITED PROXY FORM

The undersigned, owners of

as proxyholder on the matter of

ELECTORAL AREA C OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN AMENDMENT  
(SHUSWAP COUNTRY ESTATES) BYLAW NO. 725-12 - PUBLIC HEARING SUBMISSION

to vote and act for us to the same extent that we would, if personally present.

DATE: July 23, 2018

This proxy is revocable by the owner and is valid only for the meeting for which it is given and any lawful adjournment.

<input type="checkbox"/> CAO <input type="checkbox"/> Works <input type="checkbox"/> DS <input type="checkbox"/> Fin/Adm	<input type="checkbox"/> Agenda; _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Reg Board <input type="checkbox"/> In Camera <input type="checkbox"/> Other Mtg.	Ownership:  File #
<b>JUL 24 2018</b>		
<input type="checkbox"/> Ec Day <input type="checkbox"/> IT <input type="checkbox"/> Parks <input type="checkbox"/> SEP <input type="checkbox"/> HR <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Received <input type="checkbox"/> Staff to Report <input type="checkbox"/> Staff to Respond <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Info Only <input type="checkbox"/> Dir Mailbox <input type="checkbox"/> Dir Circulate	Ack Sent:  <input type="checkbox"/> Fax <input type="checkbox"/> Mail <input type="checkbox"/> Email

CONCERNS OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT ABOVE  
MY PROPERTY AT 1747 TAPPAN NOTCH HILL RD.

- PROPERTY VALUES BECAUSE OF PROPOSED  
EXPANSION OF MOBILE HOME PARK.

- WATER LEVELS OF EXISTING WELLS FROM  
MORE WATER USE.

- BLASTING NEAR MY WELL TO LESSEN THE  
GRADE FOR ACCESS TO DEVELOPMENT.

July 22/2018

<input type="checkbox"/> CAO	<input type="checkbox"/> Agenda	Ownership: File #
<input type="checkbox"/> Works	<input type="checkbox"/> Reg Board	
<input type="checkbox"/> DS	<input type="checkbox"/> In Camera	
<input type="checkbox"/> Fin/Adm	<input type="checkbox"/> Other Mtg	
JUL 24 2018		
<input type="checkbox"/> E- Day	<input type="checkbox"/> Received	Ack Sent: <input type="checkbox"/> Fax <input type="checkbox"/> Mail <input type="checkbox"/> Email
<input type="checkbox"/> IT	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff to Report	
<input type="checkbox"/> Parks	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff to Respond	
<input type="checkbox"/> SEP	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff Info Only	
<input type="checkbox"/> HR	<input type="checkbox"/> Dir Mailbox	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Dir Circulate	

“Public Hearing Submission-Bylaw No. 725-12”

July 24,2018 Property address

Points of Concern with this proposal.

My main concern is about the extra water this development will draw from our aquifer not only short term in for years to come. As proposed this will draw over 7 million gallons from the aquifer per year.

I am totally opposed to all the blasting that will be required to do this development as where this will all be happening is on the hillside where several of our water wells are or where the wells on the field area get their water from.

I am opposed to the de-forestation of the hill as this will create extra water erosion and potential damage to properties below.

We moved here for a reason and that was to be in Rural Properties as this is zoned for. I do not want the re-zoning to allow expansion of NR densely populated zoning.

We want the Rural Holdings and Small Holdings zoning to remain as they are designated in this area.

<input type="checkbox"/> CAO <input type="checkbox"/> Works <input type="checkbox"/> DS <input type="checkbox"/> Fin/Adm	<input type="checkbox"/> Agenda <input type="checkbox"/> Reg Board <input type="checkbox"/> In Camera <input type="checkbox"/> Other Mtg.	Ownership:  File #
<b>JUL 24 2018</b>		
<input type="checkbox"/> Ec/Day <input type="checkbox"/> IT? <input type="checkbox"/> Parks <input type="checkbox"/> SEP <input type="checkbox"/> HR <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Received <input type="checkbox"/> Staff to Report <input type="checkbox"/> Staff to Respond <input type="checkbox"/> Staff into Only <input type="checkbox"/> Dir Mailbox <input type="checkbox"/> Dir Circulate	Ack Sent:  <input type="checkbox"/> Fax <input type="checkbox"/> Mail <input type="checkbox"/> Email

**Marianne Mertens**

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 24, 2018 3:01 PM  
**To:** Planning Public Email address  
**Subject:** Public Hearing Submission - Bylaw No. 725-12

Public Hearing Submission - Bylaw No. 725-12

The impact this amendment will bring on my property raises multiple concerns for myself. There is a concern with regards to my property's ability to produce water and the financial implications of additional well drilling. The development of the hillside also raises concerns with regards to possible future slides due to destabilization and possible increased run-off discharge.

Well impacts as per the impacts raised by 1885 Tappen Notch Hill Rd's well (by over the last several years, with regards to the documented water/well impact of the initial development of the Shuswap Country Estates. As I have only been on the property for 2 years and do not have a detailed historical record of any changes in the area, this raises a concern to the impact of my property's ability to produce water and the financial implications of additional well drilling.

As is located downhill from the proposed re-designated area from RH to NR, and the changes to the side of the hill, assuming similar changes as the current developed area, raises major concerns with the stability of the hillside and any increased risk of slides, destabilizing, and other impacts incurred due to changes to the natural landscape, over the foreseeable future.

With the reduction of natural absorption and probable increased run-off from roads and yards, this would dramatically increase the probability and severity of flooding during the spring run-off, increasing my property costs and possibly damaging my home.

Overall my concerns with the re-designation raise concerns with regards to the impact of my properties well's ability to produce water, the stability of the hillside and the impacts of any changes to said hillside on runoff through my property. Please consider these factors and how they might be mitigated and/or compensated for if damaged and/or impaired. Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,



July 23, 2018

Columbia Shuswap Regional District  
555 Harbourfront Drive NE  
Salmon Arm, BC V1E 4P1  
Attention: Dan Passmore

Dear Mr. Passmore

Re: Public Hearing Submission – Bylaw No. 725-12

This letter is written in response to the proposed Electoral Area C Official Community Plan Amendment (Shuswap Country Estates) Bylaw No. 725-12.

We have lived on our 20 acre property, located at Tappen Notch Hill Road, for over 6 years and believe the proposed expansion of the Shuswap Country Estates will most certainly have an effect within our area, the extent of which we feel has not been fully determined to support the final approval for this mobile home park expansion and re-zoning of existing land parcels.

While the applicant has not disclosed the number of manufactured homes sites they intend to develop, this application would allow for the addition of 71 manufactured homes sites to be established on the property, for a total of 125 mobile home residences. The applicant is also requesting 3 parcels to be re-zoned to allow for more residential densification.

Our issues with this application encompass three (3) primary areas of concern:

- 1) Water
  - a) Impact of 71 new mobile home sites drawing over 4,000,000 additional gallons of water per annum on the existing aquifer (based on 80 gallons person/day);
  - b) Are geological reports available that indicate the size and capacity of the existing aquifer to quantify and support such a residential expansion; and
  - c) The surrounding area is primarily agricultural and by virtue of that is extremely dependent on unimpeded access to existing water resources to support agricultural activities;

BL 725-12  
PL 2018-0016

PUBLIC HEARING SUBMISSION

BYLAW NO. 725-12

In Regard to Official Community Plan Amendment (Shuswap Country Estates)  
1885 Tappen Notch Hill Road.

<input type="checkbox"/> CAO	<input type="checkbox"/> Agenda	Ownership: File#
<input type="checkbox"/> Works	<input type="checkbox"/> Reg Board	
<input type="checkbox"/> DS	<input type="checkbox"/> In Camera	
<input type="checkbox"/> Fin/Adm	<input type="checkbox"/> Other Mtg	
JUL 23 2018		
<input type="checkbox"/> Ec Dev	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff to Report	Ack Sent: <input type="checkbox"/> Fax <input type="checkbox"/> Mail <input type="checkbox"/> Email
<input type="checkbox"/> IT	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff to Respond	
<input type="checkbox"/> Parks	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff to Circulate	
<input type="checkbox"/> SEP	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	
<input type="checkbox"/> HR		
<input type="checkbox"/> Other		

My name is \_\_\_\_\_ and owner of the property at \_\_\_\_\_

I have concerns with the water supply for the trailer park as well as the capacity available with their existing septic system.

My home is serviced from a drilled well, so far there has not been any problems, but thinking that the well that the CPR drilled, as well as the one drilled by Shuswap Country Estates, and are very close to each other, are both pumping a large quantity of water each day. I am not sure but one would believe that these two wells, as well as the one on my property are drawing from the same underground stream.

If Shuswap Country Estates is to expand, then the quantity of water they are drawing from this source would be largely increased as would the amount of waste going into the existing septic system. If this has to be pumped out where would this go?

I know there is a need for more housing, but not sure that is the proper place for this to happen.

If these plans are to proceed, I would like in writing from you the CSRD, and Shuswap Country Estates, that any damage done, or loss of water to the existing wells within the area surrounding this parcel of land, will be restored by you and the property owners compensated accordingly.

In closing I trust that CSRD will take their time to make the correct decision on this matter and protect our existing water source.

Sincerely