
Mountain Drive
Vernon, BC,
V1H2B7

February 12, 2020

Regional District of Central Okanagan
1450 KLO Road
Kelowna, BC
V1W3Z4

Dear RDCO,

I am writing this letter in regards to a Public Meeting notice for a proposed addition located at 571 Mountain Drive. I have contacted RDCO and have been notified of the addition that my neighbour would like to make to their property.

At this time our household (Both Mark and Robyn Prosser) are not in agreement with this addition. The reason for our decision is because there is already no space for us to drive past their home. We have to drive past this property at least 2x each daily and traffic has been reduced to one lane.

This property has a double garage and more parking space in the area for the proposed addition. My concerns are the single lane for driving, which makes it even more difficult for winter as our plows can't clear enough of the snow; thus turning into ice buildup. The owner of this home and their renters park on the street causing this issue, reducing this space will cause ample issues.

We will be unable to attend the Public Meeting but hope this letter will suffice. Thank you for hearing our opinion!

Sincerely yours,



Robyn and Mark Prosser

From: [Ray Cotton](#)
To: [RDCO Planning Services](#)
Subject: File: VP-19-09
Date: Tuesday, February 11, 2020 8:53:31 AM

To whom it may concern,

In regards to the proposed addition which would require a reduction of the minimum front set back at 571 Mountain Drive, lot 121, District lot 3688, ODYD, Plan 26101. Please be advised I would **definitely object** to allowing this addition to be built. As it stands now, most of us neighbors feel this home should not have been approved as it is already way too big for the property it sits on. I understand it already intrudes on the minimum front set-back and further infringement is definitely not acceptable. To this day, this house has not been completely finished on the outside and as the driveway has never been completed the parking situation is overflowing onto the road causing difficulty for snow plows and the flow of neighboring traffic.

This house was built with no sensitivity for any of the neighbors and the owner has been less than neighborly to many residents who have lived in this neighborhood for many years. This house already has the appearance of an apartment building that would be better suited in a multi-resident zoned area. It is an eye-sore to all that are close and will definitely have a negative effect on the property values in close proximity. Any further enlargement to this already unsightly building would only make it more offensive and go against the building guidelines in place for good reasons.

There have been at least a couple sets of renters renting an upstairs rental unit which I understand should not be allowed. I was led to believe this was approved as a single family home. This also contributes to the parking issue. Due to unruly renters living there, the police have been called to this residence on multiply occasions. Historically this neighborhood is not used to this type of disruptive activity.

Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to voice my views on this application and I do expect to attend this public meeting on February 24th.

Sincerely,

Ray Cotton

■ Mountain Drive,
Vernon, BC

From: [Joel Boulianne](#)
To: [RDCO Planning Services](#)
Subject: File: VP-19-09
Date: Monday, February 17, 2020 3:55:08 PM

Dear Planning Department;

Thank you for sending us a letter requesting our opinion about the proposed "reduction of the front setback" for the residence located at 571 Mountain Drive, Westshore Estates, Vernon, BC.

Our property is located kitty-corner to this address at 538 Mountain Drive (lot #163) and we are currently building a house there. Building permits have been issued.

Our opinion is this: The house in question has already been built to the limits in the front and side setbacks and it "dwarfs" the houses surrounding it.

If the request is to allow for an error in construction where some part of the existing building sticks out into the setback one or two feet, then we are not opposed to that.

If the request is for anything more than this, such as any enclosed spaces added to the front of the house, then we are opposed to that.

I would have liked to be able to attend the meeting (and still may if plans changed) but I am scheduled to be working out of town on the day of the meeting.

Please accept this email as our "proxy vote" on the subject for my wife Sylvie and I Joel. Please feel free to email me back or call me if any of the above is unclear.

Thank you!

Joel and Sylvie Boulianne



Regional District of Central Okanagan

To whom it may concern.

RE: Public Meeting Notice (File VP-19-09)

Subject Property: 571 Mountain Drive Vernon BC Lot 121, District 3688, ODYD, plan 26101.

I have been asked as a homeowner and direct next-door neighbor, I occupy lot #122, at [REDACTED] Mountain Drive to weigh in on a decision and voice my opinion as I understand it to grant the owner a variance due to the encroachment of the house relative to the setback laws for the front of the property. I also have been asked to voice my opinion on the owner asking for an addition to be built to the front of the property.

The short answer is I **do not agree** with allowing the variance to be granted or the addition to be built.

The subject property over powers both adjacent properties including mine, and properties across the street. It is a 3-story building that looks like an apartment building with no curb appeal. This design has devalued my property, as anyone who comes to visit me says what is that doing in the rural setting of the neighborhood. They say good luck selling your property next to "that". I had to spend extra money on a fence that is called solid fencing to block out the house as much as possible. I also had to spend an extra 25 K on a pergola which is currently approved and permitted with RDCO. I will be putting this up in the Spring to block out the house from my view in my back yard as the subject property over powers and towers my backyard and pool area, leaving me with no privacy without building a massive pergola.

The long answer or question who is accountable for allowing this to happen? Is it the builder, the home owner the planning and permit dept, the building inspection dept?

How could anyone think building a 3 story 4500+ square foot house on .22 acres of land a good idea. Fair enough if the owner has their own taste of what is beautiful but allowing a 3-story box that stretches the entire lot from corner to corner and no bump outs that could soften the overpowering presence of the house or even lowering the height would help. No one suggested this? Again, if all legal fine, but what is the job of the planning/permitting dept can't they suggest changes to ensure something like this doesn't happen?

Now for the real crux of the issue. Its fine the owner has an idea of what good looks, and the planning and permitting dept approves the plans if it meets the legal requirements and then the building begins.

Answer me this how does the building inspection dept miss the fact the foundation was not poured, to the right setback clearances for the property for this huge house. Didnot someone pull out a tape measure? You would think with such a large house this property would receive extra scrutiny because of its massive square footage on such a tiny lot.

Now I am being asked to forgive a mistake that the builder, owner and in my opinion the RDCO made and put myself at odds with the subject property owner. Any objective person would have to vote against the approval of the variance and the addition. Take a drive out there and see for yourself, you would be shocked like everybody else is when they pull up for the first time and see this property. Your left speechless.

Harvey Motowylo [REDACTED] Mountain Drive Vernon B.C.

Subject: In Response to File VP-19-09

To whom it may concern,

This letter is in response to File VP-19-09 regarding the property located at 571 Mountain Drive, West Shore Estates.

Our property is located immediately adjacent to the above mentioned property and we do not approve of the application to allow a reduction of the minimum setbacks for the existing residence and proposed addition of this property.

We would like to express our concern regarding the above mentioned property's setbacks and current proposal for an addition. The existing residence:

- was constructed against permitted setback allowance (it was constructed beyond the allowable frontage set back without approval from neighbouring properties);
- has renters currently residing in the suite, although it is not approved as a rental suite;
- is an apartment style building, completely out of spec with the appearance of the surrounding homes;
- nearly consumes the entire lot and we believe will/has negatively impacted the resale value of surrounding homes; and
- the sheer size of the current building has not only impacted the neighbours views but has left no room for parking which has caused and continues to cause congestion on the road (a potential safety concern on our narrow rural road).

We believe an addition to this already monstrous sized building will diminish neighbouring property values even further and could cause safety hazards on the road due to the buildings footprint on the lot currently consuming any available parking space. Photos attached for your review.

We do not approve of any relaxation of current setbacks. We hope you consider this rebuttal in your review of File VP-19-09.

Sincerely,

Bev and Udo Hennings
■■ Mountain Dr Lot # 120






From: [Tony/Shirley](#)
To: [RDCO Planning Services](#)
Subject: Re: file: VP- 19- 09
Date: February 18, 2020 5:12:55 PM

CAUTION: This message was sent from outside the organization. Please do not click links, open attachments, or respond unless you recognize the source of this email and know the content is safe.

Address request for the attached email of objection is:

Alfred Luoma

 Mountain Drive (directly across the street from 571 Mountain Drive)

Sent from my iPad

> On Feb 18, 2020, at 2:45 PM, RDCO Planning Services <planning@rdco.com> wrote:

>

> Good afternoon, Alfred:

> RDCO Planning Services will need to your property address to include your letter of opposition. Please submit so that we can include your letter to the file: VP-19-09.

>

> Thank you.

>

> Sincerely,

>

> Planning Services | Community Services

> Regional District of Central Okanagan

> 250-469-6227 | planning@rdco.com

> Connect with us | rdco.com | rdcogis.com

>

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: 

> Sent: February 18, 2020 2:36 PM

> To: RDCO Planning Services <planning@rdco.com>

> Cc: 

>

>

> To whom it may concern: File VP 19 -09 I am not in favour of any proposed additions to this property. It will only make this place worse than it does now. Alfred Luoma

From: [Larry Sullivan](#)
To: [RDCO Planning Services](#)
Subject: File # VP1909
Date: February 19, 2020 1:37:37 PM

CAUTION: This message was sent from outside the organization. Please do not click links, open attachments, or respond unless you recognize the source of this email and know the content is safe.

I am responding to a notice of application that is posted at 571 Mountain Drive Vernon BC.

This notice of application indicates that an expansion is going to be built onto this existing structure at 571 Mountain Drive.

This residential community know as Westshore Estates is suppose to consist of single family detached homes.

The existing structure that is at 571 Mountain Drive is an apartment building and has 3 separate suites existing in it. Each suite has it own entrance. At least two of these suites are currently being occupied. The present owner of the building has not completed the front of the building and there is no place for the tennants to park but on the street which takes up one lane of traffic causing very unsafe conditions for all residents that live in the immediate area.

I am opposed to any construction on this apartment building that would encroach further into the street and create more vehicle traffic. I do not think that the laws should be relaxed to allow construction on a building that should not have been allowed to be constructed in the first place.

I would like to know who at RDCO signed off on the construction of this building. Does RDCO not have any home inspection requirements and regulations for new home builds. Did the builder pull the proper permits for this building? Was the builder registered to build such a structure? Did a building inspector inspect the building during the various building stages?

These are questions that all the residence in the area have been asking since this ugly apartment complex was built.

I would like answers to the above questions and it is my understanding that RDCO is where these answers must come from.

Please respond.

Larry Sullivan
[REDACTED] Mountain Drive
Vernon BC
[REDACTED]