

Public Hearing Report – Bylaw Nos. 3365 & 3366 Windermere South / Brewer Ridge Holdings Ltd.

This report is submitted to the Board of Directors of the Regional District of East Kootenay pursuant to Section 464 of the *Local Government Act*.

The public hearing for Bylaw No. 3365 cited as “Regional District of East Kootenay – Lake Windermere Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 2929, 2019 – Amendment Bylaw No. 17, 2024 (Windermere South / Brewer Ridge Holdings Ltd.)” and Bylaw No. 3366 cited as “Regional District of East Kootenay – Columbia Valley Zoning Bylaw No. 3255, 2023 – Amendment Bylaw No. 22, 2024 (Windermere South / Brewer Ridge Holdings Ltd.)” was held on April 29, 2025 at 6:00 pm via Zoom Webinar.

The following Regional District representatives attended the public hearing:

Director Susan Clovechok, Electoral Area F
Director Allen Miller, District of Invermere
Krista Gilbert, Planning Technician

The notice for the hearing was published in the April 24, 2025, issue of the Columbia Valley Pioneer. Notices were sent to forty-nine (49) adjacent property owners on April 15, 2025 by regular mail with no notices returned as undeliverable.

Staff read bylaw introduction notes before the hearing and there was a questions and answers period before the hearing. Chair Clovechok convened the hearing at 6:57 pm and Regional District representatives were introduced.

Chair Clovechok advised those in attendance:

- to identify themselves and the property they own that may be affected by the Bylaws;
- that only those written and/or verbal presentations made at the hearing will be considered as part of the hearing report;
- that no written or verbal submissions will be allowed subsequent to the close of this hearing.

Bylaw No. 3365 provides for:

1. This Bylaw may be cited as “Regional District of East Kootenay – Lake Windermere Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 2929, 2019 – Amendment Bylaw No. 17, 2024 (Windermere South / Brewer Ridge Holdings Ltd.)”
2. The designation of Parcel D (being a consolidation of Lots 23-31 see CA6492472), Block 4, District Lot 8, Kootenay District, Plan 686, outlined on the attached Schedule A, which is incorporated in and forms part of the Bylaw, are amended from R-SF, Residential Low Density to R-MF, Residential Multiple Family.

Bylaw No. 3366 provides for:

1. This Bylaw may be cited as “Regional District of East Kootenay – Columbia Valley Zoning Bylaw No. 3255, 2023 – Amendment Bylaw No. 22, 2024 (Windermere South / Brewer Ridge Holdings Ltd.)”

2. The designation of Parcel D (being a consolidation of Lots 23-31 see CA6492472), Block 4, District Lot 8, Kootenay District, Plan 686, outlined on the attached Schedule A, which is incorporated in and forms part of the Bylaw, is amended from R-1, Single Family Residential Zone to R-4, Multiple Family Residential – High Density Zone.

Staff read the legal proceedings for the public hearing as set out by the *Local Government Act* and noted that a report of the hearing would be submitted to the Board at its May 9, 2025 meeting.

Staff advised that thirty-three (33) written submissions were received prior to the deadline. Twenty-two (22) letters from twenty-one (21) people expressed support for the application. Eleven (11) letters express opposition or concern to the application. Reasons for concern or opposition include increase in traffic, particularly to and from the highway, safety concerns with adding to the high vehicle and pedestrian traffic associated with the Windermere Elementary School drop off and pick up times, and when accessing and parking at Windermere Beach. Other concerns include the proposal not being in keeping with the character of Windermere, septic and water supply concerns, especially when also considering the adjacent Heritage Heights Development, the potential environmental impacts on the lake, overcapacity at Windermere Beach, concerns about impact on property values, not being aligned with OCP policies, conflict of interest of officials and concerns over the application process and short opportunity for public consultation. Additional comments note that while there is a need for additional housing the above concerns need to be addressed, and a scaled back proposal more compatible with the surrounding land use would be better suited.

Several members of the public and the proponent attended the hearing and the following people spoke:

Mike Dubois, 1735 Cardiff Avenue: Opposed due to the notice period that should be changed to provide more time for residents, the RDEK should do more than the minimum and seems to be limiting public input. Also opposed due to traffic concerns to and from the highway particularly, concerns about sewage discharge impacting adjacent and downslope wells, because it is not consistent with the OCP, and apartments should be within municipalities.

Karen Taylor-Brown, 4722 Wood Lane: She has concerns with the process not allowing for full and fair participation. The application should include more information, should have consideration for the ʔAkisq̓nuk development and broader community considerations. She has concern over conflict of interest for a Director, directing development to the RDEK. She has concerns over whether the project will provide affordable housing, and feels the cart is before the horse with water, sewer and other infrastructure confirmation. There are already water restrictions in the summer with the water system without this proposal.

Mara King, 835 Lakeview Road: She notes that many different types of people live in the Columbia Valley and this development could provide housing options for many of them. However, there isn't sufficient information for this project to proceed. All organizations need to work together for housing options to increase community well-being.

Mark Rievaj, 4882 Windermere Road: He is opposed due to the lack of details on sewer. Windermere is already underserved; this should wait until there are more services in the area. Other concerns include the lack of notification time for the process, the proposal is not aligned with the OCP, and more details need to be provided. Second homeowners are a concern, more housing doesn't mean it will go to locals.

Colleen Roberts, 4642 Birch Street: She is opposed for the same reasons as given by other speakers. She was on the OCP committee, and it seems that the OCP is being ignored in the face of providing more housing. The no Short Term Rental covenant is good. She has concerns about water supply and what triggers more upgrades. There seem to be no long-term infrastructure plans with 150 new units between two projects in the area. She also has concerns about sewer and the process.

Patti van Zeyl, 4828 Nelles Crescent: She is in support of more affordable housing but opposed to this application due to traffic concerns, the close proximity to the school, the process not being sufficient or inclusive to the local community.

Andrea Dunlop, 1821 Taynton Road: She is concerned this is the last opportunity the public has to be included in the proposed development when there are no details about water and sewer. Water and sewer are a big problem, this project and the other recently approved could fundamentally change Windermere and its infrastructure. She feels that she has no voice, but she also submitted a letter with further input.

Jack Gregory, 4796 The Bench Road: He noted that he sent in a letter. He is opposed, he lives right on the road most impacted by this development and the traffic impacts cannot be ignored. He is opposed and agrees with other speakers' concerns. He is concerned about the safety of children, there are no sidewalks in Windermere, and it is chaos during drop off and pick up times at the elementary school.

Christine Dubois, 1735 Cardiff Avenue: She is opposed and agrees with other speakers' concerns. She is concerned about the safety of children, there are no sidewalks in Windermere, and it is chaos during drop off and pick up times at the elementary school. Agitated drivers from these units will deal with that. Parents have to drive kids to school as it is a rural area, and she cannot imagine living next to that in addition to 40 additional workers trying to get to work at the same time.

Chair Clovechok called three times for comments and since no other members of the public chose to speak, Chair Clovechok closed the hearing at 7:26 pm.

Chair Susan Clovechok
Electoral Area F

Krista Gilbert
Planning Technician

April 2025

RE: RDEK "Bylaw 3365 and Bylaw 3366 (Windermere South/Brewer Ridge Holdings LTD"

Name: KARLA GERVAIS Windermere,
Address 1654 Sinclair AVE BC.

I have received pertinent information on the proposed project and:

✓ "SUPPORT"

Reasons:

April 2025

RE: RDEK "Bylaw 3365 and Bylaw 3366 (Windermere South/Brewer Ridge Holdings LTD"

Name: EVERT GUSTAFSON

Address 1815 VICTORIA AVE

I have received pertinent information on the proposed project and:

☒ "SUPPORT"

Reasons:

April 2025

RE: RDEK "Bylaw 3365 and Bylaw 3366 (Windermere South/Brewer Ridge Holdings LTD"

Name: Janet Gustafson

Address 1815 Victoria Ave. Windermere

I have received pertinent information on the proposed project and:

☒ "SUPPORT"

Reasons:

April 2025

RE: RDEK "Bylaw 3365 and Bylaw 3366 (Windermere South/Brewer Ridge Holdings LTD"

Name: 1676 rocky mountain ave
Address Akela Batchelor

I have received pertinent information on the proposed project and:

✓ "SUPPORT"

Reasons:

April 2025

RE: RDEK "Bylaw 3365 and Bylaw 3366 (Windermere South/Brewer Ridge Holdings LTD"

Name: *Ned Petersen*

Address *4705 LAKE ST. WINDERMERE*

I have received pertinent information on the proposed project and:

(☒) "SUPPORT"

Reasons:

April 2025

RE: RDEK "Bylaw 3365 and Bylaw 3366 (Windermere South/Brewer Ridge Holdings LTD"

Name: Kari Nichol

Address 1370 Hwy 93/95

Windermere BC V0B 2L1

I have received pertinent information on the proposed project and:

☒ "SUPPORT"

Kari Nichol

Reasons:

April 2025

RE: RDEK "Bylaw 3365 and Bylaw 3366 (Windermere South/Brewer Ridge Holdings LTD"

Name: Anne Riches

Address #3 Woodlane West

Windermere ~~Invermere~~ B.C. V0B-2L0

I have received pertinent information on the proposed project and:

✓ "SUPPORT" Anne Riches

Reasons:

April 2025

RE: RDEK "Bylaw 3365 and Bylaw 3366 (Windermere South/Brewer Ridge Holdings LTD"

Name: Shirley Peevey
Address 4858- Ditton Drive Windermere B.C.

I have received pertinent information on the proposed project and:

✓ "SUPPORT" Shirley Peevey

Reasons:

April 2025

RE: RDEK "Bylaw 3365 and Bylaw 3366 (Windermere South/Brewer Ridge Holdings LTD"

Name:

J. Wustburg

Address

*4703 North 2 St Windermere B.C.
V0B 2L2*

I have received pertinent information on the proposed project and:

☒ "SUPPORT"

Reasons:

April 2025

RE: RDEK "Bylaw 3365 and Bylaw 3366 (Windermere South/Brewer Ridge Holdings LTD"

Name: *Mike Haminski*

Address *24-4775 Wood Lane W.
WINDERMERE*

I have received pertinent information on the proposed project and:

✓ "SUPPORT"

Reasons:

April 18 2025

RE: RDEK "Bylaw 3365 and Bylaw 3366 (Windermere South/Brewer Ridge Holdings LTD"

Name: Heather Nilsson 

Address 4776 The Bench Rd
Windermere Bc

I have received pertinent information on the proposed project and:

☒ "SUPPORT"

Reasons:

April 2025

RE: RDEK "Bylaw 3365 and Bylaw 3366 (Windermere South/Brewer Ridge Holdings LTD"

Name: GRANT MERQUIST

Address 1764 GOV. ST

I have received pertinent information on the proposed project and:

✓ "SUPPORT"

Reasons:

April 2025

RE: RDEK "Bylaw 3365 and Bylaw 3366 (Windermere South/Brewer Ridge Holdings LTD"

Name: Ben Falconer

Address 1654 Sinclair

I have received pertinent information on the proposed project and:

☒ "SUPPORT"

Reasons:


April 2025

RE: RDEK "Bylaw 3365 and Bylaw 3366 (Windermere South/Brewer Ridge Holdings LTD"

Name: *Peter Boyne*

Address *4657 Rowan Street*

I have received pertinent information on the proposed project and:

 "SUPPORT"

Reasons:

April 2025

RE: RDEK "Bylaw 3365 and Bylaw 3366 (Windermere South/Brewer
Ridge Holdings LTD"

Name: REGAN TUBBS

Address 4785 GOVERNMENT ST
WINDERMERE BC

I have received pertinent information on the proposed project and:

✓ "SUPPORT"

Reasons: Its a great place for multiple dwellings
right next to a school for young families.

April 2025

RE: RDEK "Bylaw 3365 and Bylaw 3366 (Windermere South/Brewer
Ridge Holdings LTD"

Name: *Linda Chemelli*

Address *4750 GOVERNMENT ST.*
Windermere

I have received pertinent information on the proposed project and:

☒ "SUPPORT"

Reasons:

April 2025

RE: RDEK "Bylaw 3365 and Bylaw 3366 (Windermere South/Brewer Ridge Holdings LTD"

Name: Don Ferguson

Address 1660 VICTORIA AVE WINDERMERE

I have received pertinent information on the proposed project and:

☒ "SUPPORT"

Reasons:

will be great for the area!!

April 2025

RE: RDEK "Bylaw 3365 and Bylaw 3366 (Windermere South/Brewer Ridge Holdings LTD"

Name: *MIKE JENSEN*

Address *4766 - WOODLANE*

I have received pertinent information on the proposed project and:

☒ "SUPPORT"

Reasons:

April 2025

RE: RDEK "Bylaw 3365 and Bylaw 3366 (Windermere South/Brewer
Ridge Holdings LTD"

Name: BRIAN HOFFOS

Address 1661 SINCLAIR AVE.

I have received pertinent information on the proposed project and:

✓ "SUPPORT"

Reasons:

April 2025

RE: RDEK "Bylaw 3365 and Bylaw 3366 (Windermere South/Brewer
Ridge Holdings LTD"

Name: BRIAN HOFFOS

Address 4735 GOVERNMENT ST.

I have received pertinent information on the proposed project and:

☒ "SUPPORT"

Reasons:

April 2025

RE: RDEK "Bylaw 3365 and Bylaw 3366 (Windermere South/Brewer
Ridge Holdings LTD"

Name: GEORGE BARR

Address 4706 MERCURY ST WINDERMERE

I have received pertinent information on the proposed project and:

☒ "SUPPORT"

Reasons:

April 2025

RE: RDEK "Bylaw 3365 and Bylaw 3366 (Windermere South/Brewer Ridge Holdings LTD"

Name: MEL SADLER

Address 4754 WOOD LANE WEST

I have received pertinent information on the proposed project and:

☒ "SUPPORT"

Reasons:

Krista Gilbert

From: Peter Boswell [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, April 22, 2025 2:42 PM
To: Krista Gilbert
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: PUBLIC HEARING FOR 22 UNIT APARTMENT IN WINDERMERE- Brewer Ridge Holdings Ltd
Attachments: Brewer Ridge Public Hearing-Final.pdf

Krista, further to our phone conversation please note our traffic concerns. To add these developments Heritage Heights and Brewer Ridge to our town of Windermere is to add an unusual amount of traffic congestion to a small town. Of specific concern is the parking at the public beach and the traffic on Selkirk. In the summer days there are cars, trucks, campers etc. parked from the public beach all the way up Selkirk to Victoria. These cars etc. are parked on both sides of the street on Selkirk and limit the existing traffic to one way only. The visibility for cars etc. to see kids walking up and down Selkirk to the beach, is dangerous. We live at 1677 Victoria Ave. on the corner of Selkirk and Victoria. We witness large traffic congestion all the time. The noise is an issue but the traffic safety is a huge problem. As a community beach area we are full of vehicles. To ADD more than 200 residents in these developments will create parking problems and restrict beach access for the current residents of Windermere. There is simply no more parking at the beach. Yours Truly Peter Boswell

From: Windermere Community Association <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 21, 2025 9:16 PM
To: undisclosed-recipients:
Subject: RE: PUBLIC HEARING FOR 22 UNIT APARTMENT IN WINDERMERE- Brewer Ridge Holdings Ltd

Good Evening Everyone,

The Windermere Community Association Planning Committee would like to share an important update with you all.

Similar to the Heritage Heights project, the notice for the above application will be in the Pioneer **Thursday April 24, 2025** giving little time to meet the **4:30pm Monday April 28, 2025** deadline for comments and to preregister to attend the virtual Public Hearing on **Tuesday, April 29, 2025 at 6:00pm. To register** [click here](#)

The application proposes amendments to the Lake Windermere OCP and Columbia Valley Zoning Bylaw to permit a **22 unit multi-family apartment** in Windermere by Brewer Ridge Holdings Ltd. It is located on Rocky Mountain Avenue just west of Windermere Elementary School.

While this proposed development will provide much needed housing, it raises similar concerns including **water supply** and **sewage disposal** as the recently approved 131 unit multi-family Heritage Heights Development Inc. project. Although Brewer Ridge Holdings Ltd. proposed development is of a smaller scale, there are concerns.

Please see the attached document for the concerns of many community members.

If you have any questions please feel free to reach out to the planning committee at [REDACTED] and they will do their best to answer your questions.

Krista Gilbert

From: Michael Tilling <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, April 22, 2025 2:43 PM
To: Krista Gilbert
Subject: windermere developoment Brewer ridge and Heritage heights

note from: Michael Tilling, Windermere resident

RDEK Contact: Krista Gilbert, Planning Technician at 250-489-0314 or toll free at 1-888-478-7335 or email kgilbert@rdek.bc.ca

Click Bylaw No. 3365 for information on Lake Windermere Official Community Plan

Bylaw No. 2929, 2019 – Amendment Bylaw No. 17, 2024 (Windermere South / Brewer Ridge Holdings Ltd.)- and -

Bylaw No. 3366 Columbia Valley Zoning Bylaw No. 3255, 2023 – Amendment Bylaw No. 22, 2024 (Windermere South / Brewer Ridge Holdings Ltd.)

Re brewer ridge and heritage heights windermere
4711 Kootenay Street, Windermere, BC V0B2L2

Points which need to be addressed when considering any development in Windermere:

- This kind of high intensity development proposed is completely out of character with Windermere which is typically single property on a large lot with a village rural atmosphere, mostly owned for recreational purposes.
- all properties in Windermere are on septic systems. No municipal sewerage system exists.
- engineering environmental and water quality tests were carried out about 20 years ago by the ministry of environment, test results showed contamination of Windermere Creek by E coli sampling, showing increasing levels moving down the creek and, in the Windermere Lake, adjacent to Windermere residential areas, an indication of the effects of current septic systems, and these systems are relatively small. This illustrates that the current limited septic systems of the village are already polluting the highly porous underlying geological till and discharging effluent into Windermere Creek and the lake. Such massive, proposed developments, (requiring rezoning 7 lots to accommodate 131 lots in heritage heights and Brewer ridge 22 lots) could not use septic disposal without extremely high pollution, to ground water and lake
- Water supply to Windermere was upgraded about five or so years ago by a new water treatment plant serving Timber Ridge and Windermere, this treatment plant may not have adequate capacity for such a large increase in houses and most like continuing development. This development, if it were to go ahead, would set a precedence for further development, destroying the peaceful character of windermere. Current property holders paid large increases in water fees to pay for this upgrading.
- traffic intensity is already a problem for vehicles exiting onto the highway from Windermere.
- Windermere beaches are already overcapacity in the summer, the car park is overflowing, and vehicle backup parking is several 100 meters from the beaches
- Windermere beach facilities are already subjected to vandalism

- Windermere lake already has too many powerboats; the lake is shallow, and the lake and bed ecosystems are badly disturbed by power boat propellers. There should be no power boats on the lake, let alone the increase with additional development which will increase the pressure for more people to have more boats.
- Those officials making decisions on this development may also have some conflict of interest as there is considerable business opportunity for developers and building material suppliers. Any committee member with an interest in the property development business should exclude themselves from voting on this issue.
- arguments are repeatedly made by politicians and officials for the need for housing. This is delusional thinking. The bottom line, in the destruction of the environment and the climate crisis, is too many people, too much development. We do not need an expanding population, and excessive immigration which ultimately destroys the environment. Canada should establish policies to stabilize the population.
- There is a desire for developers and others in the building industry to make money regardless of the consequences. Their desire is not for community benefit.
- Natural human desire is to strive to increase individual well-being and material possessions. This is leading to environmental destruction without constraint
- A sustainable world can be achieved only by limiting population expansion and overconsumption. This subject is unfortunately very rarely addressed by those making decisions or those who already have sufficient assets.
- These public announcements are carefully timed at short notice to minimize feedback opportunity from residents. A similar situation was described on the CBC morning radio 6 February 2025, in Nelson. The town council had also used the same strategy to put through a proposal for a high-rise structure on a public space in the town centre, without allowing time for public input

Bylaw Amendment
Windermere South/Brewer Ridge Holdings Ltd.
Bylaws Number 3365 and 3366

I am a resident of Windermere and have concerns that will be expressed below. No data has been made available to me, **in spite of my request as per the Bylaw notice**. Therefore, my questions and/or reservations have been made using only the very limited information I was able to glean from the published notice or the internet.

1. At some point, enough is enough with regard to the load developments such as the proposed development will place on the community infrastructure, roads, water supply and the subterranean eco system.
 - Who will pay for those costs? The entities who are responsible for this “tipping point”? Or the community at large? In the case of a community sewer system being required, this cost will be astronomical.
2. I have not been able to obtain estimated water consumption data other than what was originally stated in the original February 11, 2025, submission which states:

Engineering Department: There is currently sufficient capacity within the East Side Lake Windermere Water System to accommodate the additional demand, subject to the timing of other connections. Several upgrades and conditions need to be met for the proposed development, outlined in the attached letter.

 - Estimates gleaned from Sewerage System Practices Manual Volume II indicate that the proposed development will consume (and therefore dispose of) at least 20,000 liters per day. Given this development AND the even larger one that has been approved to the east, does the water treatment facility have enough spare capacity? If not, who is going to pay for the necessary upgrades?
3. Given that “what comes in, must go out”, the original application states:

Sewer Services: The application proposes to develop an on-site package treatment facility or a larger community system if viable. The application notes that an assessment of the property has been completed to confirm that the soils are suitable for an on-site package treatment facility that can service the proposed development.

 - At some point the community as a whole will develop to a point whereby a sewage system becomes mandatory for the entire community. Surely there must be a point where putting your “effluent” directly into the ground via (uninspected?) septic systems becomes unfeasible. Where is that point? And who will pay for that event when it happens? The original submission states similar concerns stated by the Interior Health Authority, but I cannot find anywhere that this serious issue has been addressed.

- Who will pay for this eventuality? Will it be the developments like the two proposed? Or will it be the community as a whole?
4. The Ministry of Transport has also expressed concerns over the public transportation system (roads). The Bench Road is the primary access point to Windermere and is presently under stress, especially through access to the highway and the poor condition of the road in general.
- What is happening with the MOT concerns and who will pay for this?

At some point too much is too much, and I believe developments like this in Windermere will push us to “too much being too much”....unless that is the goal?

There is a good article from CBC about one community in B.C. that did not plan well. We do not want what happened in Sechelt to happen to us:

<https://www.cbc.ca/radio/whatonearth/drought-planning-1.7518702>

Regards,

Jack Gregory

Krista Gilbert

From: Andrea Dunlop [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, April 27, 2025 5:17 PM
To: Krista Gilbert
Subject: Comments on Brewer Ridge Development Proposal

Subject: Comments on Brewer Ridge Development Proposal

Dear Krista Gilbert and RDEK Planning Staff,

I am writing to provide comments on the Brewer Ridge Holdings Ltd. development proposal.

I appreciate that this project could provide much-needed housing for our community, especially given the covenant that restricts short-term rentals. Ensuring that new homes are available to local residents is a crucial step toward maintaining Windermere's livability for its residents.

That said, I do have several concerns I hope the RDEK will consider carefully:

- **Sewage and Wastewater:**

With 153 units between Brewer Ridge and the nearby Heritage Heights development, the cumulative impact on groundwater could be significant. While I understand these developments must meet Environmental Management Act and Municipal Wastewater Regulation standards, I would like to ask: **Does the RDEK have plans to develop a proper sewer system for the east side of Lake Windermere?**

We already have examples in our community where private sewer systems have led to serious odour problems and ongoing maintenance challenges. We must refrain from introducing additional developments that rely on private systems unless long-term solutions are in place or we know that the treatment plants used will be safe and odour-free.

- **Water Supply:**

While there is currently sufficient water, the combined demand from Brewer Ridge, Heritage Heights, Shadybrook Resort, and future growth will strain the Lake Windermere East Side Water System. A long-term infrastructure and funding plan is needed to ensure sustainable service for all residents.

- **Traffic Impacts:**

The addition of 22 more units will increase the number of vehicles in our small community, adding pressure to the already challenging highway access at Bench Road. Although a formal Traffic Impact Assessment isn't required for Brewer Ridge, I urge the RDEK and the Ministry of Transportation to ensure that traffic from both this project and Heritage Heights is properly studied and addressed.

Thank you for considering these concerns. I support thoughtful growth that protects the health and livability of our community.

Sincerely,
Andrea Dunlop

1821 Taynton Road
Windermere, BC [REDACTED]

Personal information has been withheld in
accordance with section 22(1) of the *Freedom
of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*.

I am grateful to call home the land cared for by the Ktunaxa for thousands of years, and I commit to supporting local First Nations people in the care of this land into the future.

Krista Gilbert

From: Rod & Christine Turnbull - [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2025 8:18 AM
To: Krista Gilbert
Subject: Re: Bylaw Amendments # 365-3366 Windermere South

Addendum to our Bylaw Amendment sent 27/04/25

The last paragraph should read:

In short, we urge this development to be deferred again until the citizens of Windermere can get a clearer picture and concrete solutions of all the concerns in this development and their real time solution the and in particular, how the RDEK will respond to the traffic issues in the community and the beach area that will be more exacerbated by this development and also Heritage Heights, already approved . If you choose again, to rubber stamp the application as seems to be the modus operandi of the RDEK, there will be little faith in the governance that this organisation.provides.

On Sun, Apr 27, 2025 at 7:27 PM Rod & Christine Turnbull <turnbull.lakeside@gmail.com> wrote:
Attn. Krista Gilbert

Re the above bylaw amendment, we do support the prospect of this buildup, however, as so often happens in Area F, these applications, too often are "rubber stamped" (like all the STR's) without proper study or proactive answers to the problems that may occur.

The WCA points out several concerns,(water,sewer and traffic impact) and we think it may be prudent to defer any further consideration until the developer and the RDEK have done their homework and can present a clearer picture vs the nebulous information given to the public as posted.

The WCA has highlighted these three concerns very well and we hope you will heed them before the horse has left the barn.To add to the concerns outlined by the WCA, one issue that RDEK has buried their head in the sand for the last four years, is the beach vehicle traffic.There have been many photos and written concerns sent to the area director, most of which have been ignored or "it is not within my area of responsibility". If this is so, what is her purpose? Is it not the elected persons duty to advocate on behalf of those who elect them to the RDEK board as a whole or, if necessary to the province. There have been many players who support meeting an aggregation made up of the RCMP, WCA, MoTi, Main Road and BC Ambulance to find a solution. (MoTi has threatened to bulldoze and remove all the landscaping that encroaches on their right of way. My, what good neighbours!)

In short, we urge this development to be deferred again until the citizens of Windermere can get a clearer picture and results of all the concerns in this development and their real time solution. If you choose again, to rubber stamp the application as seems to be the modus operandi of the RDEK, there will be little faith in the governance that this organisation.provides.

Rod & Christine Turnbull

4676 Selkirk St
Windermere, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Personal information has been withheld in
accordance with section 22(1) of the *Freedom
of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*.



April 27, 2025

Krista Gilbert, Planning Technician
Planning and Development
Regional District of East Kootenay

**RE: AMENDMENTS TO THE LAKE WINDERMERE OCP & COLUMBIA VALLEY ZONING
BYLAW (NO. 3255 & 3366) BREWER RIDGE HOLDINGS LTD.**

The Windermere Community Association (WCA) recognizes this proposal has the potential to provide much-needed housing for our community. The owner's commitment to register a covenant prohibiting short term rentals (less than 30 days), ensures these units serve local residents. This covenant would prevent the issuance of short term rental permits by the RDEK for this property.

There are however concerns with the following:

Sewage Disposal

The proposed development is adjacent to the recently approved 131-unit multifamily project by Heritage Heights Development Inc. The combined total of this and the Brewer Ridge project is 153 units on a 5.08ha (12.43ac). Given the cumulative impact on the groundwater, it is imperative sewage disposal for both developments adhere to the ***Environmental Management Act*** and follow the Ministry of Environment & Climate Change Strategy's ***Municipal Wastewater Regulation (MWR)*** along with the RDEK's ***Subdivision Servicing Bylaw***.

In addition to the above, it should be noted that approval of these developments, along with existing and future growth on the east side of Lake Windermere, raises the need for the RDEK to investigate building a sewage disposal facility.

Water Supply Considerations

The Lake Windermere East Side Water System (LWESWS) indicated there is sufficient water for this development. However adding 153 units from Brewer Ridge and Heritage Heights, the recent connection to Shadybrook Resort, along with water provided to existing communities and for future growth, raises capacity issues. Consequently, the RDEK should prepare a long-term infrastructure plan and funding strategy for the Lake Windermere East Side Water System (LWESWS).

Traffic Impact

The Ministry of Transportation and Traffic (MoTT) has concerns with the access and state of Rocky Mountain Road as it is unmaintained, not to Ministry standard and an agreement was made with the school district for parking. Brewer Ridge Holdings Ltd. has indicated road upgrades will be provided as required by MoTT to address road upgrades and potential cost sharing with other users.

While the traffic generated by this development does not merit a Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA), it should be noted vehicles from the 22 units will add to the safety issues related to accessing highway 93/95 at the Bench Road. We therefore recommend when Heritage Heights Development Inc. prepares their required TIA, traffic generated by the Brewer Ridge apartment building be included in their study.



The WCA appreciates the opportunity to provide input on this application and trust that our concerns will be duly considered by the RDEK.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, which appears to read 'Andrea Dunlop'. The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name 'Andrea' and last name 'Dunlop' clearly distinguishable.

Andrea Dunlop, President
Windermere Community Association

Cc: Susan Clovechok, Director, Area F
Anita Ely, Specialist, Environmental Health Officer, Interior Health
Remediation Branch, Ministry of Environment and Parks
Debbie Keely, Development Officer, MoTT
Taoya Schaefer, Board Chair, Lake Windermere Ambassadors
Heritage Heights Development Inc. c/o Haworth Development Consulting Ltd.
Manon Moreau, Executive Director, Shuswap Indian Band

Krista Gilbert

From: Gordon Travis [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2025 11:19 AM
To: Krista Gilbert
Subject: Fwd: 22 unit apartment block
Attachments: P 724 578 Brewer Ridge Holdings APC Package.pdf

RE Windermere P724578 as attached

As an owner of land on Gouvernement Street putting in an R1 home in the next year. My minor changes were rejected by the RDEK and I accepted the rejection

I object strongly to the rezoning in our community as proposed to higher density that no one wants.

There are RDEK lands where higher density works and R1 development which is now double to 2 residences is more than adequate.

There are no need for our community today or in the future to fund utility and services upgrades into the future. Is this guaranteed by RDEK representatives in writing.

Other development progress to the west of this staged into approval by RDEK going through process by a group that is controlled by owners who won't do it in their own back yards. ie it seems that full disclosure of plans to the public by developers who obviously have information is not a policy in the RDEK it seems Perhaps I am wrong. Although I did attend a meeting where this was evident. ie a lack of respect for the community.

Respectfully I object to this application
Gordon Travis
[REDACTED]

My Lots previously addressed as 4664 Gouvernement Street.

Krista Gilbert

From: John Frain - [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2025 12:44 PM
To: Krista Gilbert
Subject: Bylaws 3365 & 3366 Brewer Ridge Holdings Ltd - Windermere South

Attention: Krista Gilbert, Planning Technician, Regional District of East Kootenay

I am John Frain and have been a resident of Windermere for over 30 years. As a retired architect I have acquired a good knowledge of planning matters.

I would like to comment / question the proposed development as follows:

Windermere is a community of primarily single family residences 1 or 2 storeys in height that are well landscaped. The OCP states that "the proposed development should be compatible with the surrounding land uses, parcel sizes, local rural character and lifestyle". My concern is that the proposed 3 storey height of the development does not meet that criteria and is not compatible with the surrounding neighbourhood. The large building footprint together with the land area dedicated to parking detracts from the rural character. Perhaps a 2 storey, 14 unit apartment would be better suited to the site. Apart from fitting in better with its surroundings the reduced footprint and less parking would provide a better opportunity for additional and better landscaping opportunities.

In the information provided I cannot see any reference to what type of accommodation is being proposed; ie: bachelor suites, 1 or 2 bedrooms, etc. It would be helpful to understand what the mix of units is proposed and whether it will further the needs of the community.

I don't intend to speak at the public hearing but to plan to attend on line.

I respectfully submit the above comments for RDEK's consideration.

Sincerely,

John Frain

Krista Gilbert

From: Michael DuBois <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2025 1:42 PM
To: Krista Gilbert
Subject: Brewer Ridge Windermere Bylaw 3365/3366

I am opposed to this OCP and zoning change and encourage elected officials to reject the application. I live full time on Cardiff Avenue in Windermere and this development will very negatively impact my property value and quality of life. High density apartment buildings should be located in a municipality with a sewer system, sidewalks, garbage collection, storm water collection, etc. Apartment buildings should also be located close to commercial services that Windermere does not have.

Sewage Disposal

It is impossible and ridiculous to even consider on-site sewage disposal for 22 units on 0.93 acres. The building and parking lot will occupy almost all of the land. The quantity of sewage will be very high. Based on Canadian averages, the building will produce up to 33,000 L/day. Discharging this high volume to ground will have an immediate and very damaging impact on groundwater and Lake Windermere. My home operates on a well and is almost directly downhill from this site. Will the sewage from this project end up in my drinking water?

Density

The average density in Windermere is currently about 3 homes per acre. This development is almost 24/acre or 8 times the existing density - far too much.

Traffic and Pedestrian Safety

My children go to Windermere Elementary. The start and end of the school day has very high vehicle and pedestrian traffic in a small space for pickup/drop off. It is very chaotic and most of this occurs on Rocky Mountain Avenue. Adding 22 more families and the associated vehicles to this space will make it much worse and almost certainly - unsafe.

This application does not meet most OCP and land use policies. In fact in many ways the high density building is the exact opposite of what policy recommends. The RDEK policies were made for a reason. Please reject this application.

Mike DuBois
[REDACTED]

On Apr 28, 2025, at 11:26 AM, Krista Gilbert <kgilbert@rdek.bc.ca> wrote:

We are accepting written submissions until the end of day today, **4:30 on April 28**, so that people have had the opportunity over the weekend to review/consider the proposal and get submissions in to me.

Krista Gilbert

From: Christine DuBois <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2025 2:32 PM
To: Krista Gilbert
Subject: Re: Brewer Ridge Windermere

I'm sure someone else will voice my opinions but if not ill raise my hand. I have 2 children in this town who walk/bike to school. I do have major safety concerns about this location right next to the school and sharing an access to the school drop off zone. I encourage the RDEK to sit and watch the morning chaos currently.... I can't imagine it with 22 families added to that mix. Tenants and owners of these units will be frustrated with the morning drop off and afternoon pick ups and that will cause even greater worry for parents with agitated drivers.

Christine DuBois

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 28, 2025, at 11:58 AM, Krista Gilbert <kgilbert@rdek.bc.ca> wrote:

Hello Christine,

That is your call as long as you are registered to attend the Zoom meeting. The only difference is that at the meeting I will be making notes and will capture your comments to the best of my ability, but it may be more of a summary of what is said. If you have a lot of comments and want to ensure you're exact words are reviewed by the Board a written submission is best. You can do both as well if you want. Please note that written submissions are accepted until 4:30pm today, April 28.

Thank you,

Krista Gilbert
Planning Technician

From: Christine DuBois <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2025 9:50 AM
To: Krista Gilbert <kgilbert@rdek.bc.ca>
Subject: Re: Brewer Ridge Windermere

Hi Krista,
Would you like us to submit comments before the zoom meeting or voice them at the meeting? Please advise.
Thanks
Christine DuBois

On Apr 28, 2025, at 8:42 AM, Krista Gilbert <kgilbert@rdek.bc.ca> wrote:

Bylaw Amendments No. 3365 -3366 Windermere South

Brewer Ridge Holdings Multifamily Development Proposal for Windermere

As a permanent resident of Windermere, I have a number of concerns about these Bylaw amendments. The fall into two categories: 1) the Process by which development decisions are being made by the RDEK and 2) the Brewer Ridge Holdings Development as a project.

1) The Approval process.

- a) Decisions about the future of Windermere are being made without full and fair consultation with either the full time residents of Windermere or property owners in Windermere who may only be part-time residents.
- b) Decisions about development in Windermere are also being made without adequate consideration of the plans the ?Akis'qnuk First Nation has for the lands they own adjacent to Windermere.
- c) RDEK Directors and Administrators may not have ever come to see the development sites and are unlikely to have any substantive knowledge of Windermere and its history.
- d) RDEK Directors who represent the Town of Invermere are in a conflict of interest as regards developments adjacent to Invermere. They can easily be accused of offloading to surrounding communities the problems they have with housing availability and related infrastructure within the town.

2) The Brewer Ridge Holdings 22 Unit Multifamily Development

- a) The development prospectus does not provide any information that could enable anyone to assume that this project will provide affordable accommodation for local families. The history of Brewer Ridge Holdings as a provider of holiday accommodation, food services, dormitory accommodation in industrial work camps and other similar types of situations might, on the contrary, suggest the current development may be the thin edge of the wedge of bringing to Windermere multifamily, multistorey developments like one sees in places like Canmore, Alberta and now Radium, BC.
- b) The close proximity of this apartment complex to Windermere Elementary school raises issues about traffic and parking availability. Rocky Mountain Avenue is a very narrow lane that already becomes congested when there are events occurring at the school or even at regular school drop off and pick up times. That problem is not addressed in this development proposal.
- c) The size of this site obviously is not adequate for a septic installation large enough to address the needs of 22 families. The suggestion that somehow an agreement may be made with the developers of the nearby, but not contiguous, Heritage Heights Development is just a suggestion. It would be irresponsible for the RDEK to approve this development until there is concrete proposal for sewerage for any large scale development in Windermere.
- d) Development proponents and the RDEK staff claim that the Windermere Water System currently has the capacity to service 22 more residential units in Windermere. That is clearly belied by the fact that for several years residents of Windermere and all other communities on the east side of Lake Windermere that use that system have water restrictions for several months in the spring, summer and early autumn. This includes not being able to water ones garden **at all** on four day weekends across the summer. Vegetables die without water after less than a day in hot weather.

Thank you for your attention to my concerns,

Karen Taylor-Browne (PhD) 4722 Wood Lane West, Windermere.