

Ryan Penney

From: Helen Eldstrom [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, April 25, 2026 4:06 PM
To: Ryan Penney
Subject: Short-Term Rental Temporary Use Permit

We are writing to respond to the short term rental temporary use permit application for lot 14 - 1421 Wilmai Rd. In Windermere. This application because of the cul de sac we are on is 15 metres away from our property. If approved we would then be directly across from two STR's each with a 10 person permit! This would mean we would have 12 additional vehicles at the end of our very small street...all scrambling for a place to park. The application said it would have six off street parking but that would only work if the cars were parked in line meaning the front would be unable to get out so we know that this will not work and parking would on the street! Because the property is on the end of the undersized cul de sac off street parking is very limited and would create a safety hazard in the case of an emergency. The street has a total of 6 dwellings if approved this will make it 1/3rd of the total making the street unacceptably congested. Were the property be used for Long Term Rental it would provide a greatly and desperately needed accommodation that Windermere lacks.

Sincerely Patrick James Eldstrom and Helen Eldstrom
4728 Wilmai Road
[REDACTED]
Sent from my iPad

5532 Darymple Hill NW
 Calgary, AB
 T3A 1Y3
 16 April, 2026

RDEK
 19 - 24 Ave South
 Cranbrook, BC
 V1C 3H8

RECEIVED

APR 24 2026

Gentlemen:

Regional District of
 East Kootenay

STR Temporary Use Permit
 STR Application No. 31-26; 4721 Wilma Rd, Windermere

I am the registered owner of property located at 4727 Wilma Road in Windermere (4727) and I am writing to **Oppose** The subject application STR 31-26 at 4721 Wilma Rd for the following reasons:

1) **STR DENSITY:** The RDEK has yet to develop a policy on STR Density especially as it pertains to Area F. Referring to the attached letter from the Columbia Valley Pioneer 8 April/26 it appears that the matter of establishing STR Density Policy & guidelines is still a matter being considered but no policy exists currently to establish the STR Density Metrics nor does it appear that such a policy will be forthcoming anytime soon.

This matter is of particular concern to me since if approved, my house at 4727 Wilma Rd will be placed in the awkward position of being *sandwiched* immediately between 2 - STR dwellings!

Currently there is an STR unit (see 4735 Wilma Rd.) on the property immediately north of my 4727 property With the approval of this application STR-31-26 (4721 Wilma Rd) there will be an STR unit immediately south of my 4727 property!

The result will be that my house is to be sandwiched between 2-STR or Air BnB properties!

Can any proposed STR Density regulations anticipate 2 out of 3 connected lots being approved for STR development? For my property to be sandwiched between 2-possible Air BnB properties is not a prospect that I am willing to consider nor accept!! *I would kindly ask the Directors to contemplate how they might react if their property was sandwiched between 2-STR's?* (Imagine how this eventuality will affect property values...?)

Because I find the prospect of 2-STR's sandwiching in my residence to be unacceptable and unreasonable, I oppose this application

2). **PARKING:** While the STR proponent states that there is on-site parking for 6-cars, he may be *Theoretically* correct, however a closer examination will reveal that in order to accommodate 6-vehicles it will be necessary to "stack" the vehicles in the space provided which means that cars will often have to be shunted onto the road (WILMAI RD) in order to provide egress and access.

This will certainly result in people more conveniently wishing to park or leave cars on the road (the road being a quiet cul de sac) which will impair traffic from turning around at the end of the cul de sac and this will result in objectionable consequences. Also with the other STR at 4735 Wilmai Rd just 2-doors away from STR 31-26, imagine the likelihood of an unacceptable number of cars on the road (WILMAI RD) during times when both STR's are occupied!

I am not willing to accept the possibilities that large numbers of cars will be parked on the street and on either side of my property when both the STR's are occupied, and I oppose this application

3). **ENFORCEMENT:** While I understand that some form of "Hot Line" will be established to field complaints or deal with issues that may occur with STR occupants, I question how effective it might be. For example if a rowdy party is going on at one of the STR's in the early morning hours and a person was to call the "Hot Line" in the early morning, would that call end up in Cranbrook? AND would the person answering the call be available to deal with a situation?...OR would the call be directed to an answering machine? in which case the problem would be impossible to deal with. This entire matter of ENFORCEMENT appears to be unsatisfactory without a more stringent protocol for dealing with Issues as they arise. It would appear that without a proper enforcement officer and/or team, the STR regulations are without any practical means of enforcement.

Because I am not confident that the STR-regulations are meaningful and enforceable in a satisfactory way, I oppose this application.

I do not oppose the overall implementation of STR's PROVIDED that the jurisdictional body has a clear cut set of regulations and a well developed Policy governing the implementation of STR's. I find both the Policy and the Regulations severely lacking in substance and vision as far as the RDEK Area F framework is concerned.

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

As a minimum consideration, the RDEK Directors should place a pause on STR developments until an STR Density Policy is approved by the Directors, *especially* in areas where other STR's have been approved, The Directors should at least review prospective applications in light of possible Density issues that may occur AND their impact on existing (tax-paying) properties.

Yours, truly

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M. Langfeldt', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Michael K. Langfeldt



STR density still not addressed

CIVIL PIONEER 8 APRIL 2026

The growing number of short-term rentals (STRs) and their concentration (density) in residential neighbourhoods is a concern in Windermere, Fairmont and elsewhere.

In November 2025, the Windermere and Fairmont Community Associations raised this issue with the RDEK and outlined practical tools to manage it, including limits per street, neighbourhood caps, and separation distances between STRs. The province has recognized concerns related to STR density and has made it clear that local governments have the authority to use density management tools to address these issues. Despite this, the RDEK has deferred work on developing a clear methodology to manage STR density until at least August 2026, with progress likely extending into late 2026 or 2027. In the meantime, STR applications continue to be approved.

The board is now responsible for these decisions in Area F, yet there are no defined metrics

or thresholds to determine when density is too high. Without this, it is unclear how cumulative impacts are being assessed or when STR applications should be refused. The RDEK has indicated that mapping of STRs will be provided for individual applications. While this may offer some context, it is based on an undefined area and may not reflect the actual level of density in the surrounding neighbourhood.

Without defined metrics or thresholds, continuing to approve new STR applications is concerning. The RDEK should pause all new STR applications in Area F until clear density metrics and a consistent decision-making framework are in place. STR density must not undermine neighbourhood livability or reduce housing availability for year-round residents.

This is an issue that needs to be addressed now, not after another peak tourist season.

Colleen Roberts, Windermere