**Comments\* from Sol Aqua Survey – October 12/2021**

**Question 1 - I support up to a maximum of 45 townhouses**

* I am still very concerned about the safety risk for everyone in Casa Loma for our one road in and out access. Also, very concerned about the traffic impact during building as construction begins in a steep terrain area. The developer is, however, building houses that tie into existing neighborhood. There is no way that 60 townhouses would be able to fit in.
* The community urges the developer and CWK to keep this development to the maximum of 44 townhomes with a covenant to ban any short term rentals. There will be too many short term rentals in Casa Loma with the WFN Shelter Bay development as it is.
* Seems reasonable
* Not too over populated considering there is only one road access to escape the area if emergency occur.
* I am concerned about egress/traffic issues with any development but this looks far more reasonable than earlier designs
* Traffic is a significant problem with only one access in and out.

**Question 1 - I support up to a maximum of 60 townhouses**

* This is a large piece of non-ALR land. As all City's develop and grow, it is important to provide land for developments.

**Question 1 - I oppose any townhouse development**

**Question 1 - Fire/Safety Related**

* I have lived in Casa Loma for 13 years and have seen 4 separate new development be approved by Council. These developments have already added over 75 houses to Casa Loma and another 75 have been given 3rd Reading approval. In conjunction with each separate proposal, Development Services has noted that the one road access to Casa Loma far exceeds the fire standards. Enough is enough! A complete moratorium on further building is needed. The City can no longer afford to the risk of safety of all in Casa Loma.
* The traffic is already too congested in the roundabout. Not to mention safety concerns in the event of an emergency.
* We are already maxed out with one road.
* We have surpassed the number of people living in this one ingress and exit road that are of a safe number. Adding to the already unsightly condo development on First Nations land this would make traffic and safe exit in emergencies impossible. We understand that we are already past the recommended population for the access in our community.
* Traffic is already an issue and with only one road in and one road out, it raises the issue of safety !!
* The Casa Loma area already does not have sufficient egress in case of a wild fire. Any more development without another egress would be a major safety hazard for the current residents of the area. My partner and I have already had to evacuate from a wildfire where there was only one egress. We have major concerns about more development in the area.
* We do not have more than one egress. If this area continues with the two new properties it will provide a potentially very dangerous situation. Especially during fire season.
* This is against the national fire protection rules and puts the balance of the community at one egress risk
* We are already dangerously over subscribed for traffic on our road.
* Traffic, Fire Safety, Environmental concerns
* There is only one way out and for safety reasons that many people trying to get out in an emergency would be dangerous.
* The road (only egress) into Casa Loma is already well over capacity
* There are too many homes already for safe evacuation from the area in the event of a wildfire.
* it is still a safety concern to have so much traffic leading to a two lane bridge going into Kelowna. What happens if there is a fire in the area?
* In the context of current approved Developments including Shelter Bay, this proposal is inappropriate: Environment, Fire Safety, Traffic egress & exit compromised
* This is a one way in/out road that already exceeds the number of homes that can safely live on a road with one in/out.
* We already have too many people living with a one exit development, and more are already on the way.
* With the development that’s already happening along Campbell Road over which no one seems to have any control, our area is already overdeveloped. Campbell Road can not handle any more traffic
* Need to first address firefighters concerns re: only one fire exit from the area.
* The problem of only one entrance/exit from our community has not changed. About 10 days ago while on Campbell road a fire broke out right in front of me closing Campbell Road (near the marina). The fire could have very easily crossed the road threatening all homes above. The fire was put out relatively quickly, but it emphasized the danger of only one exit. Any new homes make matters worse.
* My concern as voiced repeatedly is the one and only egress in and out of Casa Loma community via Campbell Road. It is well documented that the one egress goes against fire smart plan. No one seems to be listening.
* Traffic concerns, small road, land is too steep for development. Fire access concerns. Please keep our roads safe.
* With the WFN development there are now too many homes in this area with only one road in and one road out
* I am concerned about slope stability, increased traffic, and difficulty in egress for the rest of the Casa Loma community in the event of an emergency
* Campbell Road is only road for Casa Loma residents. One way in, one way out. In case of emergency / fire /, how evacuation can be handle safety with so many houses
* The site is steep and cannot support such a high number. In addition, there is the issue of fire safety as there is only one exit in case of a wildfire and we are already over the maximum density according to National Fire Safety rules.
* Density. Right next to large project on WIFN property. Traffic, one access road (Campbell Road). Fire and emergency services.
* the terrain is not suitable for any development, road is inadequate, fire and safety concerns
* It is already a wait to get onto the bridge in the morning & no one is living in the Shelter Bay project yet!!! ADDING 100's more people to an already congested situation - it CONCERNS me about my time coming in & out of Casa Loma - BUT most of all our SAFETY when it comes to EGRESS in case of fire but also getting Emergency Help in & out if my elderly parents need it!
* My concern is the increased density this development will cause, with the already traffic congestion on Campbell Road and the Bennett bridge entrance. We have lived here for over 60 years and have seen much residential development. Casa Loma is reaching its saturation point with the number of vehicles in regard to safety. We MUST consider the real possibility of FIRE and how will this affect safe evacuation for all residents.
* Given single access
* Does not comply with zoning and safety requirements for Casa Loma community.
* There is only one road out and if ever there was a fire or emergency, the traffic would be unable to exit.
* Need to solve access/egress issue
* This single access community should not be expanding- it is not safe already!
* Only one Road for so many people
* We have one road in and out. Kelowna and West Kelowna has a history of fires. Having only one road in and out requires further diligence on the part of Council. If you go ahead with further development, you MUST develop another road or refuse the development. Why does Council almost always fail to protect who have been in the area for years but instead allow themselves be seduced by developers. Additional tax dollars are not an excuse for negligence.
* Single roadway in/out can not support
* I have big concerns with access and egress.
* Does not comply with zoning and safety requirements for Casa Loma community.
* There is only one road out and if ever there was a fire or emergency, the traffic would be unable to exit.
* Need to solve access/egress issue
* This single access community should not be expanding- it is not safe already!
* The property is zoned for development, but I cannot support any development. Residents of Casa Loma need assurance from the City that there will be no further development below the Lakeview Escarpment. There is and will always be only one egress in and out of the community. The developer has demonstrated time and time again that he cannot be trusted! Their ridiculous schemes are an affront to common sense.

**Question 1 – Other Reasons for Opposing Development**

* There is already too much density in this area.
* I vehemently oppose this dev elopement. The wear and tear on our what currently is a quiet well cared for neighborhood will be disastrous. I imagine much of the ownership with be people who allow Air BnB people to pay big bucks to be here in the summer, these people care less about our community. They are here to party with their big boats, booze, more guests and toys. McKinley Landing "Granite" condominium building is a good example of what I’m talking about here, it is overrun with drunken party people all throughout the summer months. I've seen it all and experienced it. It’s really disgusting. I do not want to see that here in the Campbell Road area. I paid a lot of money for my property and lifestyle, and I do not want it to change for the greed of whomever this developer is.
* I feel less townhomes then 45 would be more sufficient due to the massive development going in next to it that we had absolutely have no input in.
* By its most recent long-term planning, the City of West Kelowna is committed to completing neighbourhood plans. Therefore, a neighbourhood plan should exist as a standard by which residents can evaluate and contrast what is being proposed compared to what the neighbourhood wants.
* Until they resolve the traffic issues on both HWY 97 and Campbell Road, I will not support any new development. The WFN proposals to build 3000 plus new units should ring alarm bells.
* This will only add to more traffic congestion on Campbell Rd, and on to and from Highway 97 at the bridge.
* This will create a traffic jam…only one access in and out of area…. a huge bottle neck getting onto bridge
* Over dense. Not an area developed (infrastructure wise, community amenities, etc.) for the current population let alone 40 more units. Beaches and parks in area already packed and residences having to take care of parks and beaches as city neglects to. Increase density on the grade of the hill when already eroding down below is asking for a disaster.
* This is ALR land
* too much development, complete destruction of the environment
* I am concerned about the construction as the way it was last summer was horrible and I was surprised that it was allowed to disrupt traffic flow for residents as much as it did.
* congestion of homes in the area
* Concerned about traffic especially getting onto Hwy 97 with development of Shelter Bay plus Blackmun.
* Traffic is already backed up at the round about every morning. Campbell Rd can not handle the traffic.
* Invasion of the neighborhood-already too busy with the bridge. Don’t be that disruptive
* The bridge traffic can hardly handle the population as is. Please do not make it worst and ruin the atmosphere of the neighborhood due to your greed.
* The current development is an eyesore and looks cheap. Adding a similar development up top is further taking away what people love about the neighborhood - quiet, private and feels like a hidden gem.
* Ridiculous and unnecessary.
* Blackmun Bay is a cheap looking addition to the neighborhood. The original proposal was so outlandish and to be whittled down to 180 units that are small, cheap looking, and a waste of gorgeous Landon a good indicator of what the next development would be like. A greedy proposal for Casa Loma.
* Road traffic would be clustered in that area
* Ridiculous to think more population can be supported in that area. This would be an irreversible assault to the environment on every possible level.
* Area is too congested
* too much congestion
* space allotted to allow for number of units is impossible to fit into area even if the size is decreased--also the section of road will be a nightmare with construction and following completion
* I live full time at Casa Loma Lakeside Resort & oppose any further townhouse development above or below Campbell Road. Traffic in & out on Campbell Road is already a major concern.
* I might support a number of units if I could compare it to the community plan for the Lakeview watershed.
* Do not have roads or other infrastructure and sewer smells are horrible already
* Will increase traffic on Campbell Road

**Question 2 - I oppose 45-60 boat slips**

* The city needs to come up with a plan on how to deal with similar situations or West Kelowna will be overbuilt with marinas.
* This project makes absolutely no sense. The user is not going to cross Campbell Road dragging their boat supplies up and down a steep hill to reach their boat. I hope both the City and the Developer recognize that this project does not make sense and drop this goofy idea.
* Too many things wrong with this to count: ALR access and zero parking allowable for non-ALR activities, crossing of busy Campbell Road to access slips, and traffic/egress issues for a non-core request (housing is one thing, not-needed marinas are another).
* We have two marinas already, the boat traffic doesn’t need to be added to. The noise off the water is already loud enough and makes peaceful enjoyment less so. We don’t need to add more
* A marina attached to the condo development project will create more traffic tie ups than we currently have, and there is a marina within sight of the newly proposed one. Why add another?
* There is already too much boat noise in the summer for locals.
* There is already too much boat traffic with the existing marinas that are in the area.
* The lake bottom churn this close to the shoreline and with a significant number of new boats this marina will be harmful to the shoreline and the fish habitat
* Parking and traffic issues again.
* Not every owner will want a boat slip - so not that many needed
* Due to already crowded boat slips on this area due to adjoining extensive development of slips and no way to launch boats apart from overused local launches
* Crossing Campbell Rd to access the boat slips sounds like poor planning and only adds to congestion on an already narrow road. The use of the ALR land to support boat slips does not sound like an agricultural use
* Environmental concerns, increased boat traffic
* It's the thin edge of the wedge
* I don’t support any of this development
* Same comment. Additional congestion is a huge risk to the existing residents.
* Once again this is an issue of lake traffic pressure. If built use the existing marina.
* I am not supportive of the marina extending into the lake. I will be writing to my member of parliament, City of West Kelowna, and other governing bodies voicing my opposition. There are many developments on lakefront that are a terrific real estate opportunities that do not have dedicated moorage. I am supportive of a common dock for residents to pick up guests and or swim off of; however, I don’t believe a dedicated boat slip is necessary. Looking at the recent development to the north as well as Shelter Bay marina the existing shoreline would tarnish the view and accessibility.
* Crossing Campbell Rd to get down to the slips makes no sense, and how are coolers, water skis, surf boards, etc. going to get down to the marina?
* There is already a marina…. access to slips could be a problem
* Not sufficient area to have this amount of slips. No parking means residence drive down and park on street blocking other areas. No one will walk down to docks if going boating as all items people need for a boat day would be a nightmare to carry down. Let alone adding children or older people to walk down. Campbell Road currently gets backed up without pedestrians trying to cross. People will get hit as no safe crossings
* No sanitary disposal, what about our drinking water, is this not a protected fish habitat area, who will monitor the excessive noise to our community?
* do not feel safe with added marina
* Water purity
* My understanding, boat slips are for the owners. How do they get to their slips, by car? On foot? This would require traffic controls for safety reasons & contribute to congestion. compromise Traffic flows will be compromised for pedestrian traffic
* I would support boat slips however as a current homeowner that has a boat and cannot get a slip in the Marina below because it is full, I do not think it is fair to allow a new development to get slips before current residents that have been in the community and want a slip. That is wrong. If there is a fair way that allows current residents an option for a slip, I would support it.
* any amount of boat slips here will require parking, and if no parking is constructed, will park on the road.
* I believe that there cannot be any connection between any homes above Campbell Road and the lake. This proposal is absolutely ridiculous. There is an access problem, a safety issue on the road, an ALR issue and the problem of more lakeshore development.
* Shelter Bay already has a marina that does not need ALR land to support it.
* There will already be slips for around 500 boats in this area
* There are already several hundred to the North - is there an environmental impact if 45-60 are added? We need to listen to the experts in this field.
* No boats should be allowed on ALR access. Keep farm land as farm land
* Too crowded
* This is to crowded for the area and disruptive to the neighbours.
* Too crowded and disruptive to the neighbors
* I feel that Okanagan Lake is the primary attractive feature Kelowna, West Kelowna and surrounding communities have to offer and it needs to be protected more than it currently is. We need to start limiting uses that can contaminate our drinking water supply and cause unnecessary noise pollution.
* There are too many boat slips on the lake now
* If the WFN land is already expanding its number of slips, plus all of the other surrounding marinas, Eldorado, West Harbour, etc. plus the high volume of boat launches in the central portion of the lake, it is already noisy, congested, and water quality will I feel be compromised
* Last thing we need on Okanagan Lake is one more marina - more noisy, speeding boats. Lake is our drinking water
* too much congestion
* No marina
* Has anyone noticed the lake level right now, boat traffic this last summer, no way can more boats be supported on this lake and there are too many already
* Dozens of new boat slips mean parking stalls and access roads for those slips, and I oppose the misuse of ALR.
* Water pollution
* I strongly oppose this as the boat traffic on the lake is already extremely excessive. Also, the access to the boat slips is through ALR lands and as such the restrictions on ALR land makes such access against the prescribed land use. Also, West Kelowna should not allow some of the last undisturbed waterfront be commercially exploited in this manner.
* I would need to see design and proximity to Casa Loma water intake - all marinas pose risk unless they are for non-motorized craft
* There is an large existing Marina next door which is in process of expansion. Too much Lake traffic, noise, etc.
* There is a HUGE amount of boat slips next door - we don't need more boat traffic in the area - adding to boat traffic safety & noise & lowering water QUALITY! Where are they going to park their boat trailers? Where are the guests, they invite to go out on their boats going to park their cars? PLUS Where are these 45-60 boats going to put their boats in the water - the Casa Loma Boat Launch is already taxed with traffic
* This will create significantly more congestion on already congested part of Lake Okanagan.
* The DOF are putting restrictions on number, size and location of individual property owners’ docks and retaining walls, why then do we need 45-60 more boat slips and boats on the Lake. The RCMP can’t handle patrolling the boats already on the lake during the summer season
* Campbell road is going to need its own long lane onto the bridge. There are already people trying to skip traffic by going through the exit and stuffing more people in this area will make it worse. We are turning our bridge into the Iron Workers Bridge.
* Will add to the current unacceptable vehicle congestion merging onto the Bennett Bridge.
* Does not comply with zoning and safety requirements for Casa Loma community.
* Once again, one road in and out, and more boats and trailers would impede traffic egress.
* The marina across the lake is built for this reason.
* See above PLUS, where will the trailers go? You are not thinking clearly.
* Single roadway in/out can not support
* I am not opposed to any development, 30 boat slips, but not such a large size.
* with no parking for boat trailers --traffic impact including the bridge--large number of slips close by--WHY WHY?
* Does not comply with zoning and safety requirements for Casa Loma community.
* Once again, one road in and out, and more boats and trailers would impede traffic egress.
* This single access community should not be expanding- it is not safe already!

**Question 2 - I support 45-60 boat slips**

* As a large waterfront property, a marina is reasonable (similar to Casa Loma Resort). Similarly, waterfront homes in Casa Loma can have docks for their boats, this should be supported.

**Question 3 - I support the use of covenants or bylaws**

* This developer has shown that they have no interest in ALR based on how they have ignored the existing orchard. If the developer is serious about converting land to a vineyard and putting in a small tasting room, I would be supportive of this direction.
* ALR lands need to be protected by covenants or bylaws.
* ALR MUST be protected at all costs. It is core to the Okanagan's tourism, real estate and agriculture industries. It must be observed and protected.
* Absolutely. It’s sad to see land that was zoned AGL for a reason, trying to be Rezoned for profit.
* One of the primary reasons for moving to Casa Loma many years ago was the semi rural area that we have enjoyed for many years. Developers are ruining our area and a large part of our beautiful city with unsightly and over sized projects.
* We need to support and respect the ALR
* Additional congestion is a risk to the community.
* This agricultural land must be protected.
* Agricultural land should be protected
* We need food, not marinas & wineries
* ALR Lands were created to protect our 'bread baskets' not a gateway for boat owners to get to their boats.
* The orchard and agricultural land are part of the charm of Casa Loma and the Okanagan valley as a whole.
* The ag land should already be protected and not amended.
* Perfectly good farm land. Leave it that way.
* If we absorb and develop more agricultural land then we are removing food producing land. Our population isn’t getting any smaller so we will need all the agricultural land for production. This land has only ever been used for agriculture so keep it that way. From a sentimental point of view it would honour Jim Blackmun who developed this land many years ago.
* ALR lands are ALR ... not subject to the greedy reaches of questionable developers.
* These add to the beauty of the area without increasing the fire hazard.
* I oppose strictly because you guys aren’t interested in protecting the land-you are only interested in ensuring no new development can be made. I would approve if the covenant was actually for protection or ALR land.
* What’s the point when you are wanting to pave and add a parking lot/access through ALR land
* Allowing any development above Campbell Rd, which, if limited should be alright, along with access for boats, trailers over the ALR lands below Campbell Rd seems likely to be opening the opportunity for future additional development of those ALR lands.
* It would be nice to have some shoreline along the lake that isn't all 100% developed. What was the valley even like 20 years ago is almost all gone
* Everything possible needs to be applied to protect these lands feeding into our water supply, alias Okanagan Lake
* I believe there are too many boats in our area. Blackmun Bay is very shallow and, in my opinion, will create turbidity for our water intake which isn’t far enough away.
* The developers bought this property with the ALR restrictions in place. They should not be allowed to brush those aside in their search for profits at the expense of our precious ALR lands.
* No development. Make bylaws, covenants restrict all development on this property
* We are blessed to live in a beautifully agricultural area - it is what makes Kelowna the wonderful place that it is to live!!! Already TOO MANY pieces of agricultural land have been removed to make way for developments!!! We must have more RESPECT for these special pockets of beautiful green bountiful land by continuing to PROTECT & treasure them!
* Zoning should not change.
* The entire area has potential land slide
* I absolutely support the protection of agricultural lands as it contributes to being able to provide locally sourced food.
* For 46 years I purchased fruit from this orchard and even now despite the owner saying non-viable, it produced
* zoning should not change.
* Consider it community green space

**Question 3 - I oppose the use of covenant or bylaws**

* ALR rules are in place. Follow them
* Agricultural land in BC is protected by the ALC Act. Covenants do not have any more power than the existing ALR rights.
* If agricultural land was important, you would not be proposing the current development of the marina. This covenant is to protect your development only and isn’t in the best interest of ALR land
* I oppose because the covenant is not used to protect ALR land. It’s to protect your development only and to prevent anyone else from disrupting your development. What a joke.
* It doesn’t take a rocket scientist to see that this covenant is not for the protection of ALR land, and is strictly for the benefit of the developer to ensure no future buyer could develop anything that would negativity effect your development. Like stated above - greedy and selfish.
* Please, protect the agricultural lands, for now and for the future. We all should care about it.
* We already have covenants and by-laws to protect the agricultural lands; they are called ARL lands and development on them is prohibited.
* Purely worded. Land is in ALR.
* Each development should be able to stand on its own merits.

**\*Comments have been edited to correct obvious spelling errors and to protect the identity of one person who could be identified by their comments**