

March 14, 2011

Mayor and Council
District of Peachland
Planning & Development Services
5806 Beach Avenue
Peachland, BC V0H 1X7

Attn: Mayor Fielding

Re: New Monaco Enterprise Corporation – March 2nd Public Information Meeting Summary

Dear Mayor Fielding and Members of Council:

Please find enclosed our Planning Team's Report on the first of two Public Information Meetings on New Monaco's Area Structure Plan to which District Council gave 1st and 2nd Reading on February 8th, 2011.

The meeting was organized in accord with District Council's instructions as outlined in the following resolution:

"THAT prior to scheduling a Public Hearing, the Area Structure Plan be presented at two community consultation sessions, to be held at least one month apart; and FURTHER THAT prior to the community consultation sessions, the Area Structure Plan be elaborated to show: Building height and form including illustrations; Highway access intentions; Water availability; and; Compatibility with the Official Community Plan and Regional Growth Strategy goals."

The information displays and presentations are appended in full to this report together with a table that shows how the Public Information Meeting, to the extent feasible at the pre-zoning stage, addressed Council's request for further details itemized in your summary "Information Requested by Council for Public Consultation and New Monaco ASP Review". Issues addressed included water availability, highway and western access, and compatibility with the OCP and Regional Growth Strategy.

In the spirit of Council's encouragement and our own Planning Team's best practices, the community was invited at this meeting to engage directly in the planning process to determine the building form and character that will be most acceptable to Peachlander's in the proposed development. A visual preference survey was developed to gather residents' feedback on architectural form, character, public spaces, streetscapes, village core, heights and views. Residents were invited to review options and to rate their preferences. The findings are presented in the meeting report and will be used to derive specific examples and illustrations within the New Monaco development at the next PIM scheduled for April 5th.

In summary, approximately 90 people attended the March 2nd Public Information Meeting with most appearing open and interested in the information presented. Comments sheets were made available for residents to fill in at the meeting. 28 comments sheets were completed and received by the end of the evening and an additional two surveys were collected from the District office. All comments are tabulated and appended to the report.

From the comments sheets collected, a strong majority expressed their overall support for the project. The majority of respondents supported the development's community-oriented focus on attracting quality jobs and retaining young families in the community. Providing health services, seniors and affordable housing and growing the community's property tax base were also identified as desired objectives from New Monaco. Greenspace, trails, and parks were seen as important amenities to the community and an important asset for future development.

In conclusion, we are confident at this point that the community is becoming progressively engaged in the planning process and that this engagement will reach a significant new level at the next PIM in April, when we share the architectural form and character options derived from this initial discussion.

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in this process.

Sincerely,

Mark Holland, MCIP, LEED
Principal, HB LANARC CONSULTANTS LTD.

New Monaco Enterprise Corporation Area Structure Plan Application March 2nd, 2011 Public Information Meeting Summary Report

A Public Information Meeting related to the proposed New Monaco development was held on Wednesday March 2nd, 2011 at the Peachland Recreation Centre, Multipurpose Room to summarize the Area Structure Plan application that was submitted to the District of Peachland in December 2010. This 2nd Public Information meeting was hosted by New Monaco Enterprise Corporation and the New Monaco consulting team, and was facilitated by Mark Holland, HB Lanarc Consultants.

Approximately 80-90 people attended the March 2nd Public information meeting. Of those, 60 signed a registration form, and 30 filled in a comment cards.

Resource people in attendance at this Public Information meeting included:

- Mark Holland, HB Lanarc Planning Consultants
- Greg Germain, New Monaco Enterprise Corp.
- Chris Curtola, New Monaco Enterprise Corp.
- Gordon Easton, Colliers International
- Mary Lapointe, New Monaco Enterprise Corp.
- Andrew Pottinger, New Monaco Enterprise Corp.
- Odete Pinho, HB Lanarc Planning Consultants
- Bud Fraser, HB Lanarc Planning Consultants

Notification and Attendance

To ensure the public information meeting was well advertised, the proponent followed the District of Peachland's "Public Information Meeting Requirements" Guideline. This included the following notifications:

- Newspaper – Peachland View – a quarter page ads appearing in the Peachland View on Friday February 25th, 2011. (Appendix E)
- Posters at the recreation center, library, post office, bulletin board at IGA posted two weeks in advance. (Appendix E)
- Notice of the meeting was mailed on February 16th to all property owners and tenants within 100 metres of the subject properties. Hand delivery to 10 properties that had mailing addresses which were different from street addresses was completed on February 17th to ensure that neighboring renters were also adequately notified.

Public Information Meeting Format

The meeting was an open house format held at the Peachland Recreation Centre from 2-6 pm. In summary, the public information meeting agenda consisted of:

- A display gallery with 22 poster boards summarizing New Monaco's Area Structure application; (Appendix C)
- A 'visual preference' survey area with 6 poster boards presenting options for New Monaco's architectural form, character, public spaces, streetscapes, village core, and height for residents to provide feedback on desired directions; (Appendix C)
- Throughout the open house, consulting team members were stationed at the display boards to discuss the proposed concepts one-on-one with the community and to answer residents' questions.
- Two 25-minute summary presentations were made to overview the early development concepts; (Appendix D)

- The poster boards and the presentations were specifically designed to address the key topics and issues requested by the District's Mayor and Council. (See Appendix A)

Twenty-two display boards summarized the New Monaco application in the following theme areas: 1) Location, Context and History; 2) Overall Vision, Concept Plan for Land use and Parks; 3) Transportation Access; 4) Infrastructure and Servicing with specific attention to Water supply, capacity and conservation strategies; 5) the Regional Growth Strategy context and overall development review process.

In addition, 6 poster boards presented an "architectural" visual preference survey to gather residents' feedback on architectural form, character, public spaces, streetscapes, village core, heights and views. The feedback received has been summarized in a visual format that presents the images that were most preferred by the community together with the general comments received with the images. The complete survey results are in Appendix B.



Photo 1: Display gallery with 26 poster boards summarizing the New Monaco Area Structure Plan submission. In the 'architectural' preferences section, 6 poster boards showed visual options and involved residents in gathering input on development form, character, public spaces, streetscapes, views and height.

Summary of Concerns and Support

Comments Sheets were made available for residents to fill in at the meeting. 28 comments sheets were completed and received by the end of the evening and an additional two surveys will be collected from the District office. The comments sheets are summarized below and the originals are attached in Appendix F of this report.

In summary, approximately 90 people attended the Public Information Meeting. Most appeared open and interested in the information presented. Of the 30 comments sheets collected, the majority expressed their overall support for the project.

When asked “do you support or oppose the following features of the plan?” the majority of respondents were supportive. The results are summarized in this table:

	Support	Oppose	Don't Know
1. Vision: A socially, environmentally and economically sustainable integrated village where residents live, work, shop, learn and play all within walking distance, and among nature trails, artist lanes and areas of organic urban agriculture.	23		1
2. Focus: medical technology and wellness services to provide core employment and tourism base for the community	31		2
3. Housing diversity: a wide range of types and sizes to suit residents of all ages and incomes, and different levels of senior living	20		1
4. Retail and recreation services on site: residents can work, shop, play within walking distance, minimizing vehicular use	21		2
5. Maximize efficiency in the conservation of water and in the use of renewable energy	21		1

The majority of respondents supported the development's community-oriented focus on attracting quality jobs and retaining young families in the community. Providing health services, seniors and affordable housing and growing the community's property tax base were also identified as desired objectives from New Monaco. Greenspace, trails, and parks were seen as important amenities to the community and an important asset for future development.

Appendix B summarizes comments and architectural preferences received by residents at the Public Information Meeting. These directions will inform the design options presented to the community at the 3rd Public Information Meeting, scheduled for Tuesday April 5th, 2011. The complete set of original comments sheets will be provided to the District upon request.

Appendixes

- A) District Council Request Information From New Monaco – Summary of the delivery of PIM poster boards and presentation contents
- B) Summary of Architectural Preferences and Comments Sheets
- C) March 2nd PIM Display boards - New Monaco's ASP Summary and Architecture boards
- D) Power point slide presentation
- E) Public Information Meeting notices and newspaper ad
- F) Registration List

Appendix A

District of Peachland Council Requested Information from New Monaco

The following chart summarizes the approach that New Monaco has taken to address the information requested by the District of Peachland Council:

- in the February 8th, 2011 Council resolution (1st and 2nd reading of the ASP);
- from meeting with Mayor Fielding on February 24th; and
- from meetings with Councilors throughout the month of February.

The ‘topics/ issues’ that the District’s Mayor and Council requested be addressed by New Monaco are summarized with the ‘response’ that was presented at the March 2nd Public Information meeting, and that will be further advanced at the PIM on April 5th, 2011.

Topics/ Issues	Response – PIM Display Presentation
Water	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Availability – provide a definitive statement assuring sufficient water (recognizing this is information to be provided from the District’s engineers). • Water conservation – 25% reduction through metering • Climate change reduced supply • Pine Beetle deforestation 	<p>The District of Peachland’s engineers (Urban Systems) have confirmed there is adequate water supply to supply a population of 19,000 with the planned water conservation initiatives the District is implementing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to March 2nd poster board 16. <p>New Monaco’s target for water consumption is 50% per capita of the 2010 (post-water meter implementation) rates of consumption in Peachland.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to March 2nd poster boards 17 to 18.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No engineering projects required other than those already anticipated and included in current financial plan. 	<p>The lands on which New Monaco is located were not included in the Water Master Plan calculations for the District’s capital planning. It was always understood that New Monaco would cover the infrastructure costs it created for supply and management of water.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to March 2nd poster board 15. • New Monaco will cover costs of infrastructure and servicing
Access	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diagrams of the proposed access on Hwy 97. 	<p>There are 3 options for access off Highway 97 in the Transportation Study: The protected T; the at-grade streetlight; and the Hybrid underpass. All 3 are under discussion with MOTI and the District at this time. New Monaco will build any of them in whatever phases are required in the agreement with the District and MOTI. As such, getting access within the standards of safety and convenience required is assured. The specific design and phasing is under negotiation at the time of the first meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to March 2nd presentation notes and poster boards 20 to 21.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other intersections studied as agreed in the Terms of Reference with MOTI and DoP 	<p>The Transportation Study looked at some of the other intersections on the highway near New Monaco. The results of the study are under discussion with the District and MOTI.</p> <p>The intersections of most concern are already considered to be “failing” badly and as such, New Monaco does not cause any of them to fail.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Western edge – provide a map of proposed connections and implications to land ownership, etc... 	<p>The transportation negotiations have indicated a secondary access between New Monaco and the existing streets in Peachland adjacent to the site. There are several options for these connections – and the design and location have not been decided, however it is assured that a road connection is feasible and will be confirmed at zoning stage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please refer to March 2nd poster board 20,
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implications to Trepanier Bench road 	<p>Because of the very low density proposed in the western section of New Monaco and the extremely indirect route from here to downtown Peachland (due to terrain), traffic engineers conclude that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5 years after the start of the development, there would be an increase of only 2 cars/hour on Trepanier Bench Road. At full build out, 15 years from the start of the development, there would be an increase of 14 cars / hour.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Connections to trail system adjacent Cousins road area. 	<p>The trail system adjacent Cousins Road would be tied into the access road to New Monaco if that Cousins connection is the one selected by all parties. If the McNeil Court connection is selected, then New Monaco will provide an easy trail connection to the edge of its property, but it cannot provide a trail connection across the lands between New Monaco and Cousins Rd because there are a number of private land holdings between them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please refer to March 2nd poster board 20 showing the potential connection alignments.
<p>Height, Density + Built Form</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Densities on “buildable” acreage #s – and for each of the neighbourhoods. Acreages devoted to greenspace, unbuildable area, and roads. 	<p>New Monaco will have a gross unit density of between 20-23 units/acre. The precise “buildable acreage” varies depending on the neighbourhood and site planning work which will be undertaken with the community to further define density, height and open space for the site</p> <p>For greenspace and road concepts, Please refer to March 2nd poster boards 9, 10 and 12.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Buildings higher than 6 storeys: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number Locations Heights Look Illustrations from highways Buildings lower than 6 storeys. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Look for the 3 zones. All areas show how buildings are compatible with natural terrain. 	<p>The building heights for New Monaco have not been determined at this point, but will shortly (at zoning stage) and will be developed in consultation with the community. The concepts of density, height, massing and open space are to be explored with the community to give them the most say in how the site is planned through a 2 step process.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The first step is to have the community look at many types of buildings and to identify which ones they like – to give the New Monaco team a sense of what the community feels is appropriate. As well, we have asked that the community comment on our 4 principles of working with height on the site. Please refer to March 2nd poster boards 23-28. The second step will be undertaken at the next PIM (April 5th) where options for how buildings of various heights, form and

	<p>character suggested by the community at the last PIM could be massed on the site will be shown through digital 3-D concept plans. The community’s comments on those will then help lead to a preferred massing / height scenario for New Monaco for Council to consider.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to March 2nd poster boards 23-28.
<p>Compatibility with the OCP and RGS</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How is NM not a complete new town isolated from the other areas of Peachland. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to March 2nd poster board 11. <p>New Monaco aims to offer a range of land uses to be “complete” however it will not be self sufficient. The location of New Monaco separates it from the Downtown, which is also separated from the other future new neighbourhoods of Ponderosa and Princeton. As such, the topography of Peachland creates neighbourhoods that have geographical separations. It is desirable to have every neighbourhood with sufficient mixed uses to support basic daily needs to reduce the need to travel for everything. The alternative is to create traffic and emission problems.</p> <p>New Monaco will endeavour to meet the basic shopping and recreation needs of its residents as well as some employment as well as other choices of shopping and services not available currently in Peachland in order to reduce the continuing economic leakage currently experienced and to provide more convenience to Peachland residents so that they don’t have to drive extra distance to shop and obtain services. New Monaco’s projected population of approximately 5,000 residents at build out will create a significant demand amongst residents for leisure activities, recreation and shopping at Peachland’s downtown. During early to mid construction stage (roughly 8 years), there will be little retail or general services available at New Monaco.</p> <p>In order to respond to the transportation demand to connect the two neighbourhoods, New Monaco proposes a shuttle service program to the downtown. This type of service has proven to work well in the circulation of people and can be operated for a reasonable cost.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How to address consistency with goals in OCP that focuses on supporting the downtown, infill and preserving rural boundaries. 	<p>The development of New Monaco will bring significant additional demand for shops and services that will enhance the development of the downtown economy and the fulfillment of the Charrette Vision for the Downtown.</p> <p>New Monaco will be retaining much of the natural space in its plan (approx 25% in open and park space) and will be celebrating in design and in the landscape the historical natural ecosystems and agricultural history of the site.</p> <p>The process outlined by Council in 2008 for developing the Area Structure Plan within the OCP is being followed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to March 2nd poster boards 1 to 11.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RGS suggests that growth should be focused on existing serviced town centers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to March 2nd poster board 11. <p>The regional growth strategy is a decade old and is under review at this time. The specific policies and suggested locations for development are yet to be determined in the new RGS.</p> <p>The focus of the RGS on avoiding sprawl is laudable and New Monaco meets the criteria for avoiding sprawl.(single use, low density, car-oriented, etc...) withmixed use, higher density, pedestrian and transit oriented, protective of sensitive landscapes, etc.</p>
<p>Economic impacts</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the economic benefits to Peachland? Downtown, etc...? 	<p>There are many economic benefits to Peachland from the New Monaco project, including jobs, taxes and retail expenditures – both during construction (over approx 20 years) and after completion.</p> <p>As noted earlier, the retail demand created by New Monaco far exceeds what it will provide which will be a real benefit to the downtown of Peachland’s business district.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to March 2nd poster boards 9 and 10. •
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How are we focusing on families? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to March 2nd poster boards 5 to 14. • Families are an important and central part of New Monaco. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ jobs as our primary agenda for the eastern village; ○ rich parks and trails program; ○ arts facility that will have a focus on children and the arts; ○ a facility dedicated to families which will include a day care, extra curricular activity programming, tutorial learning for children, lifelong learning for adults and seniors. ○ diversity of housing, including 10% affordable housing, to support a range of family sizes and incomes.

Architectural Style: What We Heard...

Public Information Meeting: March 2, 2011

Form and Character

Comments

- Create a unique and artsy character
- Reference first nations and pioneers - For example: using materials/colours from the surrounding environments
- Form should not be square, blocky, bulky, or too boxy
- Buildings should follow the contours of the land
- Create varying angles, heights, and placement
- Blend buildings with the landscape
- Accent natural features rather than contrasting the natural surroundings
- Allow height to keep more open space
- Limit height to follow landscape features
- Include smaller units and common spaces of higher quality
- Style:
 - Traditional
 - Craftsman style
 - Clean / modern
 - Not too "ski resort"
- Colours + Materials:
 - Local earth tones
 - Local materials - wood / stone
 - Variety of Textures
- Desires:
 - Underground parking
 - Large decks
 - Horizontal plantings on decks
 - Walkways and trails through and around buildings

Most Popular Images



Public Spaces

Comments

- Natural / Native vegetation:
 - Historic fruit trees and grape vines
 - Xeriscaping
 - Greenery on buildings
 - Include lots of trees
 - Orchards
 - Gardens
- Multi-modal public areas - Pedestrians + Bicycles + Vehicles
 - Wide sidewalks
 - Trails
 - Allow room for sidewalk cafes
 - Include bike storage
- Consider public spaces for all ages
 - Create play spaces for children
 - Integrate playgrounds, community gardens, rest areas, benches and public seating
- Materials + Colours
 - Coloured concrete
 - Utilize natural colours
 - Greenery on buildings
- Public spaces should not be too formalized
- Include places for dogs
- Build attractive retaining walls
- Design for winter use
- Ensure a variety of places with different atmospheres (quiet and calm vs. loud and exciting)

Most Popular Images



Village Core

Comments

- Create a unique 'Okanagan' village core
 - Mix of uses
 - Public art
 - Sidewalk cafes
 - Shops with awnings
 - Meeting places
 - Rest areas
 - Bike lanes
 - Colourful
- Pedestrian focus - lots of walkways with no traffic
- Public Markets are key
- Not be too urban
- Include lots of trees and vegetation for shade
- The village should be modern, using wood and other local materials
- Emphasis on alternative transportation modes
- Not a concrete city
- Incorporate the history of the Peachland into the village core

Most Popular Images



Views and Height

Comments

- General Height Opinions:
 - Maximum 6 storeys
 - Only a few buildings at 6 stories if necessary
 - The area is prone to high winds so building height should be kept low
 - Allow varied heights but not a concrete jungle
 - 8 to 10 storeys is ok
 - A must to include high rise (over 6 stories)
 - Allow some height to keep more open space
 - Buildings should gradually step down the hillside
- General View Opinions
 - Restrict heights for optimum views
 - Higher buildings at the back, lower buildings in the front
 - Higher buildings should be near the highway but should not affect views from the highway
 - Do not allow high buildings close to Hwy 97
 - Every house deserves a view
 - Stagger views
 - Don't block commuter views
 - The development should look good from boats on the lake
- Other Comments
 - The buildings apparent height will vary if the buildings follow contours of existing land form
 - Ensure the buildings feel humanly scaled
 - Reduce shadow / shading between buildings
 - Allow sun and air movement between buildings
 - Include green space between buildings
 - Avoid a straight line of development
 - Exciting structure design does not need to be high rise
 - Ensure height does not create an imposing feeling
 - Integrate the topography into the design
 - Design buildings for the winter months
 - Buildings should blend with the natural landscape

Summary of PIM Feedback for March 2, 2011

Number of Attendees (signed in):60

Number of Comment Cards Received to Date: 30

A. Please rate, in order of importance to Peachland (Low, Medium, High):

	Low	Medium	High
1. Create quality jobs to attract and retain young families	2	7	16
2. Increase commercial tax base	1	11	12
3. Increase tourism	7	8	7
4. Better access to medical services	1	8	13
5. More seniors programs and amenities	3	10	11
6. More family amenities, extra-curricular education and entertainment choices	1	10	11
7. More shopping and services for Peachland that complement the downtown	5	9	8
8. Reduce per capita water consumption	1	7	15
9. Meeting or exceeding Peachland's sustainability goals and emission reduction targets	2	5	15
10. Managing regional growth in a manner that reduces sprawl	2	4	16

B. Please tell us how effective or ineffective you think this concept plan is at meeting the following priorities/development goals and objectives?

	Very ineffective	Somewhat ineffective	Neither effective nor ineffective	Somewhat effective	Very effective
11. Create new and different employment opportunities for the community		1	1	3	15
12. Attract new and different visitors and add value to the visitor experience		1	5	8	7
13. Enhance health services, amenities and quality of living			1	8	11
14. Diversify and grow the community's property tax base			1	8	10
15. Respect and celebrate the natural environment and the history of the land through our Parks & Trails program			3	4	14
16. Provide new artistic and cultural opportunities and experiences			4	8	8
17. Manage growth responsibly		2	2	8	7

C. Do you support or oppose the following features of the plan?

	Support	Oppose	Don't Know
1. Vision: A socially, environmentally and economically sustainable integrated village where residents live, work, shop, learn and play all within walking distance, and among nature trails, artist lanes and areas of organic urban agriculture.	23		1
2. Focus: medical technology and wellness services to provide core employment and tourism base for the community	21		2
3. Housing diversity: a wide range of types and sizes to suit residents of all ages and incomes, and different levels of senior living	20		1
4. Retail and recreation services on site: residents can work, shop, play within walking distance, minimizing vehicular use	21		2
5. Maximize efficiency in the conservation of water and in the use of renewable energy	21		1

D. Your Comments on Architectural Form and Character Options

Answers to this section being evaluated by architects/planners.

E. Do you think the New Monaco Planning Team is listening to and open to the community? Please provide suggestions as to how we can do better.

Yes: 19
 Maybe: 3
 No: 0

Comments:

- Seems like it so far. The key will be in the details and how long they continue to follow what the community desires as the building begins and continues.
- Yes. Vision and objectives are fine – detail is too thin.
- They appear to be. Write and submit regular articles to the Peachland View – lots of uninformed people here.
- Yes I believe the planning team has been very open and forthwith with all of their designs and ideas for our community. Their attention to detail and focus on environmental issues are great to see!
- Yes. Excellent input process.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes – this is my first meeting.
- Yes.
- Yes. I think so.
- No opinion at this time.
- NM has obviously hired people who know all the right things to say. Time will tell whether this apparent altruism will be able to be a reality when it comes time to make profits.
- Yes. They have covered everything that Peachland needs. Art, markets, medical care for seniors.
- Have to wait and see – you are asking for input but will you use it?
- Yes, I feel they are doing their best to respond to the needs and wishes of the community.

- Yes – perception of building a better Peachland for Peachland
- Yes.
- Yes, seem to have quite high profile and sincere in listening to residents.
- Peachland residents are very impressed by how much effort your group is putting into creating a favorable impression. Well done.
- Good job – enjoy communiqués.
- Yes
- As good as they can be and still carry the project forward. Research in to the most outstanding architectural blending projects that are possible – poll the community for direction once you have decided on a likely route to go.

F. Do you have any other comments or feedback?

- Where is the firehall? How many homes (single family)? Where are the high-rises? Condos? How many people? Need more info on traffic flow up and down Trepanier. No construction vehicles trucks. Very danger down hill – access onto 97 very dangerous.
- I really like what you are doing and I am in favour of the whole concept. I could not study the boards like I wanted to because I have back pain. Anything you could send me would be welcomed.
- Your gateway that will be seen for many years should make such an impact that it will endure for its architectural innovation. That will be almost self-evident but there is an agreed standard that elevates it to world class.
- Perhaps its like Rev King – I have a vision – I hope yours is just like it.
- I am not swayed by any of your “slick” posters. This project is wrong for Peachland and I wouldn’t support any amendments to the OCP to accommodate this project. There’s is a downtown core to Peachland now. We don’t need a ‘competing’ duplicate community with the approval of one project. Peachland will grow neighbourhood by neighbourhood not by complete, stand-alone separate communities within Peachland’s boundaries. This proposal could wreck Peachland. The charrette process of 2010 focused on a central, vibrant downtown. Your project is divisive and inappropriate. I don’t want any mailings. I left my name so you don’t think negative comments arise only anonymously
- Looks very impressive.
- Good luck! Interesting project!
- Unless you get lots of height okay’d (over 6 storeys), you must reduce the density a lot.
- We are interested in retiring to Peachland. We are very interested in your project. Healthcare is so very important on this side. We would like to move in 2-5 years. We do not want towering buildings like tall condos or apartments.
- A retirement community facility (could be private) where I could start in independent living...assisted living (2-3 meals per day)...extended care...all in the same facility. My mother has recently gone through this graduated process in North Vancouver. Building materials to ‘fit’ with natural colors of the hillside.
- Nice plan. Some residents have the impression that this is moving too quickly (as do some members of Council). You need to continue to highlight the benefits to Peachland in clear, understandable language ... good that you added this in the FAQ’s . Excellent presentation by Mark. What about a small community indoor swimming pool? It can be used for therapeutic purposes...good fit with medical offices. Obviously the District of Peachland would need to be involved and should operate the pool to allow for community access. The lake is really only swimmable for July and August and is too cold for old, babies, sick, etc.

- Don't recreate the deadly challenge of getting people from your development on to Hwy 97 using the same Russian roulette approach used at the shopping plaza (ie. option #1 – protected 't'). Push for a merge lane from the development eastbound to the Connector (Hwy 97C) which won't disturb traffic flow coming into the Okanagan but will eliminate the danger of crossing Hwy 97S to get to W. Kelowna. Water licensing is irrelevant to facing the water challenges of the future as they are based on pre-climate-change scenarios (ie. life will be great forever). The prime inputs have changed – available water vs. total number of people and organizations using that water. Water reuse strategies must be extremely high priority. Town of Peachland is saying two things that don't correlate...(a) we need water restrictions in the summer and (b) we have lots of water to support 6000 new units including droughts. The water availability will drop with time. The stories don't match each other. I strongly support the integrated approach vs. single-use connected by roads.

G. Are you a Peachland resident?

Yes: 26

No: 2