

**From:** Niki Vanker [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Monday, May 13, 2024 10:29 PM

**To:** Jennie Helmer <jhelmer@pemberton.ca>; Mike Richman <mrichman@pemberton.ca>; Katrina Nightingale <knightingale@pemberton.ca>; Laura Ramsden <lramsdn@pemberton.ca>; Ted Craddock <TCraddock@pemberton.ca>

**Cc:** Admin <admin@pemberton.ca>

**Subject:** Letter to Mayor and council re: OCP Amendment 956, 2024

I'm writing to say I do not support this OCP amendment and would like to give my comments as to why.

This is the largest housing proposal we have seen in Pemberton and the sub area plan is based on a 10+ years old idea of what the Pemberton community wants. We have started a full OCP review because Council and staff recognize that things have changed; the economic environment, thoughts on reconciliation and many actual community members have changed. The full OCP review will give the current Pemberton community and businesses a chance to give their opinions, ideas and vision for the community. If we move ahead without the benefits of the full review, we will be making a decision that can't be walked back if later the full review reveals that we have concerns about this area.

This development has a major impact to moving around town as it will bring approx. 500 units onto the north side of town, the tracks, the round about. Although engineers and traffic specialists may claim there is capacity, let's consider what it will actually mean. If we needed to evacuate town due to a forest fire, how do we move thousands of people through town, across the tracks and down our 2 lane road to the highway? Or less drastic perhaps, what happens when Signal Hill is let out for the day? Should we consider opening the gate at the Glen or punching a road through Tiyata to get more traffic flow? Staff was quoted as saying we may have 'growing pains', but that infers the pain will pass with time; with no proposed solutions we will be in permanent pain regarding the traffic in town.

Consider the financial implications of developing in this location – extreme hillside, relative density, new servicing that, while the developer will install it, the village and our taxes will be required to maintain. We are being hit this year with almost 10% tax increase to get aggressive with our current aging infrastructure – we have deferred maintenance for years and are now deliberating over adding a huge new development with its associated increased load on our infrastructure. There is an online tool on BC Province Ministry of Municipal Affairs website called Clic tool that has case studies on smaller communities looking at Community Lifecycle Infrastructure Costing. Has staff gone through this type of costing exercise? I would be interested in seeing the numbers - tax roll income does not tend to cover the cost of this type of development.

The proposed benefits mention about contributions of \$12M. \$1.8M is cash contribution towards a potential recreation facility that was deemed 'relatively generous' in the report – what could that buy us? We don't have the population and business base (even at build out) to pay for and run a pool or rink if that is the carrot being dangled – Whistler struggles to run and maintain their facility with many more residents and larger business community. Once we hit 5000 we are also going to have to budget a lot more towards policing – what is the anticipated tax increase needed to cover that? Then \$7.2 of the contributions is deemed the value of affordable housing. 15% of this development has some affordable housing wording around it but I'm unsure of how that will be enforced, and who will decide the 'market rate' to reduce by 30%. And in the overall picture, do we think the other 85% will

be even close to attainable for Pemberton folks? Who is this development being built for – Vancouver elite, second home owners?

Mayor and council, you are the people that we voted for, to listen to the community and really hear the community members concerns, and vote based on what you hear from us. Staff may have strong opinions and recommendations but in the end the community is who will be living with the impact of decisions made tonight. An approval of this OCP amendment is a one way decision, whereas waiting for the full OCP review gives you time to learn and consider the current community needs and wants. I urge you to not support this sub area plan, and instead consider it during the full OCP review.

Thank you.

Niki Vanker

