

LETTER WRITING POINTS RE: THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AT 580 COMMONAGE ROAD

Want to write a letter to Council/the local media voicing your opposition to this development, but not sure how to start? Here are a few ideas/ suggestions for how you may wish to focus your letter. We have included some references in the footnotes.

BETTER ALTERNATIVES EXIST: RESPECT THE OCP - SMART GROWTH not SPRAWL

YES TO: “smart growth” principles - as outlined in Vernon’s past AND present (2025 draft) Official Community Plans!

NO TO: sprawl development

YES TO: compact, sustainable development rather than increasing urban sprawl far from the city core

YES TO: settlement patterns that minimize the use of automobiles

NO TO: the long-term fiscal, social and environmental damage of sprawl development

BAD FOR CLIMATE

NO TO: increased car use that will make it difficult for Vernon to meet its goal of net zero GHG emissions by

2050. Driving cars is responsible for 63% of Vernon's greenhouse gas emissions.

YES TO: protecting wild and agricultural lands, as these natural areas store carbon, meaning less of it goes into the air to make climate change worse.

NO TO: ignoring the science on potential climate impacts and ignoring the City's own Climate Action Plan

BAD FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING

YES TO: truly affordable housing as outlined in Vernon's 2024 Housing Needs Report.

REMEMBER: Vernon's 2024 Housing Needs Report. "A healthy housing network includes emergency shelters, transitional housing, supportive housing, social housing, affordable rental and home ownership, and market housing."

NO TO: 'attainable' housing that requires a minimum income of \$100,000 a year to afford the mortgage on a three bedroom house.

NO TO: sprawl development that requires homeowners to own a car to access most services and amenities.

BAD FOR NATURE

YES TO: protecting sensitive and essential habitats and ecosystems.

REMEMBER: the community has repeatedly stated its opposition to further development of the Commonage lands

REMEMBER: 49% of the land in this proposal is classed SER1 (High Environmental Sensitivity) and another 44% is classed SER2 (Moderate Environmental Sensitivity). This proposal will see much of the SER 2 area covered with low-density residential housing leading to degradation of the adjacent SER 1 lands and destroying the ecological integrity of the site. The result? Loss of almost all of the SER1 and 2 land, simply because of the nearby construction and ongoing human activity.

REMEMBER: sprawl development – e.g., Predator Ridge, the Foothills, The Rise, The Outback, Adventure Bay – have already resulted in significant destruction of the area's natural environment

BAD FOR TAXPAYERS

NO TO: straining existing infrastructure and services

REMEMBER: sprawl development puts greater pressure on water supply by increasing water consumption and runoff

NO TO: the long-term fiscal, social and environmental damage of sprawl development

THINK: absence of a full cost analysis for this proposed development makes it impossible for Council and the

public to understand what the long-term infrastructure and servicing costs will be to the city taxpayers

REMEMBER: there is increasing awareness of water scarcity in the region

NO TO: expanding taxpayer costs related to wildfire protection

REMEMBER: this is a wildfire interface area (although the report Kerkhoff had identified this as a low to medium risk area)

BAD FOR RECONCILIATION

NO TO: building more developments on land that is contested by the Okanagan Indian Band.

REMEMBER: the OKIB considers the Commonage as Indian Reserve #9.