

Scenario: Welcome the World

Pro

Agricultural land will be protected by the ALR and hillsides by Crown land

As long as the ALR remains in effect the beauty of our area will be maintained. Controlling development is better than pretending it can be completely prevented.

While not an attractive option, controlling development is better than pretending it can be completely prevented.

I can support this alternative if strong guidelines are in place about residential development in the hills. The clear cut approach seems unnecessary and there are some examples locally of residential developments on 2 acre properties that retain some of the natural landscape.

Naramata has already been discovered and as long as the ALR remains in effect the beauty of our area will be maintained.

Increases commercial opportunities and local businesses

More people year round would enable more businesses to thrive and create a community to sustain itself outside of Penticton. It will bring much needed amenities to the village.

It is always nice to have stores around.

Increasing the commercial opportunity, and providing SOME business and residential growth. Attracting investments from outside can be good, as long as they are keeping the overall feel of the village as smaller. Sharing costs is good. Could enhance local artisan business as well.

More money is more activity is more jobs.

Only moderately in favour as there is definitely a scenario where too much becomes counter productive with traffic and loss of community but more people year round would enable more businesses to thrive and create a community to sustain itself outside of Penticton.

Increased residential density in the Village needs to take place as approximately one-third of the homes are seasonal. Commercial growth goes hand-in-hand with residential development and cannot not be allowed to stagnate. As there is limited commercial land in the Village, appropriate re-zoning will have to be addressed.

Welcome the world to develop the village, provide services, employment and livable wages for residents.

I think that commercial opportunity would be good for the economy and citizens of naramata.

Development to the Village area only see my next answers with a vibrant village.

To bring more business and life to the village

I am not 100% behind this - I would prefer a moderated commercial scenario

Village needs increased vibrancy.

it would create a more vibrant environment to enjoy the area throughout the year. It does not imply we would have to destroy the things that make this place beautiful and fun to live.

Commercial Activity would be maximized and I like sharing infrastructure costs

The aspect of additional shops and services in the village is appealing, and it would be nice to see some of the older more run down properties and vacant lots improved.

Growth in residential and commercial investment brings vibrancy to an area, particularly when it is well done. There are many examples of communities which have blossomed into leading examples world-wide while embracing community values such as preservation of nature.

We need more amenities. The Village is dismal, but so much opportunity. I refer to this little community as the "Naramata Nay-Sayers". It's thumbs down to everything! There is nowhere to go in town, we tend to always drive to Penticton for shopping, a bite to eat etc. The village restaurants close down when they want, relying ONLY on tourists. The locals don't seem to want to support anything?

We welcome the world seasonally and should provide the business to facilitate.

I slightly prefer this as it will bring much needed amenities to the village.

Attracts developer investment in the community

Outside investment to make Naramata an even more desirable place to open businesses and welcome tourists. Increased tax base and amenities are needed.

cost of increased infrastructure should be funded by developer. I am not in favour of welcome to the work. I am sorry but find these categories too simplistic.

Controlled hillside development will increase the tax base and the village taxes low. Developers should pay the full cost of the infrastructures of hillside developments.

Growth is good - outside investment to make Naramata an even more desirable place to open businesses and welcome tourists.

This is progress, and why not split the cost of infrastructure with developers. This Could provide real local jobs and allows for more housing.

It seems inevitable that over the next 10 to 15 years more people will want to live in the Naramata area. We should embrace this opportunity to attract investment to this area. Definitely the developers need to pay their fair share of the infrastructure, but RDOS needs to be more proactive in monitoring new developments to ensure they meet environmental concerns. This may require more resources for RDOS to audit and review development processes.

Sure . If they paid their own way. Why should residents subsidize their developments

In order to develop and move forward, it's important that we welcome outside investment. We can't expect Naramata to be world class without it!

The RDOS see's the residents here as being a source of even higher taxation upon already overtly high taxes. The RDOS would prefer to believe everyone in Naramata is a wealthy investor now, who can feed the RDOS plenty of cash and those who are not can leave. That is the disintegration of the community, disgusting and an unacceptable agenda. Welcome the wealthy but don't make the poorer , old timers pay for it.

This approach welcomes those who would like to live here and potentially brings diversity and has a cost shared model for development.

Cost of new infrastructure is split between developers and residents

Increased tax base and amenities are needed.

Allows more growth and settlement for new families

The world is growing and I think some growth within Naramata should be welcome. I envision low density homes on the hillsides (min. 1 - 5-acre) set out with care for fires & climate change.

The world is growing and I think some growth within Naramata should be welcome

Growth is inevitable, so this scenario might also be inevitable.

Although I like a bit of growth the whole charm of Naramata is keeping it small and quaint community, this just screams tourists and not actual residents

While I could see this being scary to many longer term residents, I love the idea of putting Naramata on the map.

We live in a wonderful place. Why would we not want to share it?

We need a vibrant and growing community to attract young families and workers, and to provide places for them to live and raise their families. I would want to keep the developments safe and under control, but I would like to see more housing provided for younger families.
We cannot complain about the local housing/rental market if we are not willing to help improve it.

Some commercial growth is needed here.

The Vista dev. above Naramata is awful. I envision low density homes on the hillsides (min. 1 - 5-acre) set out with care for fires & climate change. Our Village could be a small, charming Carmel-by-the-Sea (small town in California). Interesting architecture - artists, artisans, restaurants, bookstores, boutiques, technology offices & our funky Naramata Store. To thrive, Naramata needs people of all ages & types that will be here all year. Not just workers at wineries & labour in vineyards. Naramata is dead for 5-6 months of the year with its current setup of old, retired or rich people, only brought alive by visitors.

Only support more residential focussed in the village not more spread out across the hillside.

Given the deliberately expanding population in Canada, consideration must be given to allowing development in the area, albeit in a controlled and disciplined manner. To say that we must not change the environment around us is selfish and smacks of Nimbyism.

SOME development is good and desirable. I personally like the Stonebrook? area because it lots conform to the existing landforms and the presence of trees but dislike Outlook due to its "subdivision style" lots.

continue to make the region a very attractive place to visit and settle

supports a growth focused community

Thoughtful growth and development would have endless benefits for our local economy.

Improve affordable housing and infrastructure

This would hopefully bring in some affordable housing. Naramata is out of reach for people with modest or low income. We need more infrastructure currently and allowing more development will make living here more affordable.

Second favourite option. We need more infrastructure currently and allowing more development will make living here more affordable by adding more inventory and limiting scarcity. Development should include some more multi-family inventory to welcome people of varied income and stage of life circumstances. Developers should be contributing to a DCC system to build a bank for future infrastructure

This scenario sounds like it has no limits or guidance about the kind of developments and commerce that would be welcomed.

Naramata is already moving towards becoming a playground for the rich, and is out of reach for people with modest or low income.

I uphold Naramata Slow ethics.

It doesn't accommodate the needs of families & long term residents that are dependent on affordable rental housing. We're fortunate that we own our home. Not many young families can afford to buy without assistance.

Additional housing and infrastructure created to blend with the land and provide additional recreation opportunities.

This would hopefully bring in some affordable housing.

Not needed in Naramata/NIMBY

If I wanted to live in a city I would have moved to a city. There is enough opportunity in Okanagan in other jurisdictions.

This is an easy one. Absolutely no. There is enough opportunity in Okanagan in other jurisdictions. This is not needed in Naramata.

Do not want surrounding area filled with development
Enjoy the current view and p+q

If I wanted to live in a city I would have moved to a city. Sure tourists are fine, but mega homes occupied by part time dwellers is inappropriate. The "charm" factor of the village and vineyards is rapidly being replaced by "west Kelowna" style development. The "charm" of this place is getting ruined. Views from the KVR and Summerland towards our hillsides have been replaced mature forests with large openings for developments like Vista, Kettle Ridge and Outlook.

too much infill of homes, people, commerce. We may as well live in Kelowna! This is not what brought me here to live. If this is the way we are going to move towards i may as well sell and move away. This would be a very sad day for me.

Too many people in Naramata already, split between developers and all residents? No. Keep out of the hills, the animals need it, plus fire hazards.

Too much of the world finds us already - no more help needed.

Vernon, Kelowna and soon Penticton have been destroyed by development. This area needs to remain rural and undeveloped , natural and beautiful. It needs to have restrictions to development like Banff, Tofino and Revelstoke. The naturalness of the area is what makes it special.

Eeeewww to large housing development in the hills! Build up the town, let the nature be it is one of the things that make naramata special. It will look disgusting AND there is still only 1 road out of naramata so it is unrealistic to think that building giant housing development is not going to ruin the entire charm of the town and can you imagine trying to drive in and out at peak hours

Ick. So we can be West Kelowna? No, no, no.

What a terrible idea, this plan ruins all that makes our community beautiful and vibrant. I want to know my neighbours and not live in a cookie cutter house. It's WHY I live here. There are plenty of communities like this around the province and someday, I hope people come to understand that these developments aren't desirable to live in like other countries have discovered.

Not interested in making a big city out of a quiet peaceful village.

This type of development would turn this area into a suburb of Penticton with local residents having very little control over the type, the size and the cost of future development projects. What attracts people to this area may be completely lost.

Absolutely do not want to see new developments on the hillsides! The purpose to moving to Naramata was to get away from City living, commune with nature and live in a small community. Besides, developments will only bring more cars, more traffic, more noise.

Significant development will make Naramata like the other parts of the Okanagan and poses a large risk to the charm of the area.

Not long before it looks like West Kelowna and Kelowna - disappearing hillsides and countryside, reduced habitats for wildlife and loss of biodiversity

REALLY ? It is Naramata! Look up the hill to see what unchecked development looks like! Consider that we only have one road in, and one way out! The world can stay out, we have enough here already!

No interest in becoming a new Kelowna/West Kelowna. The slow, rural neighbourly feel of Naramata is what makes it unique. It would be a tragedy if this was lost.

Naramata would turn in to a suburb. Highly undesirable.

We already have a problem with too much development on the hillsides and destruction of the peaceful environment. Any scenario that goes further in this direction is the wrong direction for Naramata. We need local investment, not investment from the outside.

We can keep development away and have a few tourist attractions (like a culinary centre of excellent built around the Heritage Inn) - but keep big tourism and big crowds away - and let the tourists stay in Penticton.

Do not approve of dense hillside development.

Existing infrastructure cannot support more growth

Naramata road does not support this level of development. Increase use of limited water supply. Huge sewage increase and associated capital expenditure. Reference the Drainage Related issues.

I fear that it will run rampant and the roads cannot handle the additional traffic. I don't really want to see the road twinned or a bypass be required across the hills somehow.

See above. We don't have enough infrastructure to support all the emergency services and water and power services these new development would require. These developments detract from preserving our biodiversity and eco-systems services. Plus we only have one road out of Naramata in the case of fires and floods and climate change is upon us. More Hillside development is going in the wrong direction for Naramata and should be stopped.

the ALR is eroded now with all site specific licenses creating commerce and retail outside of what they produce and way to many lounges and impaired drivers on the roads
no more expansion the road cannot handle it slow growth can be managed with existing tax

Totally opposed. Infrastructure and the Naramata road are over limit now. Summer traffic makes it dangerous for all. Driveways accessible on Naramata road and Wineries are dangerous. With the increased traffic we have seen already it is unsafe to walk around our neighborhoods. The speed limits need to be decreased. Few stop at the stop signs. The trades are speeding to their locations with little regard to the residents.

negative impact on rural lifestyle. Increase use of limited water supply. Huge sewage increase and associated capital expenditure that ALL residents would bear.

Naramata road. There is already too much traffic on this dangerous winding road and increasing the number of people using this road is a bad idea.

Slow growth,,,keep taxes down.
The blackwells cost a lot.

Not really interested in a open market approach to growth. I find it is more often than not that growth of people is usually faster than infrastructure, so we are usually just having to play catch up.

The infrastructure for this option does not exist...no sewer system, only one road in. To create proper infrastructure for this option would be devastating to the natural environment and put everyone at risk for flooding, forest fires and pollution.,

We don't need the extra traffic and infrastructure required for an increase in people.

The rural nature of the Naramata Bench needs to be preserved. The geography and geologic setting of the Naramata Bench is not conducive to major changes in infrastructure that would be required for large scale residential and/or commercial developments.

(Reference the Drainage Related issues of the Outlook and Kettle Ridge Developments that occurred in 2017).

Naramata road can not handle more traffic; the rural lifestyle is a huge part of Naramata's unique appeal; it is crucial that agricultural land be preserved

Cost should fall on the developers not current residents

Rampant development enriches the few, with all the costs borne by residents.

We need the infrastructure to support the increased density. Who's going to pay for it.

Naramata road does not support this level of development

Need restrictions and controls on the growth

Provide a plan of tempered growth which allows for adaptation by residents and newcomers in an orderly fashion. Lets build there where it is already "commercial". It has to be done in a considered and measured way.

Focus on the village and surrounding without ruining the pastoral country side and putting undue pressure on the environment

Welcoming the world has all types of positive and negative connotations and permutations. In the context of development and livability, it highlights the possibility of unlimited development and unbridled growth, which for a jewel such as Naramata sends the wrong message to the world. I am much more comfortable to permit the professional planners to provide a plan of tempered growth which allows for adaptation by residents and newcomers in an orderly fashion.

Insufficient restrictions on hillside developments

Access via the Naramata road is going to be a huge problem. Also real estate prices will keep escalating and not helping locals with an average or below average income. They will sell and move to a more affordable place.

This one scares me. We cannot be all things to all people. Every change must be thoughtful, careful and long term. There is space in the Village to build. Lets build there where it is already "commercial". Naramata's specialness targets the "right" development that retains our values and targets residents, developers and visitors that want us just as we are. With a bit more to offer. That draws in local communities and their dollars in a broader season.

The way this option is written sounds like too much, too far down that road. Progress is one thing, but the other reality is that we are small and can't take on too much. It has to be done in a considered and measured way.

I don't think that we need further development on the hillsides

I would prefer smaller perhaps local commercial development in the village

Naramata needs to remain a village and commercial interests will fundamentally alter that. Any other proposed scenario is dishonest and manipulative.

This option leaves too much room for uncontrolled, developer-driven building on the hillsides that, left unchecked, will destroy the community.

I am in support of growth but not unbridled growth

Density should be focused on the Village area

The development that is happening on the Naramata hillside above the Village right now is pretty awful

May cause more negative flooding/erosion/fire/ecosystem impacts

The hillside is a critical ecosystem that protects us from erosion and fire. Enough erosion now, loss of green space, and driving wildlife from their natural habitat. It destroys valuable agricultural and native land.

With all that we know about environmental degradation, this should not even be an option. There are existing serious issues with development gone wild in the Outlook, Stonebrook, Vista developments. We can not afford this kind of development from an environmental perspective but also from a community cultural perspective.

Very opposed to Hillside development. -environmentally and esthetically. There is already too much hillside development.

Welcome to the world has the detriment of excessive growth throughout the entire area, we need to preserve our natural areas as this benefits locals as well as visitor/ tourist. Keep the growth to a localized area, the village mainly.

- > Destruction of sensitive lands and ecosystems
- > Need to maintain Naramata's charm and quaintness

To much development on the hillside will stress our natural forests, water supply, road ways, septic/sewer, emergency services and create disasters by not considering the environment.

Strongly opposed. Watching our hillside get clear cut and moonscape is very disappointing. Destroying prime wildlife winter range and redirecting runoff/water courses due to vegetation removal/rock changes will have huge implications in the future. Keep hillside development to a minimum and keep the development in the village

overwhelming growth, there are no intentions to improve road access, flood control of developed areas has been a disaster - lawsuits are still pending on the 2017? event. Cost of infrastructure being split is a bullshit line because ultimately the consumer and the residents will foot the entire bill - costs are merely passed on, long-term obligations are always the responsibility of the rate payer - developers will be long gone and unaccountable for errors or omissions.

Development on the hillsides does nothing for anyone other than the developer. It is entirely based on greed. It costs tax payers more after the developer sells everything and moves on. It causes major environmental issues like flooding, temperature increases due to clear cutting, displacement of animals due to destruction of their habitat and migration corridors. Not to mention it looks like hell. I'm ashamed of what RDOS has allowed to happen recently up on the hillside.

We have a difficult time managing what we have , why on earth wd we want to introduce problems . Wd make no sense

We need to limit travel until we can move with environmentally methods. As well tourism revolves around wine and grapes. We need to encourage self reliance in our food supply. Welcome the world is not sustainable and will eventually collapse.

Because so far the development on the hill has been done extremely poorly. And with the newest development on the top of Arawana there will be more water runoff problems to the people down hill

This scenario represents growth that is too rapid and uncontrolled. This growth scenario would unnecessarily consume precious natural and agricultural spaces.

as in the past, new developments have caused grief and damage to residents who have lived in Naramata for many years. I am sure these past problem developments were "subject to ALR restrictions" but shall we count how many lawsuits are existing due to past development in the last 5 to 6 years.

It destroys valuable agricultural and native land. Most land above Naramata and Naramata Road is either ALR or Environmental Sensitive Area 1 or 2.

Natural beauty and agriculture are fundamental parts of what make Naramata a great place. Widespread development will rob Naramata of its charm.

Fragmentation of rare sensitive natural landscape (30% of red/blue listed species are in the S. Ok also native bunchgrass) Destructive development disregards this value by blasting, scaping, burning rocky hillsides resulting in habitat loss/alteration of water flow as in flooding and erosion/toxic "run-off" into our creeks and lake (drinking water) Major consideration of water catchment/storm water/septic flows need to be addressed-impact on the lake/creeks/wildfire threat. Affordability?

To much development on the hills is making environmental problems for people down below with water run off ect. Traffic is becoming a big issue. I would love to see another road to Penticton up in the hill perhaps

this is just unrealistic with the geography and large areas of ALR

New development is not environmentally sensitive but rather dominated by the developers financial gain at the expense of the community. Foreign Investors are primarily concerned about money (personal financial profits) not the communities well being. For the most part, the RDOS and foreign investors do not reside in the community or they are shielded, disconnected from the concerns, needs and preferences of the community.

See above. Also the cost of any new development in the hillsides needs to be restricted with covenants in place and all the costs of the emergency service risks, providing water and power should be borne by the developers, none of these costs should be borne by the existing Naramata residents. Hence I don't agree that additional commercial and residential activity should be split between developers and residents.

The hillside is a critical ecosystem that protects us from erosion and fire , offers a multitude of outdoor and recreational opportunities but also provides the scenic rural backdrop that differentiates Naramata from larger Okagan sprawl sites such as Penticton and Summerland.

Please, no more development on hillsides. Enough erosion now, loss of green space, and driving wildlife from their natural habitat.

Building in wildfire interface areas is not smart at all. Lack of water for these new developments. Houses jammed in side by side with no respect for what it looks like. Clear cutting for housing like vista and kettle ridge is disgusting. There should be a requirement for at least 1 hectare lots minimum to keep or beautiful hillsides beautiful not scars on the landscape cluttered with ugly square houses trying to maximize on every inch of land to build on

New development and businesses target rich tourists/unaffordable

The new housing developments were unaffordable, and often vacant. Massive subdivisions and increased vacation rental homes that do nothing to support our community. We'd be at the mercy of developers who only have profits at heart

The current development of the Naramata hillside for massive, luxury homes, which appear to be vacation homes, is detrimental to the community spirit as well as being a visual eyesore and insensitive architecturally. No attempt is being given to replacing the landscaping which was stripped for the development of these homes. Development should be subject to the type of controls which are exercised in most other communities in B.C., large and small.

Costs will rise for locals trying to buy here. Our kids priced out of the market by this becoming a summer destination and playground.

We have too many issues with massive subdivisions and water issues and the increased prevalence of vacation rental homes that do nothing to support our community.

Naramata's charm is the beauty of the crown land and forests that surround us. The new housing developments that were built recently were unaffordable, and often vacant for 8 months of the year. More developments like this will just keep housing unaffordable while demolishing the natural landscape.

We want a place when we can afford to live without more tourists than villagers. B&B'S have decimated the rental market in Naramata. We do not need to market our Village at all. There are only a few people and businesses who would benefit from an influx of the world. The village belongs to everyone, not just a few businesses and wineries, there are actually people that live here who want to live in a peaceful and underdeveloped community. Naramata has become a small over-priced Vancouver.

Not in favor of welcoming the world . The Naramata road is already clogged by the tourists and the village commercial is not big enough to deal with a larger influx of tourist

Naramata is a small, quaint village and that is the appeal of our community. If there is too much growth, it will be a place where only the extremely wealthy can live. We presently have Penticton just 15 minutes away to meet our shopping and commercial needs.

We need to be careful with urban sprawl - first, if we are only building multi million \$ homes, that is not going to serve young couples and families, the elderly etc. the rich will find a way to have some big house, they always do, what we need to do ours on is housing that is reflective of the mean income in the area, and foster a future generation that will continue to love and live in naramata

Risk of making natamata only a practical place to live and experience by the very wealthy

It would run the area flat. Outside people do not care about Naramata, the hillside would eventually be mowed down for urban development, lands and water would get polluted, small town charm would disappear. We'd be at the mercy of developers who only have profits at heart

Businesses with no base in Naramata whose only interest is in profiting during the tourist rush of the summer would not help to maintain the community in the off season. We don't need more coffee shops, cafes or restaurants that are shut down for 5 months because their profits don't meet expectations

Cost to residents
Over development

Do you really trust developers to honour their extravagant promises to the community once approval has been granted? How does adding MORE development serve the critical housing shortage for regular people and invited workers? The latest new clear cut development and Grace Estates to name a couple, have/will do nothing to provide affordable housing for agricultural workers and the sons and daughters of generational farm families, who currently have to leave their childhood community to survive.

While we welcome the world a few months of the year, we must remember to provide for year round residents, providing affordable housing etc.

Agriculture and space is what makes this place special. Developers have no interest in building a community, they want the most return - which means mega mansions that will sit empty.

Overcrowding in the summer months is already a problem in the village, the town is just too small to develop additional commercial tourism

The world has grossly inflated the house pricing and second home that are very limited use do nothing to support those living and working in the community,

Destroy what makes Naramata special

This option will destroy the character of Naramata. I would hate to look up the hill and see row upon row of new houses. Charm of Naramata is its low density. We have a special magic place here. We like the peace and rural feel.

The community would lose it's specialness, and be like any other sprawling acreage place in BC. This would have a negative economic impact on the wine and tourism industries and introduce more bedroom traffic which would decrease the quality of life for residents.

New developments on the hillsides will take away from the smaller town feel of the village, and will increase population too much. Shouldn't be TOO much increase in the commercial side of growth. No big developments, buildings, services added. Significantly improved store would be excellent - broader selection and some higher end foods. And also could showcase local foods.

Too much is lost already. Too many mega houses build, literally mountainsides have been blown up and forests were decimated. Stop before you ruin everything.

I love enjoying the surrounding hillsides and would hate to look up the hill and see row upon row of new houses. That would change the rural feel of Naramata.

Charm of Naramata is its low density and almost scattered pattern of growth which would be lost if growth was uncontrolled.

I am in favour of keeping the hillsides free of huge development as I think most people move to Naramata to enjoy the quiet charm which is what differentiates it from so many other communities in BC that have sprawled out and lost their village charm.

Too much development will alter the character of the village too drastically .
I also believe the hillsides have already been developed sufficiently.

This option will further destroy the area which has been an agricultural, low density farming community where you could safely raise a family.

Could destroy what makes Naramata a destination

We like the small . quiet and slow village atmosphere. It enhances the community and makes the village and surrounding areas liveable without the commercialization you experience elsewhere.

There needs to be more oversight of development. We want to keep the "rural character" in Naramata and respect our history. I think all development should be carefully scrutinized.

Too much growth and loss of the rural character of the village.
In the worst case scenario Naramata simply becomes an extension of Penticton.

Will completely destroy the bench & village character ... big traffic makes living here a pain, big business kills the small wineries/vineyards, big development crowds everything, big problems (water management, crime)... we will leave.

Absolutely against! I cant state strongly enough how disastrous this would be for our community. We would end up like every other sprawling urban blight losing our precious history, community and beauty.

No, No, No.
This option will destroy the character of Naramata.

I strongly oppose hillside and agricultural land development, regardless of the approach taken in the village. Allowing larger, external commercial ventures will result in loss of local control over village and community affairs and decisions.

High growth will destroy the village.

I don't think that every community needs to welcome the world and I question why we are so focused on "growth" at all costs. This scenario worries me because of its unknown burden on existing infrastructure, and future impacts on the environment. I believe this option would fundamentally change the character of Naramata.

Mega hill houses don't suit the feel of the village

This scenario doesn't fit Naramata. Just look at the "Likes" reported after the Survey #1. "Investments from outside" is a misnomer, because all investments expect a return. Highly unlikely such investments will be philanthropic, which means the investors will benefit, not necessarily the community.

Over-development is not appealing. One of the best things about Naramata how quiet it is. Limited roadway is already creating traffic problems.

Naramata is a farm community and development on our beautiful hillside and agriculture land would destroy the characteristics of such a beautiful destination.

Too much aggressive growth

The charm of Naramata will be lost with too much commercialization and growth.

The infrastructure does not support this type of growth.

Should this be considered all costs to improve infrastructure (roads, drainage, emergency services etc) should be 100% covered by those commercial endeavors and by the developers. So much development has been allowed to happen already with the developers being allowed to avoid accountability or safety, drainage issues, infrastructure upgrades etc.

This is not what Naramata is about, if I wanted that I would move somewhere else like Kelowna.

This is just too extreme and would destroy the character of Naramata.

I am opposed to Welcome the World because it is too extreme and would change the character and ambience of the village.

We chose Naramata to live because it is a village and away from busy areas. We like the peace and rural feel.

This would materially change our reasons to live in Naramata and actually change the reason the visit here from appreciation of nature to a commercial experience

Too much development would ruin the charm of the region. Who wants to travel to a major subdivision.

Currently Naramata has a relatively low density (especially outside the Village proper) that creates a tranquility and peace that I feel is increasingly important in this world whether it is a lifestyle or a vacation spot to 'get off the train of life' for awhile. I feel the 'Welcome to the World' option would destroy that (as did most of the local population when an option to have a new high density subdivision created opposite Red Rooster winery).

Development on the hillsides is not walkable, and has little social mix. It is not affordable. There is too much of it already.

Naramata needs to retain its small town charm. Welcome the World is providing the opportunity to invite more corporate, big profit people in who will change what Naramata is all about.

Out of character with Naramata. We should celebrate our small size, agricultural history, and open spaces

The hillside is the charm of Naramata small village and hills of vineyards and large lands is how it should remain. The cost of development and the loss of that charm would change the community.

In my opinion, a complete destruction of an area that should be honoured. This is an agricultural area, not a suburb.

Having lived in this village my whole life, I think that the integrity of the village would be at stake. I love living here for the small-town feel and the welcomeness every business has. The store has already changed away from the simple corner store I would bike to, to get candy as a kid, into a place I don't even want to go because it doesn't have the same feel that it once did. I fear this will happen to other businesses as well.

This would alter the feel and appeal of the area, I personally love the rural and small village feel. That is why the people who live here chose to do so. The Welcome the World option would be developing the area into something completely different, we have enough larger towns in the area, we don't need another.

We will lose what Naramata is, if we welcome the world, it will only be a place the the extremely wealthy and will force the people who built Naramata out.

I am concerned that much of Naramata's charm will be negatively affected by this approach.

Naramata would just become an extension of Penticton and lose its uniqueness and character

Shotgun development removes any vestige of Naramata's legacy and charm. Ari Brussels would be rolling in his grave, and not just over the Blackwell fiasco's outcome (ask someone if you don't know the history). See capital cost charge allocation previously.

Do not want urban sprawl. Not good wrt forest fires, people using their cars, busy roads, infringement on outdoor activities like biking walking hiking. Will probably also encourage people who have houses as second residences. We want people to live and work in this area and be able to send their kids to school here. Let's maintain the village but keep it quiet and quaint.

Would like to be very careful with future development of Naramata. Obviously there will be change but would like to be respectful to what makes this such a special place.

This would destroy the essential character of the area which makes it such a beautiful place to live or to come visit. It would benefit developers more than anyone.

Building out sub-division style housing on the hillside would, in my opinion, absolutely destroy the quant/rural feel of Naramata. I support density, I just believe it should be strategic. There is a proper balance that can be achieved to keep Naramata really special.

Naramata will lose its quaintness and flavour and just become another town. Visit Surrey and Langley in the Lower Mainland to see how greed has enabled rampant wanton development in those cities.

Not in favour at all. I have watched development throughout my life in many areas and it changes the local areas to become more sprawling centres with traffic, more crime, environmental damage, loss of wildlife, more people becoming less friendly. Naramata will never be what everyone loves about it again, once it's gone it's gone. Those funny little quail...gone along with everything else we love. If you don't build it, they won't come. Preserve the beauty of these small towns.

We have a special magic place here. Lets keep it that way as much as possible.

I don't want to see Naramata's population or commerce increased. I like the sleepy farming village that it used to be. Low population and lack of commercialism are what makes Naramata rare and precious and charming. It's why we live here.

I don't believe this option would keep the small town feel that we have currently. I don't feel we need this level of development in the area and prefer to keep the outlying area as is.

Would not like to see cookie cutter houses and hoards of people.

I am opposed to unregulated developments on the hillside. Much of what is being built is suburban subdivisions in a rural setting. The allowances for smaller lots on community septic systems has had the adverse effect of building a an ugly subdivision instead of a pleasing subdivision.

End goal is unclear. What are limitations/guidelines to maintain charm of the rural village setting? Developers should pay as much as possible of increased infrastructure costs.

This option will destroy Naramata. I am strongly opposed.

Scenario: Vibrant Village

Pro

Maintain low taxes and share infrastructure costs

A vibrant core keeps our dollars and energy in our community. There are major concerns like a sewage system for the village to grow in this way. I do not want more increases in taxes.

This village has the potential to become even more than vibrant than currently but there are major concerns like a sewage system for the village to grow in this way.

Few restrictions on commercial activity and infrastructure cost sharing.

Preservation of hillsides

Costs to be split

I believe this is how we need to develop the downtown area however I don't believe the taxpayers should subsidize developers to do this.

New development and commercial businesses pay their own way. If it's public amenities use the taxes that are collected already. I do not want more increases in taxes.

cost share but this is not new

A vibrant core keeps our dollars and energy in our community. Depending on what "split" means (1:10?, 50:50?), developers need to continue to pay meaningful capital development charges so that existing residents don't subsidize the capital growth of (non-resident?) entrepreneurs.

Lead to more affordable housing

Allow for some less expensive housing where people who work in the village could also afford to live here. We also need to add small multi unit housing for Naramata residents who would like to sell the farm and move into the village.

This is more or less what is happening now with the new development in the village. I would strongly recommend before those apartments are all built that there are rules on short-term rentals put in place like in Banff and other destination communities.

Naramata is a gem that is no longer a secret. By providing places for visitors seasonal workers and residents growth can be managed

Our vibrant village must provide for both seasonal guests and residents, this includes new businesses and affordable housing. The village is walkable now, making it the perfect place to live, if there is supply and services.

Hopefully, it would allow for some less expensive housing where people who work in the village could also afford to live here. The Christmas Market staged by Naramata Slow showed that the village is already quite vibrant and I'd to see more of that.

i believe as noted above that the village needs to offer amenities to residents and visitors. WE also need to add small multi unit housing for Naramata residents who would like to sell the farm and move into the village. Preservation of the hillsides and agricultural land with all growth channeled to the village is important to me.

Naramata used to be a vibrant, self sufficient community, with hotels, shops, bank, gas, even a jail. There is no reason the village cannot get back to that place

Focuses growth at key point

It provides for an attractive, aesthetically pleasing and a bit more commercially diverse community without impacting the surrounding rural areas. Preservation of hillsides and agricultural land a key priority.

A vibrant village coupled with preservation of the beauty of the hillsides and agricultural land attracts more paying visitors to Naramata.

Focus on Vibrant!!! Preservation of hillsides and ag land a key priority

I like preservation of the hillsides and agricultural land. Agree village needs economic growth.

I think this is my preferred option. Best compromise, given that growth is necessary.

I think the village needs to be a more attractive "center" for Naramata, but the hillsides need to be preserved in order to maintain the peaceful natural environment that we all love.

I am in favour of keeping the hillsides free of huge development as I think most people move to Naramata to enjoy the quiet charm which is what differentiates it from so many other communities in BC that have sprawled out and lost their village charm.

Maintaining the hillside and promoting growth where the density exists works to both give Naramata an opportunity to provide a full time home to new families as well as provide new services to existing residents.

Controlled growth. Restricted to the Village.

May reduce development on the hillside; concern that most new buyers are wealthy and prefer larger lots versus high density like Vancouver.

People who choose to live in Naramata do so for lifestyle. Tourists come to Naramata to share that lifestyle. Having more amenities for locals and visitors would be welcome. By concentrating this in the village, the community has a go-to place to gather and for businesses to maximize visitors (vs. being spread around).

It keeps the development to the village

So that our village has a focused centre, but without becoming a busy downtown.

It preserves the hillside and agricultural land

I am in favor, to a degree. Every community needs focal points, places to gather, a community center, a coffee shop, clothing shops, ice cream stand, bar, restaurant, breakfast nook, etc. The experiences of visiting and interacting with people within the confines of the village community establishes relationships and habits, which create the fabric of the community. While familiarity may breed contempt, it also creates friendships and opportunities to grow as individuals.

Given its location, wineries etc, this is likely the natural sweet spot for Naramata. I would like a small vibrant village.

Strongly favour this option. It provides for an attractive, aesthetically pleasing and a bit more commercially diverse community without impacting the surrounding rural areas. It should have limited impact on housing costs that would not otherwise occur anyway. An increase in housing should accompany this option.

Preserving our agricultural land and hillsides is so important.

There sh be moderate development but have concerns with lack of oversight if it proceeds

Obviously this makes the most sense to preserve the beauty and feel of naramata while allowing for growth...but business need employees...employees need housing

Preservation of the hillsides and agricultural land is important environmentally. The name is catchy, I do want a vibrant village but not commercial development that makes the village unaffordable for the average resident.

This is a decent options provided growth is monitored and controlled (limited).

More opportunities for employment/businesses/amenities

Reason to stay local and support the business and services it provides. Vibrant is good, jobs, tourism, more diverse business scene could benefit the local population.

A vibrant village at the centre of Naramata Plan is key to attracting the new services and small businesses to Area E

A vibrant village will create a vibrant community. I own a technology company in Victoria and own a cherry orchard that is a vacation home. We contemplated moving to Naramata but we want more in the village to support our lifestyle. I don't expect it to be a Tofino, but I think a vibrant village will provide local jobs, a local sense of entrepreneurship, and a community while ensuring our rich agricultural lands are maintained.

The Village is stagnant, and it has to have higher density as approximately one-third of the homes are seasonal. The Naramata Centre is the largest land owner in the Village, and the space is grossly under developed. It would be a prime location for residential and commercial expansion.

If commercial development is focused on activities that support the existing charm of the village (wine, fresh produce, beach activities, etc.), and is consistent with keeping it a village, I'm all in favour. A village square that can serve as an entertainment venues good, a Subway and A&W is not.

I really love the idea of a vibrant village, and I know Naramata has a bit of this in the summer months. I would love to see a Vibrant Village all year-round, with support from residents to encourage small businesses to establish themselves and stay open particularly in the quieter, winter months.

In support of small independent businesses

The village has very limited amenities and thus residents have to drive to Penticton for any shopping and even food/dining options for 6 months of the year. By encouraging some development in the village, it can be a community hub with its own community vibrancy

More businesses, more jobs, more year-round community.

Greater services in village leads to less vehicle usage

Allows opportunity for new small business in the village. Naramata is a small bubble so providing any chance for commercial businesses to succeed is important. Don't expect giant businesses in the village as our sheer size is what limits this

I support the addition of more local businesses in the Village, making it a destination for residents and tourists; create a permanent space for the Farmer's Market; add sidewalks down Robinson Ave to protect pedestrians

Adding more appropriate small businesses and services in the village is a good idea. Developers should bear a higher cost of new development than existing residences

Better serve Naramations' needs for services and commercial enterprises. Keep shopping dollars in our community

Naramata has a lovely location and it would benefit from a couple more restaurants, especially with outdoor seating. A supermarket, dry cleaner and hardware store would be improvements to the town. The reality is that new housing is being built. The road infrastructure will have to be upgraded. We can't pretend the development is not happening.

I would love to see opportunities for small, family run businesses in Naramata.

Boundary for Rural Growth is therefore NVC?

Great! Problem solved.

Commercial activities will be likely self-regulated by free market system.

Age-in-place will severely restrict possible funding of costs, so developers and 'foreigners' will by necessity inject capital for developments.

If the village is vibrant the need to go to Penticton frequently will be reduced. The greater concentration in the village could sustain much improved bus service also making living in the village more affordable

I'm in favour of some commercial and small businesses in the Village WITH RESTRICTIONS. This all depends on location, services offered, competition and impact to the community. Community consultation is imperative.

Small growth of commercial stores are ok, as would be a gas station as is splitting of costs between residents and developers.

The language of this option is not completely correct - not "all" growth funneled to the Village. Most, yes, but not all. This option at least encapsulates what I believe to be heading in the right direction: Commercial expansion, diversity, and vibrancy in the Village (another restaurant or two, wine bar, some retail, something to attract more interest and engagement), considered residential expansion and loosening of restrictions, tourist accommodations helped by the RDOS not hindered by them.

Further amenities

I would prefer to satisfy my needs in the village as opposed to having to travel to Penticton

creates employment, helps to pay for infrastructure and supports more economic vibrancy within the village and community as a whole.

I think growing the village center is exciting. This would bring new people and smaller businesses to the village - making it a richer life experience. Of course there would be residential growth needed to support this. Developers of commercial and residential growth activity is good to be split. Keeping and enhancing the village spirit of wine/food/agriculture and tourist and artisan services is good. More excellent restaurants would be good. Thought should be given as to what demographic

Vibrant is good, jobs, tourism, more diverse business scene could benefit the local population. Have more people around in the 'off' season. Red tape is awful around here, and it adds a lot to the cost of new projects. These costs are eventually paid for by residents and customers/buyers.

reason to want to move to. Reason to stay local and support the business and services it provides. No need to travel to achieve the littlest of services or goods

I'd like to see a few more quaint shops and cafes all within the theme of the village.

I love the idea on increasing the number of small businesses in the village.

I am strongly in favour of expanding the availability of businesses and services in the village . I believe an increase will also help to increase year round or closer to year round residency. Come winter there is virtually nothing available in the village. Also, I would prefer to be able to have a few more dining and shopping options available here so I wouldn't have to go into Penticton. There is a lot to be said for vibrancy. It doesn't have to be frenetic . See Peachland for an example

Commercial opportunities are employment opportunities for residents. This in turn allows for more full time residents and also a thriving and more diverse stream of income to the area outside of wine tourism.

It would be great to have a few more little businesses in the village as long as the population is able to sustain them through the winter months.

I would like to see new businesses, commercial activity and new residents to broaden the tax base and make our community more vibrant.

Approve of keeping agricultural and hillsides protected. New small businesses and services would appeal to residents, and visitors need more options than currently exist.

Village could use a few more amenities/competition

Like the preservation of the hillside and the agricultural lands. Some commercial activity could be beneficial to the village.

Would be nice to have a few more amenities within walking distance. Down the road I see art galleries, antique shops, etc.

Of all the options, this offers the best opportunity for responsible economic growth and building a more vibrant community through enhancing its core, while creating added resources to preserve the natural beauty of the area outside of the village center.

A few more amenities would be nice!

There is a need for improved services in the village to support the growth in the area. This would also improve the character and charm of Naramata which would increase revenues from tourism.

Naramata Village is a jewel in and of itself. It is small, quaint, and low-key. I definitely am open to unique shops, small businesses. I am, however, concerned as to parking and increased traffic.

We need amenities for ourselves and the tourists that visit.

It would be fun to see new small business and to have more places to go for locals and visitors in our village....coffee shops, restaurants, shops maybe car free zones, etc.

Yes, vibrant, sustainable, organic DEBT FREE ! There are ways to support and encourage a healthy community without over taxation of the less wealthy residents. Making the poor pay for a few wealthy investors needs, interests, requirements. Nor having the RDOS budget double every year.

strong preservation of the hillsides, agricultural land and the experience of exploring the KVR.

With increased commercial activity comes opportunity for Naramatians.

As long as the village is not overdeveloped, I think this would benefit existing businesses, attract new businesses , facilities and families. The balance between growth and the village vibe would have to be well managed and supported by the local population.

I am moderately in favour of this, as it will provide a village with jobs and residential neighbourhoods for young families and workers.

I do want the agricultural land and hillsides taken care of, but not necessarily stopping some development there.

We need to provide housing and chances for jobs if we want to have younger people and families stay here and create a community.

We need more businesses and choices in Naramata. The potential for tourism is enormous however there is nothing to draw people as there isn't the facilities.

Love the idea of the village becoming a destination point for tourism to create a highly vibrant exciting village

It would be nice to have some more amenities here and as long as it's kept charming and small, a vibrant village could increase tourism, local options for food/clothing/services, boost the local economy while also preserving the hillsides and wild spaces, create community gathering spaces

I like a vibrant village. it brings more folks to our community and what we have to offer. Obviously unbridled growth is wrong but so is a strong preserve attitude. IE: NIMBY....

I don't feel the village has enough infrastructure to support housing growth. I bigger better General Store as I am sure the new owners envisage would be a great benefit (lower carbon footprint from trips to Penticton). We badly need a coffee shop with inside seating for locals in winter. We need one or two more family restaurants. We need a sidewalk in the village down Robinson. etc

Employment, excitement

I would like to see a drs office or a gym and indoor pool for locals. Dentist ect so the people that live here didn't have to go to town for everything. We use to have a gas station and dr office it would be nice to get that back. More things for locals instead of just tourist.

I love the idea of supporting more visitors coming to the area! I also think residents could benefit from more services that would enable less travel into Penticton.

The village has a lot of potential, residents would benefit from a selection of additional services. Naramata could use the commercial tax base to assist with community infrastructure improvements.

Provide jobs to people, create a community. It's a dismal day when we are trying to figure out 'where can we go to eat?'....then having to call the pub to first see if they are open, then ask if the kitchen is open today? then decide if we went below average service and food. Or if you want to spend \$200 on lunch go to the Naramata Inn for the same below average service and food. If there were carriage type homes and legal suites, there could be jobs available for summer jobs too.

Added charm plus needed services to contribute to Naramata's economy

this will provide employment options for our youth and increase the tax base while maintaining the rural character of Naramata. You can look at other small rural communities where a vibrant core both supports and adds to the tourist draw without ruining the natural attraction of the area

Supporting an environment where new small, local businesses can thrive is critical to the long term vibrancy of the community and strengthens the local feel of businesses. Current local businesses and services are a fantastic part of the fabric of Naramata. It would be great to see more!

Medium amount of commercial growth is welcomed, such as a small downtown core with a few apartments with commercial business below.

The village needs more amenities for residents.

It would be great to attract enough business that places could be open year-round.

Preservation of the hillsides and natural land, with a focus on building a vibrant core is the best of both worlds.

Make the village a jewel - with discreet, beautiful, interesting businesses that are both local and excellent. It can be vibrant without letting the tourists and big money and box names take over. I envision a culinary centre of excellence supported by fabulous wine and agricultural based businesses - all showcasing in the village but not letting the village be overtaken by commercial interests or tourists.

This is by far my favourite option. A vibrant village provides more local amenities year round for residents but is also a draw for tourism. Driving the bulk of growth and commercial development in the village allows Naramata to retain its rural feel with the farms and vineyard, but also strategically modernize. Very little impact in terms of lost views, etc. Increased density around the school is a good thing. More density will also support more local businesses.

A vibrant village is a good balance to benefit local residents and attract more tourists and visitors. This will also offer more opportunities for local residents.

We need more small businesses and services. Especially year round.

I would like more options of places to eat and shop in Naramata. I would like the area to be kept mostly unchanged but having more businesses in the village would be nice.

There is so much potential to make our village an amazing destination, create jobs, and have a vibrant community. Change is hard sometimes, but in this case, required to evolve.

Village centre has the capacity for more commercial businesses and services

Preserving agricultural land is important for food security and provides jobs. Development of the hillsides poses too much risk from fire and erosion. Existing food and other retail is not sufficient to foster informal gatherings and interactions with other residents.

Growth needs to be managed. No growth model is unrealistic but we do not want Naramata to become mainly a commercial "big box" center. Small unique artisan privately owned businesses should be encouraged.

Part of me likes the idea of walking down to the village and seeing it busy. It could be a great place for the community to meet, like a central square.

More commercial area of the village so we encourage and can support small businesses within walking distance, creating a vibrant healthy, community. A vibrant walking distance village will ensure that people can safely cross from a clothing store to a coffee shop and spend money at both. It means that people who live in the neighborhood can grab groceries and other necessities easily, so they'll probably visit nearby establishments more often. One new biz will encourage a new one & so on.

Attract more families and improve quality of life year-round

Retail spaces can improve the mix & livability of the village. I would like to see a year round vibrancy to the community and I want to see opportunities for young families to settle in Naramat

Given the popularity of Naramata as a holiday destination along with the Wineries along Naramata Bench, A more attractive Village core would be an asset!

So much opportunity to create a quant, thriving, vibrant destination village such as Sausalito, CA for example.

Vibrant Village is the best scenario to keep the agricultural rural value of the countryside, which has an influence on the economy and tourism, and to provide amenities for visitors and residents. It's a good choice for quality of life and people staying through the stages of family life.

Some additional vibrancy in the village can enhance community life.

It would be nice to see new businesses in the Village to attract more people. In addition, I like the thought of preserving our hillsides for wildlife as well as preserving the agricultural land.

This is my first choice. I think Naramata does need to grow and develop. It makes me sad when people up in Granite Estates state, "I haven't been down into the village for years, why? There's nothing there.

We actually have a vibrant village core, and there are people looking to spend money here in the summer months, we are missing out on an opportunity to bring even more jobs, and revenue into our community by not giving them more opportunities to stay and spend in the village.

It makes sense to allow more opportunities and make it easier for small businesses to flourish in Naramata. We are tourism based, let's let our neighbours benefit from the tourist and their tourism dollars.

It keeps people here year-round and attracts visitors year round. It also makes it a place where you want to come as a destination.

I think if we do it right the village could be an amazing place. I'm envisioning little european towns with town squares where vehicles are prohibited and pedestrians are prioritized. We could get more ground level restaurants and shops and the village would be an amazing place.

I would like to see some more development in the village with services and opportunities that make sense for residents and visitors, and MAINTAIN and build upon the core character of the village - small, unique and welcoming to all.

A vibrant village works if combined with successful commercial development. A good example is the Naramata Inn which is probably the biggest employer in the neighbourhood. Their biggest challenge is employee housing, and the seasonality of the Village.

I believe that future development with the village core would be most effective in developing a community that reduces GHG by sharing resources. A certain amount of development is okay.

Increase desirability as a day destination while preserving overall community structure. Opportunity for business and increased in-town tourist spend and positive impressions have benefits for residents

Vibrate village be if it's everyone. Summer jobs for youth, night activities for young adults, a larger sense of community and of course larger attraction for tourists that is without a doubt good for everyone.

The village of Naramata has the capacity to become a lively community, with commercial options, affordable housing, and a vibrant social mix. This will also support the school, and allow children to walk rather than being driven by their parents.

Sounds like a reasonable balance between new housing and commercial growth.

This 6 month village needs some more small business, school , recreation development to become year round more like a smaller version of Peachland or better yet like whisler village (smaller version) with small businesses down stairs and condos upstairs and tree lined park like walk ways.

We are only somewhat in favour. The beauty of our village, the strength of our community and the peacefulness is what sets us apart from other villages.

I think supporting the right sort of new small businesses and services in the village is a good idea as long as the foreshore areas and parks and streams are preserved and that we have the infrastructure to support any new growth in the village.

The Village needs to grow to service year round residents, to draw more residents, to create a decidedly Naramata town centre that works for residents and visitors. Not developing is leaving money and opportunity on the table and will ultimately be destabilizing. Keeping growth controlled, local, and meeting very high standards, while ensuring housing is within reach of staff and locals is essential. Adding services like a community centre, etc. means residents to take less trips to Pen.

It would be nice to have a vibrant village but NOT just that. There should be moderate & careful growth of multiple types where growth is allowed (not ALR).

Need more residential oriented commercial services that also supports modest tourism

This is the way forward. The village needs help.

I like this option the most as having lived here for 9 years and being an active member of the community I see the need for development of both residential and commercial properties. Concentration in the village is desirable as many of the people (seniors) would like to take advantage of local commercial and community services. Live local, buy local. I also see the need for increased density in residential properties for those who can not afford or do not need or desire a single home.

Letting market forces alone drive the creation of new businesses & services is a mistake. Some services that are only in Penticton should be here as densification increases. Likewise having some partially community funded retail spaces can improve the mix & livability of the village. If only market-driven, developer funded commercial spaces are created Naramata risks becoming a Dunderave in West Vancouver.

Vibrant Village will preserve all of Naramata's current attraction and charm, and enhance it by creating a village with the critical mass to attract new residents and businesses. Growth is inevitable, and Vibrant Village to the best way to accommodate growth while preserving the aspects of Naramata that we currently love.

This option will be best for building a unique and vibrant village at a cost that will be acceptable to most.

Naramata Village has such potential! There is just somethings lacking that make this a place people want to come, spend money and time in.

Our village is quaint but we require more year round residence to expand on what is truly a special place. A more vibrant and lively village centre can help achieve this.

Naramata is one of the most beautiful location and climate in Canada and compares also well with other beautiful parts of the world. A Vibrant Village would make our stay more pleasant for 12 months of the year by having more to offer and not just wait for the summer time to arrive to experience quality living. It would also make the community more attractive to all age groups. A vibrant Village would create more opportunities for people to meet and celebrate year round etc

In favor of a vibrant village - which I believe we have now.

I would like to see a year round vibrancy to the community and I want to see opportunities for young families to settle in Naramata - they will support the elementary school

A vibrant village will happen/is happening all by itself.....most of the technical pieces are already in place.

Con

Significant infrastructure cost

Cost should be borne by those who would gain financially. Puts stress on water and lake health; also exasperates the lack of parking. Will increase traffic and tourism on infrastructure that is inadequate already (i.e. Naramata Road).

Don't want to get too developed. Also cost should be borne by those who would gain financially from this

Few restrictions on commercial and business activity may strain the infrastructure. It also may be hard to control in the future. Without ability to increase affordable housing stock this may be a problem and also increase the traffic on Naramata road.

New infrastructure needed to support additional commercial and residential activity should be borne by the developer not the existing residents.

The cost of increased infrastructure required for additional commercial and residential activity is not split between developers and residents. The residents should not be underhandedly forced to pay for a few wealthy investors need to install a sewage treatment facility and the sewage system pipes which required to increase their new housing developments nor should the RDOS consider borrowing the money to put Naramata in debt in order to finance wealthy investors plans

Population density outstrip available services.

I'm slightly opposed because the infrastructure costs seem to be enormous and these are mainly for outsiders

We don't have the facilities or green spaces to accommodate double or triple the current population.

Infrastructure has to be expanded and improved. This should mostly being shouldered by the developer. Unless it is something the whole community has been waiting for.

Will increase traffic and tourism on infrastructure that is inadequate already

Building in this small area will require some form of sewage system, septic systems just won't work. One of Naramata's charms is its low density and lack of sidewalks and street lights.

More activity does mean more traffic on an already busy (& unsafe for cyclists) Naramata Rd.

Again, increasing the number of people in Naramata is going to stress out Naramata Road. That single winding road is the only way in and out of Naramata and any more growth would make that road even more dangerous than it is already

We need to adopt a model that places emphasis on developers having to contribute to the improvement of the local services and infrastructure as part of obtaining permits for their developments.

Residents should not be burdened with the additional costs.

I can't afford to pay for commercial developement expansion

Would like to keep taxes reasonably low. Do not want a reason for urban drug issues.

The cost implications to residents.

The possibility that a bunch of developers ruin the village atmosphere

That the citizens would have little or no say in how the village is developed.

Infrastructure concerns...sewage, garbage, traffic, crime and the ability to manage these issues.

More expansion means greater traffic along Naramata road, already almost non-stop traffic at the moment, noisy and getting more dangerous, with faster traffic and with greater problems for evacuation in emergencies.

The question of affordability, a vibrant village at what cost.

Too much focus on rapid village growth which increases crowding and puts stress on water and lake health. Also exasperates the lack of parking.

Residents should bear no financial burden.

Need to include affordable, local-focused housing

Developers will not target affordable housing. Need more housing focussed in the village to support new small retail/commercial service.

nice idea but will lead to an increase in real estate prices which will make it more difficult for some people to stay. Penticton not that far-better to increase commercial activity there and keep a small quaint commercial feeling in the village. More affordable for families

Current development isn't being done for locals. Seems like the wine vault owners want to come up with a plan to make a 2-month vacation town for their hot shot friends and will be a ghost town the rest of the year. If that's where this vibrant village idea goes then I don't think it will end well.

How can we build more small businesses if we don't have enough housing for people to work in them? I worry that this option is not realistic without moving housing into the hillsides, which I am staunchly not in favour of.

Developers will not target affordable housing.

If medium density housing is aimed at leisure and luxury market, the strategy will not deliver on the intended results.

We can barely support the commercial / small businesses that are here with the lack of year-round residents due to an over-abundance of short term rentals taking all of the affordable housing / rental options. We need more housing.

We love Naramata for its rural unique charm and tranquility. The development of a "Vibrant Village" will change Naramata into a boutique village, and a playground for the non resident wealthy. Any development to the village, MUST first consider the needs of the year round residents, and not embrace outside opportunistic endeavors.

Sounds like more people in the already busy & crowded 5 months of the year. With less housing to support locals more people would be commuting into the village to work for the new businesses.

the challenge is to develop in a way that doesn't die during off season. This is not an opposition to the VV, but rather a comment on how it is achieved.

Balanced, wide spread growth would be ideal with the goal of attracting all ages & interests of people to Naramata. But, they have to be able to make a living in Naramata without being limited to working part time in wineries or seasonal labouring in vineyards.

I think as a community we would love to have a vibrant village core, but this doesn't seem feasible all year as it doesn't take into account a need for places for people to live.

I am not actually opposed but feel the commercial interests should pay for their impact not the residents - many of whom cannot pay the new expected property tax hikes and I do not wish to see locals priced out. Nor do I since I live on the hill and have my own new septic system, wish to pay for a village septic system through taxes.

Need more housing focussed in the village to support new small retail/commercial service. The vibrant village is missing the provision of more housing options

Need growth elsewhere too

I don't think business or commercial activity should be limited to the village itself. Residential neighbourhoods are enhanced by corner stores and bistros.

We can't have just growth in the Village...it is a defined space and we don't want to take change the way of life people who live within the village enjoy

I don't think business or commercial activity should be limited to the village itself. Residential neighbourhoods are enhanced by corner stores and bistros.

Vibrancy will destroy the current village

Offensive to what Naramata actually is, a rural village with few amenities. You want just enough vibrancy to make the village desirable, but not so much that it becomes a haven for partiers and troublemakers.

Penticton is 20 minutes away. If you need services, go there. Once paved, the green never returns. Draw a ring around the village. You can develop inside, when that is done, we are full. They did it in Carmel, why can't we do that here? Exponential growth is the ideology of the cancer cell. Stop. We are full. We are already vibrant.

Channeling all growth the village is no different then Welcome the World just kept to one area. Few restrictions in village like Naramata is not a positive thing, in order to keep the delicate dynamic of a small village and community restrictions need to be as many as needed. if restrictions are opened up I believe Naramata will change and lose the village dynamic.

Vibrant village will destroy the present village.

Want the Village to maintain and retain its 'Village' atmosphere.

no need for more commerce which creates division noise light pollution and devalues existing commercial licenses

changing of community content

We don't want the commercialization or development and we will not prosper by it.

Keep the reasons we all like it.

This is tricky. You want just enough vibrancy to make the village desirable, but not so much that it becomes a haven for partiers and troublemakers.

Winter months cannot support a vibrant village commercial base and would look like a ghost town. Also our village core is already struggling with septic issues in Naramata and cannot keep up with adding more pressure on our creek delta with is the village core

What is currently happening to the current built environment in the "village" is not impressive.

I've been in Naramata (pt) for 60 years! I'd like to go back to the 70s!

I don't think the village needs more businesses and services. I value the peace and quiet of the area. Any businesses and services I need are already available in Penticton.

Few restrictions = damaged village and its charm.

Small prioritized growth, but managed will with the emphasis on ECO / green developments. NEW ways to source resources, like solar, wind, etc. Only new and zero emissions should be pursued !

We moved to the area because of the charm of the village as it exists. Turning it into a mini Wine Whistler is offensive to what Naramata actually is, a rural village with few amenities.

Worried about the type of commercial that will come in. I so love our "small town feel", worried that this could be destroyed.

Few restrictions on commercial activity will destroy the peaceful nature of the village. Residents should not have to pay for the services required by developers.

The village character of Naramata is threatened by this option. Developers get a lot of political power through their financial contribution, taxes.

Honestly to say I'm in favour of Vibrant Village would be because I'm somewhat selfish as well as talking out of both sides of my mouth. I love the idea of having shops, restaurants and good grocery shopping in the village. Perfect for me, I can walk there for all my needs, however; on the other side I want things to progress slowly and with thought. I don't want to lose the lovely rural village feel. In saying all this I guess I would be somewhat opposed. Wow, this is tough.

Developers and commercial interests will fundamentally and forever change this beautiful place.

We already have a vibrant village.

I live in the village and I feel safe and in a small community without the problems of higher city living and I would hate for the village to be bursting at the seams.

With few restrictions, there is a risk of the area becoming over-developed and losing the rural character.

I believe it will ultimately destroy the quality of life that makes Naramata special.

Very unappealing to me. This model will turn Naramata into a hip show piece.

Our village is already vibrant in the summer when all the summer residents and tourists are here. In the winter Naramata is a sleepy village, and residents do their shopping in Penticton.

I like it being the Quaint village it is now.

The town is too small to host additional tourists, overcrowding is not enjoyable for residents

lets keep our area small

We don't need to increase commercialism in the village. It takes away from what we have already.

Village can not handle additional vehicular traffic and beaches are already full in summer; we do not need commercial chains

Need controls on the amount and type of businesses

We do not want big box stores and chain franchises in the Village. We don't want to put commercial in the wrong places. The small businesses would need to fit into the Naramata charm.

Moderately opposed. Once you open the doors with few restrictions, developers and business owners will flock to this beautiful area and the pressure for more housing will follow. Opens the doors to pressure on the residents to grow.

Commercial flexibility must be available so "mom and pops" and small scale local artisans have an opportunity to shine and make money alongside deeper pocketed business' that can more readily afford the price of rent or commercial space.

I see no down side to this option, but it should be coupled with a rational option for increased housing. Although feasibility is not to be discussed, I believe that the major obstacle to this option is the economic viability that always accompanies seasonality of businesses.

Naramata is a slow city and growth development policies should be adhered to match the slow city principals.

Relatively few restrictions on commercial activity to attract new small businesses and services - restrictions need to be in place here. We do not want big box stores and chain franchises in the Village. We don't want to put commercial in the wrong places within the Village and I don't want to see any green space in the Village being replaced with commercial.

I would be concerned over what controls would exist on the types of businesses allowed to be set up. I would not want the village to become a small suburbia and be over-run with cars etc.

I would want there to be controls on what kind of businesses could be added - so some restrictions would need to be in place. All to keep the smaller town wine/food/agriculture/lake resort feel. The trip to Penticton can be easily made to go to larger businesses and services. Adding some smaller businesses for professionals (doctors, health care

We need to have restrictions on what services and shops fit in with the future of a small village.

Naramata does not need chain stores and restaurants

Not sure what "relatively few restrictions on commercial activity" means in terms of location of businesses in the village (should be on Robinson or close by), height of new commercial buildings, etc. Need clearer picture on this. Also, we should make developers bear the cost of infrastructure improvements (eg. sewer) to the extent possible and extract additional concessions in the form of community amenities from developers (COV does this effectively).

Need restrictions on commercial development to maintain the village life and culture (this is not a city or a suburb). This is why we have chosen to live here and not Penticton or Kelowna. Concerned about the influence of developers (e.g., as is evident in developments like Outlook, Stonebrook, Vista, etc) which have been poorly designed and environmentally damaging.

We need to limit travel until we can move with environmentally friendly methods. As well tourism revolves around wine and grapes. We need to encourage self reliance in our food supply. Welcome the world is not sustainable and will eventually collapse.

It depends on what restrictions are in place for commercial activity. I support restrictions on short-term rentals, but there are many other types of commercial activity.

need some restrictions on commercial activity

It would be nice to see the village refreshed a bit but not to increase much in size or density.

there should be substantial control over the growth and commercial activity so as to keep the village a village for the residents and not for the tourist. The developer should pay 100% of all cost caused by their commercial development

Potentially increasing commercial activity needs to be prudently allowed, in other words not too much too fast. Naramata is a jewel, and we must preserve its charm while allowing it to grow in a carefully considered way.

I would want to understand further what the buildings of new commercial areas would look like. I think we need to be careful to keep it feeling like a small village.

However, not in favour of relatively few restrictions on commercial activity to attract new small businesses and services. Would the residents want 4 nail salons in the village or chain-stores like Popyes?

Would only be opposed if massive subdivisions and big box stores were allowed.

I don't want it to end up like every other town. I would hope that the businesses would have to pass a test of some kind before being allowed to establish.

I do not trust that commercial development within the village core with few restrictions would lead to a improved village. What control do we have that convenience stores and other unnecessary commercial activities would not take over the village. For the most part, we already have what we need.

I'm opposed to the relatively few restrictions in this proposal. Naramata is such a small and unique place I think commercial development should have a thoughtful plan with guiding restrictions for aesthetics, functionality, fairness. No big box stores or global chains. No mass parking lots for Walmarts etc.

The small businesses would need to fit into the Naramata charm.

I am not in favour of the phrase "relatively few restrictions"

I enjoy living in the village because of neighbours, friends and fellow community members who live here. I don't want to be surrounded by vacation rentals.

"few restrictions" always makes me nervous, as do absolutes like "all growth channeled to the village." As someone who lives up on the bench, it doesn't seem fair to have a NIMBY approach.

Relatively few restrictions on commercial conjures up strip mall type commercial. Development. I would like to see a vibrant village core with mid-level expansion of businesses that fit with the existing character of the village.

im in favour of a vibrant village but the definition i have is much different than this one. There needs to be controls over the pace and amount of commercial activity. I want "dark sky" in naramata, the amount of coffee shops/restaurants/general store does not matter to me. For the most part they cater to the more financially affluent and tourists

Some restrictions must be in place for new business. Definitely NOT in favour of fast-food franchises.

Scenario: Housing-Focused Village Growth

Pro

Creates opportunities for affordable housing

Long term residents of this area can't afford to live here. We need to create smart density to allow families and young people to live here. We need more housing suitable to summer workers and young families.

This is a viable option to keep the community from being hollowed out demographically.

We need amenities for ourselves as well for the tourism industry.

To attract affordable housing and welcome young families

We need housing that is affordable.

Affordable housing continues to be an issue in the village as elsewhere. I think more housing for permanent residents is more desirable than short-term rentals for the profit.

I am in favor of this as long as the extra suites and housing can attract families. Can have more people financially able to move to Naramata and live here. I'm happy to have vacation homes as I understand the beauty of the area and the draw for those who can afford it to have a home here. However I am far more interested in building long time, established neighborhoods and permanent residents. Again tough question as I believe you need bits of it all in order to create balance.

Mostly in favor. If we are creative with the funding models I think having a market rental component can offset only a tax & fee model burden.

Legal suites and carriage houses allow owners to make some money which in turn allows more people to be able to afford to remain here or to buy here. Prices in Naramata are high and the opportunity to have a mortgage helper allows families and seniors to remain here.

I would like to see more affordable housing.

We love Naramata for its rural character, friendly neighborhood and family friendly vibe. With more commercial activity, we get more job options for Naramata residents, families and seniors.

Housing is a hot button issue especially with an aging population. All property in the village should have the opportunity (given proper sewage / septic system) to have a carriage home or secondary suite. Allowing seniors to stay in their home by having a caregiver or family member nearby. This can also be an opportunity for parents to assist their children.

Affordable housing needs to be available in Naramata so that there that the work force that keeps the infrastructure of the town working and vibrant can afford to live and stay in Naramata.

There is always a shortage of housing for single persons and families. Many people have had to move from the village for this reason. A sewage treatment system is the number 1 problem in the village, this needs priority before any growth in the village

Agree with some quality development of housing for families and people who work in Naramata area. Agree with relatively little change in commercial development.

I agree that more affordable housing options are necessary

There needs to be AFFORDABLE housing created in the community

More housing is needed, rental housing is almost nil

increasing density in the Village area will support a Vibrant Village and a walk-able community; the Catholic Church group needs to be pushed to either sell or renovate/redevelop their land holdings. Their properties are wasted space and an eye-sore.

Because the village is already our dense housing area and more affordable options are desperately needed for families and workers.

We need more affordable housing for restaurant and vineyard workers. we should encourage young families to move here. The more families with school aged children the better.

There is no longer anywhere for the regular working person to live in or around Naramata. We don't want to be a resort town.

we need enough young families with affordable housing so we can keep our school open, and young men for the fire department.

Support this if the focus is on affordable housing ad smaller homes. Carriage houses are great

Allows for the addition of accommodation for seasonal workers and tourists.

Affordable housing is important for Naramatians.

There are many undeveloped lots and run down houses that would be nice to improve. People need places to live, and it makes sense to provide options for legal suites and carriage houses as this is most efficient land use while still preserving the existing character of the area.

Current housing opportunities are inadequate.

For younger people, this is the only strategy that helps make a wonderful place like naramata accessible.

Yes this is one of my two preferred routes foward. the 2021 census shows our population is decreasing - bucking the trend elsewhere which must mean that the new homes are being bought by out of owners (for rental/commercial) or we are loosing families and with our school and community we need to reverse that trend.

In favour of more housing in the village including carriage houses (also outside the village)

I think our community is suffering in Naramata as there are fewer and fewer people who want to live and work in Naramata full time because housing is so out of reach. The people are neighbours and people who work locally are a huge part of making this a good place to live.

Housing is at a premium throughout the Okanagan, and is exorbitantly expensive. Increased supply may help drive this down.

A "neutral" answer in the previous section somehow has put me into a position of saying....I am in favour of both housing focused Village growth as well as in favour of housing focused highland/rural growth.

Prefer to have more affordable housing and greater density of modest and small homes in the village than to have more relatively undisturbed land be cleared and developed for unfettered growth on the hillsides above Naramata. This will help to continue to create a walkable community in the village, and reduce vehicle use.

We need to preserve and conserve natural areas and native habitat.

I am not opposed to thoughtful, character appropriate growth in the village commercial area.

New affordable options for young families to live here year round is the best way forward and maintaining the wonderful sense of community we have here.

We need to have a diverse housing supply. Currently only 5 homes for sales on MLS average price over \$2.8 million.

Need to add to our tourist attractions & amenities and accommodations . Encourage investment!!!

I think the idea of allowing more legal secondary suites and carriage houses is brilliant!!!

The first part of this description talks about legal suites and carriage houses. Those of us who own homes in Naramata are experiencing the increased cost of living (like everyone else). Relaxing restrictions on these #1. offers cash-flow opportunity for owners #2. opens up more accommodations for tourists = drives local economy. It would need to go hand-in-hand with reducing the restrictions on commercial activity.

Housing is very important. For families, for employee housing, workers in Naramata. There is a lot of undeveloped land and housing that could be repurposed

more affordable housing options

It seems to propose allowing more people staying at one house. Renting rooms, etc. That could help better a tight housing market for seasonal employees. Also more jobs.

Would like to see new opportunities for legal suites and carriage home in the ALR including land parcels that are 1 acre in size.

Families sh have a chance to live in this great community

My friends can no longer afford to live here.

We need more housing suitable to summer workers and young families. Instead of over priced townhouses now in evidence, why not a "tiny home" village on that site that would actually service the community better than the part time monied crowd.

A cross section of people are needed for any vibrant community. With recent increase in prices having additional housing options is desirable.

I would be in favour of housing-focused village growth provided there are clear guidelines when it comes to design, form and character. Would love to see more long term rentals available for individuals and families that are being forced out of the community due to the lack of available housing and investors buying up the real estate market. There needs to be a cap on volume as well.

I have a son who has grown up in the village and can not afford the be able to return to the village to raise his family. Sewers would allow for increased density and more affordable housing.

There are not enough housing options in Naramata, and local businesses (as well as young families) are struggling. Building up into the hillside will completely decimate the look and feel of Naramata, so developing housing in the village makes the most sense.

Affordable housing in the village is required for healthy families.

Long term residents of this area can't afford to live here. We need to create smart density to allow families and young people to live here and this is really the only way to do it

We need to provide year round affordable housing. This will help to provide employees for existing and new businesses. Affordable housing will ensure we have a varied socioeconomic population, including young families in turn keeping our school open.

I think the village growth needs to address affordable housing for medium income people as it has traditionally. The growth of huge expensive properties is NOT "maintaining the rural character" as stated in the OCP. There need to be far fewer second homes or vacation properties. The village would;d be more vibrant with more full time residents.

Mildly in favour. Will give residents a way to finance their lives with rising costs of living and taxes.

if there is a need to increase the housing in the village this is the best of the options. However and increase in fees and taxes to support the infrastructure needed should be on account of the developers who profit from the development not the general population for whom there is no or little advantage.

Only if the housing is controlled and attractive to lower earners

Some extra housing may be necessary.

Additional density and housing stock is vital for Naramata.

Providing housing choices means that we will have a healthy and vibrant community that encourages families at all stages of life to be a part of our community

I support increasing housing to provide more affordable opportunities for local residents. Such growth should come with a requirement to live year round in the community.

We need more affordable housing and creative housing solutions in Naramata to support and maintain a Community. Without people living and working in the community the "community" will cease to exist. We are already under pressure to house people who carry out core community service functions, like playschool teachers and people who work in our local businesses.

Only if it is designed for fixed or lower income residents. Let people add suites and carriage houses for affordable rentals. Conversely, the new townhouses by the Wine Vault do not serve the housing needs of this community. Once again, these will likely be seasonally empty investment properties whose owners contribute nothing to the community. Walk the KVR in the winter and count how many dark, empty houses just sit in the KVR Suburbia.

Relaxation of bylaws to accommodate workers housing. End all vacation rentals.

Building monster homes and turning them into vacation rentals is pricing regular families out of the village and Naramata area.

We need more affordable housing in Naramata to support the commercial and agricultural activity that is currently here.

There is definitely a need for smaller housing in Naramata to accommodate young families and single workers who don't need a 4,000 sq ft house.

huge vote for more carriage housing. We are desperately in need of affordable housing for full agricultural and seasonal workers

Reality is that the world is changing, places change, and this is good for the overall health of the community. The option with commercial and housing growth is best, but this option is good. Infrastructure and the fact that it is one single road in and out are concerns, but nothing that can't be overcome.

In hopes that some of the homes could be affordable to live here so folks who work here could perhaps also live here.

Every community needs to replenish its aging population with new individuals but not at the expense of increased population growth with no infrastructure in place to sustain it over the off-season when tourists are not present

Leaves hillsides and agriculture intact/ focuses growth to the core

Thoughtfully allowing densification in the village would provide room without disrupting the landscape. It is smarter and better to place housing in the village than to sprawl over the hillsides or destroy precious agricultural land.

I would like to see some carriage houses but I don't want huge building in the village again it takes away what is great about Naramata being a village

the housing component is smart, affordable, and doable without mass of design. IT allows current property owners to benefit from adding density. it preserves the hillsides.

Some increase in housing in Village is acceptable.

Any new development should concentrate in the village NOT the hillsides. Moderate allowance for new homes for families in the village, and any new infrastructure to be borne by the developers

We need to limit travel until we can move with environmentally methods. As well tourism revolves around wine and grapes. We need to encourage self reliance in our food supply. Welcome the world is not sustainable and will eventually collapse. Without housing where will people live.

in favor for preservation of hillsides & agricultural land & minimal change to commercial activity.

I believe we need this in addition to a vibrant downtown area. I also believe the majority of costs must be borne by the developer and that the taxpayers don't need to subsidize the developers.

Better housing in the village creates a better community that has a focal point.

Development needs to not happen in virgin or agricultural lands. By keeping housing growth focused on already developed lands like the Naramata Village we can preserve the biodiversity, our water ways (rives and streams) and agricultural lands. Naramata Village would benefit from mixed housing like carriage homes, and town houses.

The village is already developed so no virgin or agricultural lands are being threatened or effected however the foreshore needs to be better protected. it would good to see affordable housing in the village with mixed use types of housing such as town houses and carriage houses so more young people and young families can move to the area.

Highly appreciated vet of preserving hillsides and agricultural lands. Approve of carriage houses and legal suites - more affordable full-time rental housing needed in our village.

This is an agricultural community and the conflict between housing and agriculture is increasing. The land reserve will stay in tact and it should be strongly defended. Keeping housing village centered is the best approach. There are limits to capacity and agriculture plays a role in determing those limits, for the good of the future

Housing is important and is already generally developed so if there is something the preserve why not preserver the hill sides.

There is a lot of underutilized land in the village

Like the preservation of the hillside and the agricultural lands

The village is a real community with true heart. Don't destroy it - support and strengthen it, including the church(es), school and community amenities. And the Naramata Centre.

Housing is needed for residents and workers. Thoughtfully allowing densification in the village would provide room without disrupting the landscape

Agricultural land and natural hillsides are essential in preserving the unique nature of the area. There is space in the village to create more housing which is greatly needed. Better infrastructure is also desperately needed.

In order to limit "sprawl" and to place emphasis on our village centre.

It preserves the hillside and agricultural nature of the area

Preserve the hillsides, do we really need carriage houses or legal suites? Keep Naramata small.

Promoting legal suites and legal carriage houses will be good for the village, promoting more accommodations while minimally densifying the village. The flip side to this is in order to increase housing, we look at duplex/4-plex, apartment buildings etc. This would completely change the look and feel of Naramata forever so carriage houses and suites are a great alternative

Growth is inevitable, so it must be managed. If nothing else, new residents are going to need housing. It is smarter and better to place housing in the village than to sprawl over the hillsides or destroy precious agricultural land.

Need to be respectful of development as we don't want the Naramata hillside looking like the Northshore in Vancouver or the hillside of Coquitlam

Preferable to building on the hillside

I agree with keeping the most part of the growth to the village. I assume some of the infrastructure changes in this would include sidewalks and improved roads and road maintenance in the area.

Housing growth in the village .

It will make for a better more vibrant community with more living in the village. If we can re-zone to multi-family and carriage houses in the village we can offer homes for the young families and elderly that can't afford the single family zoned houses.

Preservation of hillsides and natural land, with a focus of housing in the village
We need more housing for workers

This allows for growth, and I can see there is a need for accommodation.

we need more housing in the entire area. Better to densify the village than sprawl in to the hill which will increase fire risk and encourage people into vehicles . Living space in a village makes for a more vibrant community. It will mean kids can walk to school too. Some commercial activity is good but a balance is needed. Affordability for housing is a huge issue these days whether rental or ownership

The village is the epicentre of Naramata so we need to ensure housing is sufficient for all....but especially young families!

I like village housing development with suites and carriage houses

Focus on local, full-time residents and balance

We do need to avoid the 'empty house' syndrome. I just can not see housing growth with without other infrastructure requirements.

permanent housing for families and workers is important for sustainability of keeping Naramata village vibrant and keeping our school open.

I favour increased housing, but the density must be carefully controlled. Few if any residents want the village to turn into a sea of short term rental condos and townhomes. Focus should be on reasonably affordable housing (the the extent that is at all possible) so that families can continue to enjoy the community.

If there must be growth let it be in the village and let the developers pay for the infrastructure

Developing a community with long term residents in close proximity establishes ties that bind, shared values and effort to improve the location we inhabit. The goal would be to maintain the sense of place but provide the opportunity to grow a local presence in the Village.

If housing were to be developed in a small portion of Naramata Centre land, I would not be opposed, but not to build on residential or park property.

Need the increase in housing to be balanced with an increase in commercial retail

We need more housing in Naramata that is at a smaller scale than 5 acre properties. This could encourage families to move here and provide housing options for employees. We do need to avoid the 'empty house' syndrome with some controls on vacation rental properties that allow full time residents in a suite or carriage house as is done in tourism communities like Tofino and Whistler.

I like the idea of legal suites and carriage houses. Just worried that these will all become vacation rentals. We don't need any more of these. Also, this would favour properties that are not yet developed, or have "old timers" on them. Many residents would not be able to take advantage of these provisions. I like the idea of additional longer term rental available on existing properties, just not sure how that could be done fairly.

Housing is limited in Naramata and growth here is necessary, however, with housing growth there will need to be growth in the commercial sector - so this is why I am slightly on the fence about this initiative.

I love the idea of more housing in the village, but can't see it happening as long as we are on septic, hard to put a carriage house in on septic, the cost is too great. But we definitely need more reasonably-priced and long term rentals in Naramata to support workers, families, and those who wish to grow old here.

We have a beautiful school just waiting for young children. When the village is full of young families it feels vibrant. It is an idyllic place for children to grow up, in the safety of a friendly village.

This would be preferable to the development of condos and commercial buildings. the two best things that could happen to Naramata are if the church started to sell and share their land they don't need or at least take care of the homes on the land and rent them out. the second is having a sewage system in Naramata to get off septic fields and build town/row housing and carriage homes.

If increased housing creates more housing for young families then yes , but if increase density generates housing not suitable for families then no . Developers should pay 100% if their development causes infrastructure is needed to be upgraded to accommodate them .. Increase housing density in the village must at the moment be septic systems within the legal lot (type 3 systems must be the stand system in the village) which will be hard in most case .

sorry I just can not see housing growth with without other infrastructure requirements. Infrastructure is needed so we don't need to drive to Penticton many times for a nice cup of coffee when one needs it .

"for residents only "the area is becomming Air B&B destroyed. Locals are having trouble affording real-estate for their families due to B&Bs driving up prices. we NEED housing for people that live here not tourists and out of town owners!
property needs to be for people that live here.

Increasing the population of the village (as long as it is not over built) will benefit the current small businesses within the village and surrounding orchards, wineries, etc. There should always be a balance between housing and businesses needs.

I was born and raised in naramata, and have seen what uncontrolled vacation rentals is doing to the community. If this issue is not fixed or better maintained, We will lose families and long time Patriots to the village that make it so special.

Additional housing may be needed and I believe that development in the village itself is acceptable with strict adherence to zoning and the community plan. Limits to height, size and type of development within the village should be directed by the community. I support strict limits on further development of the hillsides and agricultural lands. More controlled development in the village allows for a more sustainable way of life- less waste, shared spaces, resources and transportation.

The biggest landowner in the Village is the Naramata Centre. The Centre site is under utilized and the organization needs help to diversify so that the entire Village benefits. Such a plan might be realized though this option.

Some housing is very valuable but not at the expense of a vibrant village.

It would allow people to build income with relatively little change to the village but increase available housing and tourism

Moderately in favour, I like the emphasis on helping with new housing for young families and workers (although I would extend some housing to the hillsides). However, if we restrict the commercial activities too much, we will not provide jobs for people and will not attract the young families and workers we need to be vibrant and whole.

Naramata needs families to keep our school open and to provide volunteers for our fire department.

Con

Need more businesses and services in addition to housing

Housing needs to come with jobs. Would make it necessary for village inhabitants to have to seek employment outside of Naramata. To keep the village healthy, we need to have amenities in place.

We need more commercial business in Naramata village.

We need more commercial vibrancy. Existing taxpayers should not carry the full burden. This is the compromise position that will please no-one in the long term

I like the idea of some increase in the vibrancy of the town centre.

Needs to be supported by commercial activity.

Without more commercial services, Naramata is simply a bedroom community to Penticton, with endless car trips back and forth to town.

I believe increasing households without adding to the services that would assist their lifestyle would reduce the quality of life in the Village rather than enhance it.

I think commercial growth of services need to compliment housing / residential growth. Once people are in Naramata they should be able to park their cars and it be walkable and self sufficient

Not in favour of restricting new commercial activity. New businesses would be attractive to visitors and residents alike.

Village could use a few more amenities

Housing growth without commercial growth weakens Naramata's independence and makes it more of a suburb of Penticton. This increases the number of people commuting to Penticton, which increases emissions of greenhouse gases by cars. That makes Naramata part of the problem, rather than the solution.

I would like to see the commercial opportunities grow. The tourism industry provides jobs for our locals, as well as financial support for our small businesses.

There is no point in having just housing if you want balanced, moderate growth. You need some commercial growth as well or Naramata will continue as an unsustainable bedroom community.

Increasing the village housing density without a change in the commercial vibrancy would make it necessary for village inhabitants to have to seek employment outside of Naramata.

What's the point of allowing for residential development without additional services? The village has great potential. Just a few extra shops / essential services would be required to support community growth.

Because I think we also need more commercial space to support the people who do and will call Naramata home.

The Village has to have higher density as approximately one-third of the homes are seasonal. It is contradictory to build housing for workers, but not open up for commercial development that would likely be a natural complement to more residential space. The Naramata Centre is the largest land owner in the Village, and its space is grossly under utilized. Financial constraints keep the Centre from developing a go forward plan, and now might be the time for developers to intercede.

It is only one piece of the puzzle. With soaring housing prices, a sole focus here is also naive. It needs a commercial partner to make financial sense.

Concept is too limiting on providing more commercial vitality to the village

Housing needs to come with jobs or you just end up with seasonal housing that clogs the area at the best times of year for permanent residents. DO NOT bank on work from home being a long-term normal. Too many people who work outside of the village will cause traffic or seasonal bottle necks. It MUST occur in conjunction with job creation and creating lots of jobs will be tough so not too many new houses in the village.

What's the point of increased housing if there is no commercial vibrancy in the village to support it?

I am not opposed to this scenario, however I don't agree that adding legal suites and carriage housing comes at the expense of commercial activity. In fact I think this type of housing (with restrictions on short term rental) is necessary, in order to support commercial activity. If infrastructure improvements are required to facilitate this type of infill, I do not feel increase in taxes is the only way to facilitate. P3 funding models could be considered in this scenario.

"Commercial vibrancy" (as it is so quaintly being labelled) is absolutely necessary to preserve and promote community identity in tandem with people being able to make a living in our community. Think the Naramata Co-op in the heyday of the fruit industry. Without commercial growth, Naramata becomes even more of a bedroom community for Penticton.

I think there is some room for an increase in commercial activity in the village, but again maintaining a quite way of life. For example Ashley's little coffee shop has been a wonderful addition to the village.

Should include commercial growth for the reasons stated above. Costs should be borne by the developer/owner in permits and fees, and community for services like power, water and sewer.

I feel like that additional housing needs to be supported with some commercial growth.

Housing growth without some commercial development to support the growth will just lead to increased traffic as everyone goes to Penticton for goods and services.

Increasing housing without a corresponding increase in commercial activity and amenities would create an unbalanced community.

Without commercial growth, the community will stagnate and housing is only part of what is needed.

It lack development options for some commercial services that are needed by the residents which leads to more traffic on the Naramata Rd etc. etc.

We mustn't lose sight of the fact that to keep the village healthy, we need to have amenities in place to keep the village vibrant to a lesser degree during the off-season. Not everyone leaves Naramata to head south for 8 months of the year

There should be a mix of commercial and residential growth. Residential complexes should be developed more tastefully than the townhouse complex on Ellis - those exteriors are underwhelming/lack charm. There is no need to allow additional building on single family lots in the village, except perhaps small suites over garages. There is no need or desire for increased density in a rural setting.

Disagree with restricting or little change in commercial vibrancy. Even though Naramata is more residential and agriculture, I see no reason why we should be against commercial growth. Too much black and white scenarios presented. There might be an ideal commercial business which could fit well into our community.

I am not a fan of how you have presented the options.

With more commercial activity, we get more job options for Naramata residents, but also more traffic. Naramata Road is not able to take on more traffic. If we get more legal suites and carriage houses, we get more seasonal residents and vacation homes. They don't contribute to the infrastructure.

I would like to see some more businesses in the village.

As presented, it limits commercial opportunities, which I believe should accompany housing related approaches. I do not, however, want high-density development.

I don't think that the growth should ONLY be for housing. There should be growth in other businesses to support a growth in the housing. What would the demographic of new residents be? Where would they be working? Some thought is needed here.

I think that we will need some commercial activity that could be supported by business and residents

Housing is also an employment issue and for people to live here they must also be able to have gainful employment here, so commercial opportunities must also be available.

With residential growth comes an absolute need for more commercial services. To provide only housing and no services does not make sense.

I like the growth of housing and accomodation, however this needs to be balanced with commercial growth in the village. Commercial growth = jobs and work oppotunities for younger. families

Commercial vibrancy is a must to attract investment!

I don't know why more permanent housing would necessarily limit commercial vibrancy. More permanent residents would support more retail businesses.

Will require additional infrastructure to support more housing

I am concerned that large housing developments will push us to move to sewers. Infrastructure and Naramata road are over their limit now.

Sewers are a hot topic here! I am concerned that large housing developments will push us to move to sewers and make everyone else pay for it.

Infrastructure and Naramata road are over their limit now.

I would like assurance that increased taxes would actually support the infrastructure

Adding extra housing results in more cars and more traffic.

Additional housing will require expensive infrastructures(sewer system), taxes will increase and drives out the younger population.

Unless managed properly, this would become an unwieldy mess. Have you seen Vancouver, Surrey, Langley etc? The density and the number of cars vying for parking on the street.

More tax expense..slow growth

Not necessarily in favour of huge capital cost government infrastructure projects that will add so much to our taxes that already go up every year.

Septic issues in the village core already

Do not want growth to ruin the village character

May alter the character of the village for the worse. Growth can happen in Penticton which is very close by. The village would change the quaintness that visitors love!

we will lose the small community feel if the village is overrun with multi-family complexes. The few green areas we have are all ready becoming over crowded

The core area of Naramata village is a mix of older homes which is one of the attractiveness for visitors from the crowded cities. To increase the density of the population in the village would change the quaintness that visitors love!

Why is the expectation that a small village/rural town with an aging population be expected to solely address a national problem?

This rationale appears to be a juxtaposition, as if the local area's needs can only be solved by limited local resources?

Housing is great in the Village now.

I am worried it could become a "exurban" area for Penticton or even Kelowna. As in part 1 of the survey people like the community feeling of Naramata. If it is a commuting community then Naramata road problems will increase as well.

Village should remain a Village. Growth can happen in Penticton which is very close by.

May alter the character of the village for the worse if housing developments like the Anna St development becomes the norm?

no room for more housing anyway. but more family homes are needed not commerce

There is not enough space in this village for more housing without becoming over crowded and turning present housing into more condensed accommodations is overtly invasive for the residents who chose to live in a peaceful, quiet residential neighborhood - not commercial tourist accommodation resorts. Plus, all housing development is extremely noisy activity in an otherwise peaceful , quiet neighborhood ..

Cannot allow the growth to be significant and destroy the village.

There needs to be a balance. I hear constantly on unaffordable housing which makes these low income localers very unwelcoming to new arrivers. If people have made personal choices on careers etc, its unreasonable to point fingers at those who have made other decisions in their lives to afford housing. Naramata is beautiful, do we want it full of low income renters?

I am not confident of the process that controls growth. If it is to be acceptable , the Naramata community needs to be in control of zoning and development.

I do t want to see a huge increase in housing in the village. Keep the monstrosity of buildings up in the hill. It doesn't fit the aesthetic of the village or the feel of small community.

Keep Naramata small.

Terrible idea, we need less, not more people and their destructive behavior

Naramata's role is NOT to be a bedroom community for Penticton. Naramata Rd. already too busy with the recent population growth.. this traffic will make cycle-touring of wineries even less safe.

I like the Village the size it is now.

I live in the village and already see too much growth and activity that is unwanted. illegal suites/b&b/absent home owners all make living in the village undesirable. put more money into ensuring all vacation suites/rental are registered/licensed and put a cap on how many we can have in naramata. It makes more sense to disperse housing throughout the area and not congest the village.

I would be in favour of a Housing-focused village growth strategy if, along with that, came a plan for maintaining the look and feel of the existing village center and not growing too much. Part of what makes Naramata "Naramata" is the energy it emits through its quiet streets and unique houses/structures.

There is peacefulness in the sleeper community feel.

Don't believe there is a need for more housing in the village. And more housing probably also means more vacation rentals - another trend which does not serve to protect what makes Naramata special.

I like the village the way it is and do not want to see a lot of housing developments which will increase traffic etc

this would result in turning Naramata into just another a bedroom community ruining the natural charm of the area

I am in favour of the present growth rate of Naramata.

We live in the village. We have to drive 15 km to town to have access to services , stores and sports/cultural facilities. It's a trade off for living in a quiet low density neighborhood, with low traffic and reasonable levels of taxation.

The village is busy enough; AFFORDABLE housing needs to be distributed beyond the village

Concerned that housing and fees will not be affordable

The only people building are building homes my friends cant afford. Have concern about tdevelopment that is not for the average resident.

the only people building are building homes my friends cant afford

I think that a subdivision on the hillside is reasonable if thought (and cost) is given to fitting the lots to the existing topography, perhaps similar to Stonebrook. High density may be the rage in cities but Naramata is rural. Given the average price in the area I question if "low income developments" are realistic if not a pipe dream.

I'm not opposed to additional housing, but I dislike the terms "taxes and fees" to cover these costs. I renovated and the fees were outrageous. Never again.

Have concern about the influence of developers and development that is not for the average resident but for people who will treat it only as a vacation location and not contribute to a positive community culture.

This does t make sense. Would think if there's commercial development everyone's taxes should decrease due to larger tax base.

The huge vacant hole, with yet to be determined purpose, which exists in the village next to the Naramata Store, needs to be openly discussed first. Not sure that the well over million dollar townhomes, currently under construction in the area , are what would constitute a "Village" community; more of a luxury ghetto.

Need controls and restrictions on use/types of housing

There should not be a free-for-all when it comes to allowing more legal suites and carriage houses - primarily in the way of use. Wish that there was a plan for new build to be in keeping with its neighbours. I am opposed to more vacation rentals where the rental is stand alone and owners are not on the property.

There should not be a free-for-all when it comes to allowing more legal suites and carriage houses - primarily in the way of use. I am not okay with Naramata being completely overrun with vacation rentals. We want to create a vibrant community and that means people who are living here full time.

Risk of imbalance between residents and businesses/day visitors.

I think my main concern is that further development along the foreshore is handled with care as it's already a degraded and fragile eco-system and if anything requests more foreshore conversation efforts by making sure waterfront homeowners adhere to green shore principals by naturalizing the foreshore related to their waterfront properties.

I'm not opposed to housing focused village growth but the housing should have a strong green infrastructure focus to protect our streams and foreshore.

for long term rentals only not monthly or weekly

Wish that there was a plan for new build to be in keeping with its neighbours. No mega houses next to original ranchers. Things should blend.

Naramata seems to be gentrifying therefore I think the type of housing would need to be monitored.

It might not work out the way I'm expecting it to. We likely will attract a lot more tourists, and that won't help the housing situation.

I am not opposed in principle but I would not like the Naramata centre lands to be sold to create suburban style subdivisions. We need to maintain rural density while making homes affordable for families.

I do not understand why my taxes would increase with notably more people moving to the area paying taxes with this plan? I do not want to see too much community growth with families that are just rental house to rental house type tenants. Prefer long lasting families.

I fear that instead of offering an opportunity for affordable housing, it just becomes a cash cow for those with existing properties.

Extra units become vacation rentals I would be opposed.

Most new housing in the village is being used as a vacation home or as vacation rental. This is creating a 'dark' village during off season. There are too many temporary use permits issued .

I would like to see more affordable housing, more seniors' housing and more rental accommodation. I am opposed to more vacation rentals where the rental is stand alone and owners are not on the property.

We absolutely do not want a village filled with vacation rentals. This would destroy our vibrant little community, but could easily happen if we are not thoughtful on how to do this well.

Naramata is already a seasonal Village. More housing with no facilities will make it worse.

Scenario: Preserve and Conserve

Pro

Keeps taxes low

Little development of infrastructure and amenities is required when the full time population is so low. I think we have a good balance of RDOS funded infrastructure right now.

Infrastructure & services are prerequisite for long term health, environmental preservation (water & sewerage), and affordable housing. It is hypocritical to want those, and not be prepared to pay for it.

The aspect that keeps taxes low is good for the current local community because it does not have a negative impact on affordability. I strongly favour all options that restrict or negate hillside developments.

Low taxes. Do not want to have a large tax bill surprise me every year with drastic escalations.

To keep things as they are is appealing.

Preserve the natural beauty.

Low taxes.

Not sure we need new infrastructures or public amenities.

Little development of infrastructure and amenities is required when the full time population is so low. Maintenance costs are also a consideration.

Everyone likes to keep costs low

Taxes must be reduced for the less wealthy and increased for the wealthy investors. All agricultural land must be protected, organic, sustainable farming geared towards local food security and diversity. Not alcohol production wino tours. Eliminate our financial debts and discourage the RDOS from even considering borrowing money .

I think we have a good balance of RDOS funded infrastructure right now

Enough taxes already. Don't put price this community for fixed income seniors and young families. A priority for me is conservation of valuable natural habitats and this limited growth in areas identified as critical corridors (plant and wildlife) . Limited industrial growth and closely monitored grazing of public forestlands by cattle (as the law states).

Maintain the charm/status-quo of community

Preserves the nature and charm of the community. Everything we could want is in Penticton so no need to reproduce in Naramata.

I don't have any objection to Preserve & Conserve in general.

Nothing wrong with status quo

Absolutely in favor, as a long time Naramata resident I have seen developments that have wreaked havoc on their neighbors with no repercussions.

These residents dealing with problems now they have never had in the past - before developments. Naramata and areas are a delicate landscape that I want to preserve, not develop. Most residents moved there for the quiet life, small neighborhood, less lights and for so many more reasons.

Keeping changes in population, services and commerce to a minimum is what I want in our lovely community. I don't want to see more changes in the character of our community. I love the orchards and large tracts of agricultural land. They are beautiful and important as food security and local nutrition become more important than ever.

The natural beauty and heritage of the area.

The choice to preserve what we have is good, but without backing up that choice with adequate funding we risk losing everything. We can't neglect what we have, we want to make it better.

I am not 100% in favour of P&C, I am OK with more development in the village, just not on the hillside.

Naramata is a special place that doesn't need dramatic changes other than AFFORDABLE housing and the village does not have sufficient capacity to add additional vehicles and people

Moderation is good....

Naramata is very special. Leave it as it is and allow only necessary improvements for the residents who live here.

I am all about preserving and conserving hillsides and agricultural land. The Okanagan is becoming so over-developed. Given we only have one road in and out, Naramata should remain as pristine and under-developed as much as possible.

This would keep the character and uniqueness of the village

If you hold and preserve, people and environment will always be one to behold. It will remain the wonderful, friendly little village everyone loves. Development will still pressure every year and there will always be some that happens regardless.

Naramata's character will be maintained which is good.

This focus is the reason i moved here to begin with. wild areas, orchards and farms. People who live here year round and know each other. I like waking down our village street and be able to stop and have a conversation with little to no traffic. now we have cars lined up and down village streets ruining the boulevards people spend much time caring for. I want to hike up the hills and enjoy the okanagan valley without progress, townhomes, water front resorts etc...

I came to Naramata 15 years ago for the peace, serenity, lack of street lighting so I can see the night sky and of course first and foremost its natural beauty. Any development needs to complement not destroy the ecosystem for the water, fish, land and animals.

Change/Growth for its own sake not a good idea in my opinion

What makes Naramata special is it's small village feel and knowing your neighbours. I would hate to see the village become like Whistler where the locals can't afford to live. It's Naramata's quaintness and quiet easy lifestyle that attracts people here.

I like this because it keeps what makes Naramata great with a few improvements here and there.

Preservation and conversation are not diametrically opposed to development and expansion of facilities.

fits with the feel of the current community

This approach seems to me to be the best way to maintain the village as it is today. I have no interest in adding to the commercial development of the village/ or to see a uncontrolled housing development in the village. I prefer limiting further development of hillsides and agricultural land.

From both a environmental and community based concern, naramata needs to Focus on maintaining the historic and natural beauty that so many love. We are wine country, but we need to find a way to preserve the area in roots with its beginnings

This area is quiet and a wonderful place to live year round. Getting run out of town in the summer by tourists coming to their summer homes does not sound great.

Ive spend most of my 64+ years in Naramata and would hate to see it lose its natural charm.

Maintain small town charm and keep taxes low

yes, this sounds great. we will not be a Village is there is too many people.

To maintain the rural character of Naramata, and limit it's growth compared with Penticton.

This maintains present status and preserves the hillsides & vineyards/orchards that give the bench its character.

keep the community similar

maintain peace quiet beauty health of the area- we have experienced massive growth already with winery distilleries, bench b and b and the way to numerous vacation homes which drain natural resources, depleting water roads etc with little benefit to residents. preserve dark sky slow pace and health of the area

Low growth option

This would level the playing field for new, young families, workers, individuals and seniors to live here and move here who will be integral members of our community instead of non resident home owners. Naramata doesn't need to grow anymore as it is quickly destroying the small town living style and flavour of Naramata.

Naramata is quickly becoming and playground for the wealthy, and long time residents of Naramata are being forced to move away and this is unacceptable.

Naramata is a great place and many enjoy the "sleepy" ambience

This option preserves the nature and charm of the community

The preservation of the hillsides and agricultural land around the village. This is the natural beauty of the area for outdoor activity outside the village.

It's easy to say, I don't want to change anything because it is so pretty here.

The reason to live here is because of its beauty and tranquility

We live in a beautiful spot and there is no need to change a thing. 15 minutes is all the time required to drive to Penticton for groceries etc.

We must preserve and conserve or end up like vancouver

It is Naramata, a RURAL SLOW area, not a commercial train wreck! If we don't protect it now, there won't be anything left!

no change is good compared to big change. Other scenarios are more balanced.

I am in favour of keeping the hillsides free of huge development as I think most people move to Naramata to enjoy the quiet charm which is what differentiates it from so many other communities in BC that have sprawled out and lost their village charm.

Agree with preservation of hillside

Already too much growth up hillsides

Definitely 100% in favour of not allowing any further development and destruction of the hillside and agricultural land.

Lived here my whole life, must be a reason I haven't left. We have picturesque landscapes and access to world class biking, dirtbiking, camping, etc. and this rationale would preserve all that.

Preserving the hillsides and agricultural land is a priority, both locally and globally. Naramata must do its part to conserve both natural and agricultural spaces. There is much charm to Naramata that we would like preserved. No growth is better than bad growth.

It's what makes Naramata unique

Strongly support preservation of the existing character. Am satisfied with the current services and amenities.

Covid has created an awareness in humans that they need nature and they need space. Hence, the great exodus to the Okanagan, Sunshine Coast and to the Island. The beauty of Naramata lies in the preservation of the hillsides and agricultural land.

Will keep all the best features of Naramata life.

it is what attracted us to the area. everything we could want is in Penticton so no need to reproduce in Naramata. We like Naramata the way it is (fall through spring). quite busy and loud in the summer.

This idea appeals to me because it's quite simple. It seems to go against the grain of traditional growth strategies that say "more is better" and instead says, "This is enough."

Preserve ecosystems/farm land/hillsides/beauty

The ecosystems that we live in are under threat by development. The natural landscape and agricultural lands are some of our greatest treasures.

Long-term conservation will help maintain the character and farming heritage of Naramata

strong preservation of the hillsides, agricultural land and KVR. Naramata Road will be wide enough for traffic, and can maybe even become a more defined bicycle route.

Hillside development should be closely controlled and limited. It is crucial to preserve the amazing hillside and agriculture land in the area. Once it is gone it is gone so under no circumstances should this be taken lightly.

Preservation of the hillside is important. Wildfires are a real threat. I like to hike and don't want that access removed

Naramata has an opportunity to maintain all or most of the natural areas and agricultural land that make it so desirable as a place to live and for tourists. We need to find the right balance. Concerned that continued development in the hillsides will continue to reduce native habitat and interfere in serious ways with water courses. And we are only beginning to realize the extent of climate change impacts.

Over the years we have set up strong protection for our farms via the ALR legislation.

I believe it's important to respect our green spaces and limit the development on our Bench and Hillsides.

Approve of retaining agricultural lands and hillsides. This is a large part of the village's charm.

Wish this had started earlier. Stop blasting rocks in the hills for stupid mega mansions.

Definitely want to preserve the hillsides and ALR as this is what makes Naramata beautiful. It is why the tourists see this as a highly popular destination as well.

The world needs more open spaces/ beauty/ nature/ wildlife. Please Please Please Please do not destroy the hillsides and the agricultural land.

Beautiful area needs to be nurtured.

Once this land is developed it will never return to its current state. It is very important to me to preserve and protect the land.

I like the idea of preserving the local natural beauty of Naramata and the surrounding area.

I like the idea of the protection of agriculture.

Naramata is a beautiful, picturesque community and it is important to preserve its quaint character.

Fairness to residents who do not want big changes to their community as well as preservation of the natural beauty and wilderness of the area

This is the ONLY option that I endorse. The dualism of the questionnaire is not an adequate way to measure response. Most of these options do not appeal to me. The main issue is the natural ecosystem, including water availability, ecological integrity etc. I would like to see increased parks/recreation in the outskirts, such as Indian Rock, with small nonobtrusive additions such as commercial areas and public transit to minimize commutes.

Water rights for farming and what we have. Are we going to pump all that water up the hill when we are already having water supply issues in Naramata already and leave Naramata's bread and butter farming community high and dry down below.

I don't wish to see further development in the hillsides of Naramata nor do I wish to see any more disturbance of natural areas. No houses that require retaining walls should be built in the hillsides of Naramata. Development should be restricted to already developed sites and the footprint of renovations should not add any environmental degradation or stresses. Water depletion, fire danger are both issues as well as the need for the preservation of wildlife corridors.

Keeping what we have and preserving our hillsides and agricultural land needs to be an ongoing priority.

This is a place of outstanding beauty with wilderness all around, which is fast dwindling in this world and our natural spaces NEED to be preserved. Plus Naramata is awesome as it is and doesn't need changing.

Yes maintain and preserve. The focus on monster houses on the hillsides is just too destructive. Run off increasing as upland development reduces the absorption for rain,

Sewers need. to protect the lake and ground water

Natural beauty is maintained, cost of living is minimized.

It keeps our natural forests and wilderland, and keeps the feel and community of Naramata in tact.

Preserve the hillsides

I am all in for preservation and conservation. The world is being rapidly developed, we don't have to do the same thing in order to be self-sufficient and maintain a healthy, successful and beautiful place to call home. I also want to see buyers of existing homes held to some better design guidelines by the RDOS when they knock down smaller homes and build monstrosities that are going up all around us. Setbacks/easements should be re-addressed.

Love the hillsides and great to have agricultural land for future agricultural growth. Great for wildlife.

Environmental stewardship is a strong rationale for supporting this option.

Because we are in the process of ruining a beautiful place. Why can't there be guidelines like must keep 30% of trees on raw land being developed ? Seems no one is watching while the area is overdeveloped

In favor of preserving hillsides and agricultural land. Village doesn't require much more in commercial use. Taxes are high enough now as are property values!

The natural landscape and agricultural lands are some of our greatest treasures.

The is the reason why we all enjoy our community so much. We don't need concrete and destructive development

We talk about how climate action and food security are important. How is this going to happen unless we protect the food producing land and natural habitat?

The ecosystems of the PPxh2 biogeoclimatic subzone that we live in, are under threat by development. Development pays no attention to these values. Its too late in alot of areas, but conserving and preserving what's left should be RDOS's development priority, not facilitating the continued degradation of ecosystems, which has already lead to flooding, soil erosion, and landslides.

Preservation of the agricultural land is paramount to the charm of the area, and large scale build out of the hillsides would detract from the current village feeling.

The hills around Naramata are home to many threatened or endangered species. It's our responsibility to preserve this.

This is one of the most beautiful place in the world we need to keep it that way. ALR is very important, I do wish more was used for growing veg/fruit for eating and not just drinking. Too bad someone can't grow vegies under the vines??

We are the end of the road and most of us moved here because of that beauty and the one road in.

The whole point of Naramata is that it is an agricultural based area. This is what makes it unique and carries its intrinsic value. Let it be. We have seen so many homes shoehorned into every nook and cranny these past 2 years. We have seen blocks of forests razed and clearcutting of mountain sides which is now apparently an "acceptable and modern method" of cramming more absent-owner multimillion dollar homes into a suburbia where there were once trails and migrating paths for native animals.

Water is limiting for the numbers and distribution of humans and other forms of life in the Okanagan. Electoral Area E is in the South Okanagan which is the driest part of the Okanagan. All forms of the water resource (surface water: streams, lakes, wetlands, and groundwater) in combination set the limit for humans and other life. Electoral Area E contains sensitive, at risk or endangered ecosystems and plant and animal species

I believe the hillside and agricultural land should be conserved.

Once lost, it is lost forever. We have a duty to preserve biodiversity.

Preservation of hillsides and agricultural land. Preservation of the village as a village (not as a suburb of Penticton). This is definitely my preferred option. Community vibrancy isn't about development but about commitment to the rural, small village culture. There is enormous pressure to develop and this is eroding the culture that has attracted us to Naramata for over 20 years.

We need to limit travel until we can move with environmentally friendly methods. As well tourism revolves around wine and grapes. We need to encourage self reliance in our food supply. Welcome the world is not sustainable and will eventually collapse.

The Naramata Bench is becoming renowned for its unique "terroir" in producing world class wines. The agricultural and scenic nature of the Bench needs to be preserved.

We must conserve our farming land at all cost.

Prevent further water drainage/forest fire risks from clear cutting

Too many people and developments lead to more risks. Hillside development is eroding the ability of the land to naturally absorb water run off.

Clear cutting for new developments like the Vista project - should never be an option. The failure of the storm water system on Outlook Benchlands shelf is a prime example of loss of plant cover makes the down slope residents vulnerable to extreme weather events with possibly catastrophic results.

Concerns over water/drainage and forest fires. Too many people and developments lead to more risks. Hillside development is eroding the ability of the land to naturally absorb water run off. Septic systems are not conducive to small lot developments.

This approach aims at allowing a responsible and careful look at growth and development. On January 25, 2022 the Province of BC announced a provincial-wide study of all of BC's Watersheds. This includes protecting water quality and quantity, both of which are vital to healthy ecosystems and people. Our OCP must consider this the basis for growth and development. "Run-off" from rocky hillside development/drainage into our CREEKS AND LAKE WATER INTAKE with no management plan is short-sighted

I would have liked to see more control over the Outlook and Kettle Ridge developments - they have torn apart the hillside. However, this area has become so attractive that many people want to live here or have second homes here. There should be more attention paid to the size of homes and preservation of hillsides. Proper drainage from these developments is crucial.

The obscene clearcutting for development in this area should never have happened its disgusting! The developer that is currently padding the pockets of RDOS should be forced out of town.

Con

Growth needed to fund infrastructure

Costs for everything increase and without a plan for managed growth, the village would eventually find itself unable to pay for ongoing infrastructure repairs.

With time new infrastructure and services will be needed as everything with time needs to be maintained and augmented and so I do not think this is a reasonable option.

It is a pipedream. Costs for everything increase and without a plan for managed growth, the village would eventually find itself unable to pay for ongoing infrastructure repairs. The tax revenues would not be enough to pay for ongoing maintenance unless the taxes would be increased substantially and probably unaffordably for many residents.

People want to live in Naramata so we need to ensure we have sufficient infrastructure, services and public amenities to grow and provide residents what we need. Keeping the same old infrastructure is not an option.

Would like to see some more minor infrastructure changes.

We can still maintain the hillsides and agriculture but we need to maintain and renew services , infrasturcture and amenities to move with the times and the increased population if there is more housing in the village

This will never happen as people won't agree to pay out of their own pocket to improve the much needed infrastructure. Outside investment is a must!

This option leaves little doubt that our current services and roads will continue to degrade.

Can't stop progress. Development is good for tax base and amenities are needed. The development has to be thoughtful obviously.

I'd like to see some new infrastructure and amenities and I'm open to creating a more vibrant village.

New infrastructure and services are always needed and always expensive. Keeping taxes and fees low is not a realistic expectation .

We need more infrastructure currently and restricting all development only increases property values due to scarcity. This will turn us into an unaffordable haven of highly affluent and will push out many threads of the fabric of society including seniors and differently abled people on fixed incomes. Property taxes will actually rise with property values and the increasing costs of the community will be shared only by the few.

We could use some improved infrastructure such as sewer system.

We need improved infrastructure and services.

Does not leave room to improve the community, particularly in the village. Upgraded infrastructure is required, keeping taxes low is not a good reason to prevent much needed services (such as sewer).

For the wineries to develop some additional infrastructure along Naramata Rd. (cycle path, pull-outs, 2 lane areas) are needed.

Some amenities focused to benefit the full time residents would we a welcome cost to the community and would cultivate further happiness and engagement of the citizenship. Worth some cost.

I think with the increasing housing development of all types in Naramata, there is a concomitant need for services to help them.

Growth will come, and it is better to control it than to try to pretend one can hold back the tide. Also, current infrastructure, services and public amenities are insufficient even for the existing size and scope of the community.

The costs of new amenities would require the RDOS to seek additional funding from the Provincial and Federal governments. Thus they would have to keep abreast of what initiatives were out there and how to qualify. More work for the administration.

Need more housing to make prices more affordable

I am getting priced out of the area along with the rest of my generation and preserve and conserve is only going to make it worse. All this does is drive up the price as more rich people move in and tear down existing homes.

Whoever wrote this survey should be a politician or find new work. It is the most biased survey ever. EVERY Scenario suggested to Preserve the hillsides and Agricultural land. We Desperately need more housing and developing the ALR is foolhardy. Only 2 options left, Increase density where already developed, and allow new development funded by developers, no need for taxpayers to pay for new development. Nobody wants to pay more taxes

I have a good job and want to continue to live in Naramata but I cannot afford to move out of my parents house because the average sale price of a home here is over a million dollars. I believe I am an asset to the community but I am getting priced out of the area along with the rest of my generation and preserve and conserve is only going to make it worse.

too late there is more and more developments into the hillside looks awful but eventually will be full of homes

all this does is drive up the price as more rich people move in and tear down existing homes.

remaining housing stock will quickly become unattainable for many

Naramata needs to offer more housing options and provide the services, like sewer, to make that happen.

Its unrealistic to assume that there wont be any development here, people need homes.

I would like to see town that people can afford to live in and have some more options as far as businesses.

Does not address AFFORDABLE housing needs; parks and recreation and other services are necessary for quality of life; don't want to see the community become an exclusive enclave for rich out-of-towners

Future housing needs and capacity to provide for more housing in Naramata have not been identified as required in a Community Plan so it is difficult to assess this option. Provision of a needed sewer system will be difficult to pay for without some growth

We do need to consider affordable housing options

We need new houses.

We do need housing and some commercial growth

Can allow some growth responsibly

I am not necessarily against some responsible development but concerns over water/drainage and forest fires still persist. I think there need to be limits to house sizes, and limits on water use.

We need to preserve and conserve as well as find new ways to amplify the beauty we enjoy every day here. Find ways to help the world that visits us, learn from us.

I am not necessarily against some responsible development but concerns over water/drainage and forest fires still persist.

I am not completely anti-development but I think there need to be limits to house sizes, and limits on water use.

I am not opposed - only feels we need to create guidelines for what can and what cannot change.

There is so much this area has to offer to more people who are looking for quality living. for all months of the year. One can preserve and conserve the beauty and and make enhance the experience by making the place more enjoyable and lively throughout the year.

Need growth for commercial/services/families

Naramata is not a museum and some forward momentum in the village is desirable. If we want a thriving Naramata and not a dying one, balance is required. It is unreasonable to expect no changes.

Some controlled growth is good for the community.

Although the ability to control growth in the surrounding area is mainly due to the ALR the focus seems to be the development of large expensive homes on the ridges outside the ALR controls. The tax base has to be growing very quickly with the advent of multi million \$ homes which should increase the RDOS take of tax dollars. Having a more vibrant Village core would be a major asset for all our residents and visitors as well.

It is a fine line between preservation/conservation and retreating. As a community, we all need to look forward and present a vision of livability and not merely isolation. Who we are is a function of what we do and how we communicate. While preservation always has a place in every community, it must be tempered to permit forward thinking and growth in a vibrant and shared experience of place and time.

Naramata could use a true supermarket, dry cleaner and such. The reality is that several hundred new homes are going in up the hill. This will make the road crowded. Having everyone drive to Penticton for groceries and routine purchases is going to be frustrating and inefficient in terms of CO2 emissions.

Every community requires growth and this option prevents sufficient growth

won't support families through the stages to stay and grow in the same place. People need to leave because of lack of housing or infrastructure.

Naramata is not a museum and some forward momentum in the village is desirable.

Population growth is inevitable, so "no growth" is impossible. This scenario is nostalgic and unrealistic.

Village needs increased vibrancy - see my comments on the "rural" option. Change is overdue.

I feel like some additional density and commercial activity in the Village is needed.

Limited growth centred within the village can sustain its social and economic vibrancy while minimizing demand and maintenance costs for infrastructure (i.e. water, roads, schools, sewer, etc). Environmental impacts and infrastructure costs increase significantly with developments upslope of the village.

Naramata used to be vibrant, as recently as when BC Tree was operating, and the NCS was at full use. It has suffered greatly over the last 15 years and now some believe this is normal. It is clearly not...

Status quo, no growth no future.

This option spells the death of Naramata. WE need to respond to the changing world and work with those changes

I support some growth and change provided it is tempered, reasonable and enhances the lives of local residents. However, this should be balanced with preserving the hillsides and landscape.

Unrealistic.

While this has been the mantra for pretty much everyone as soon as THEY have arrived here over the past 50 years, it's just not realistic to expect this to be successful. Having the core of the village occupied by a largely seasonal and non-participating entity in community resources makes it even harder to have a viable local community w/o some actual commercial development.

No vibrancy in the village.

Keeping the commercial additions to a minimum - should allow some growth in vibrancy.

We need to preserve and conserve our village to an extent but promoting some growth and development is key for future success. There is not a lot of room for commercial ventures and opportunities in the town so likely will be out of people's garages/basements, etc

It is a status quo and that never works out. We have to create an environment to keep young people, or have them come back.

There needs to be balance - to say no more commercial or public amenities in the village would be too far in the other direction. However, keeping the village small and quaint is important too. Definitely no big box or chains. Affordable commercial space for artists and small independent makers of all kinds would be great.

My only hesitation with this scenario is that - if a service, business, housing idea, or commercial enterprise were to want to establish itself, - it would create an environment where enterprise (even at a micro level) is not welcome. I think that would be doing the Village a disservice.

Concept lacks encouraging more retail and housing growth in the village

The idea of the village never changing is dangerous. That would mean we don't upgrade to a sewer system and we continue to pollute our lake. It would become a place where only the extremely wealthy can afford to live here, leaving people like myself who grew up here being forced out, as our property becomes so valuable we can't afford the property tax.

The Village has to have higher density as approximately one-third of the homes are seasonal. Commercial and residential growth cannot not be allowed to stagnate. As the need for improvements to existing infrastructure can only be achieved through growth.

It is unreasonable to expect no changes and to inhibit new development, when such a large population of Naramata is inhabited by "immigrants" from elsewhere in Canada and beyond. Smacks of Nimbyism.

Conservation and preservation are extremely important, but in context - be careful about development on this hillside, don't go for density in terms of big developments (like the one that was proposed in Penticton near La Frenz - that number of units would be a disaster, and completely the wrong thing to do for a wine region), but some level of development has to occur.

I am in favour of preservation but not at the expense of a non-vibrant village.

Massive missed opportunity to develop and create improvements for everyone. Nothing ever stays the same.

Sticking your head in the sand,

Things will change whether residents want them to or not. This view is naive.

I agree with maintaining agricultural land, but do not agree with limited commercial growth in the village core. A limit would mean Naramata remains as a bedroom community to Penticton and does not provide needed services for community residents and the growing tourism industry.

Some progress makes sense. Simply shutting down any growth does not make sense.

However, Naramata is changing, the demographic has changed drastically over the years and Naramata must serve the people who live here, support diversity in our community and make housing affordable for local folk.

Too much NIMBY. Too selfish to those already here, and too short sighted. If we want to have a community, it needs to attract young families and workers and create housing and jobs for them. It therefore needs some *controlled* development in order to succeed.

I don't agree that we can't change the commercial vibrancy of the village however new development in the village has to be in keeping with our Naramata Slow City principals.

I would like to see some thoughtful commercial additions to the Village within reason.

We don't want to be 'stuck in the mud' either. Let's move forwards in a healthy , sustainable and environmentally sensitive manner. Not be pushed about by corrupt corporate investors financial interests.

Feel that the village could use a few more amenities

We need some local small business to build vibrancy to this area

I don't agree that there should be little change to the vibrancy of the village. Well thought out eco-development could be a good fit for Naramata village but the issue is finding that better breed of developer who puts the time and care into their plans and provides appropriate amenities for the village and residents.

Progress. This bench is beautiful, yes tranquil, but it needs to step up a bit, not a huge shopping mall, but to sustain the residents there needs to be a village that can support and attract business.

Preserve and Conserve is great, but a vibrant village is the best way to accomplish it.

Unrealistic. Will likely lead to deterioration over time, you just can't freeze time

Unrealistic either the town grows or it does not, but all signs indicate that people are making the choice to move here so be proactive and not reactive

This feels safe and exclusionary, it often feels as if residents want to keep out new people/ideas and this scenario would only keep this occurring.

Growth is inevitable. Let's do it the right way.

Slightly negative on this only because I see no reason to completely limit growth of the village. This is far too head-in-the-sand to me.

I am for preserve and conserve but outside of the village. That being said the growth of the village while preservation and conservation would serve the residents as well as visitors/ vacationers well with a balance between a vibrant central core and a preserved surrounding area.

Vibrant, but always small, commercial activity in village would notwithstanding be a nice-to-have.

I do not believe that relatively little change to the size or commercial vibrancy of the village is a viable option into the future.

Minimizes. Vibrancy and growth

We need more commercial vibrancy in the village of Naramata

we need more small businesses and young families

I feel we need to revitalize the downtown core allowing new commercial ventures and additional housing in keeping with the overall community feel.

Preservation of nature is important - but growth can happen while still doing this. This initiative is leaning too much to one side. Growth is needed!

we can't stop change. Naramata as a community needs to allow room for their year round families to make a living.

Shutting out growth altogether will not preserve what we have, it will result in stagnation.

probably not sustainable in the longer term

The commercial vibrancy of the village should change and not be lumped into the conservation of the more vulnerable hillsides. We need more residential accommodation in the village. Both for rental and purchase. Tiny home communities with shared black water & grey water systems, with amenity buildings similar to co-housing projects. Flexible community living spaces for seasonal workers. Strata housing projects that have small footprints. Don't get me started :)

I'm very neutral. I like preserving but understand there is a need for some growth. I feel we need to have a way to attract families, children etc in order to keep the community growing and balanced. For this we do need new infrastructure etc.

Although I love the wild and outdoors in my back yard I think this model is too constraining and not oriented to a vibrant future.

However, if we want a thriving Naramata and not a dying one (it's dead except during the 'season', kept alive by visitors). Balance is required. I imagine Naramata as a small, beautiful little Carmel (small town in California) full of artists & artisanal spaces in the Village with a few other useful retail locations. Wineries & vineyards. Hillside of low density homes. Perhaps lots of young people working from home in technology - which is very possible today. Even Naramata has fibre-optics.

Why preserving hillside when they can be used for agricultural activities for bringing more prosperity to the community.

Scenario: Self-Funded Rural

Pro

Prevents large developments

Good plan, no messing up our hillsides. Small growth to the village and paid by those desiring to live there, not developers. Maintain rural vibrancy and community control to avoid the "suburb-like" development.

Like preservation of the hillsides & agricultural land, i.e. present character of the bench.

Preservation of the hillsides and agricultural land to maintain rural vibrancy and community control to avoid the "suburb-like" development that we are seeing in Outlook, Stonebrook, Vista and other developer led projects.

Prevents further degeneration of the countryside and prevents increase in traffic along Naramata Road

Good plan, no messing up our hillsides, and small growth to the village and paid by those desiring to live there, and the developers.

I agree with preservation of the hillsides and Ag land.

Preservation of the hillsides.

The whole point of Naramata is that it is an agricultural based area. This is what makes it unique and carries its intrinsic value. Let it be. We have seen so many homes shoehorned into every nook and cranny these past 2 years. We have seen blocks of forests razed and clearcutting of mountain sides which is now apparently an "acceptable and modern method" of cramming more absent-owner multimillion dollar homes into a suburbia where there were once trails and migrating paths for native animals.

I am in favour of keeping the hillsides free of huge development as I think most people move to Naramata to enjoy the quiet charm which is what differentiates it from so many other communities in BC that have sprawled out and lost their unique village charm.

yes, no more houses on the hills, fire hazard

I strongly favour all options that preserve the hillsides and agricultural land and limit rampant extra-village development.

Preservation of the surrounding hillsides and agricultural lands.

We need to limit travel until we can move with environmentally methods. As well tourism revolves around wine and grapes. We need to encourage self reliance in our food supply. Welcome the world is not sustainable and will eventually collapse.

We as a lot of people who have moved here in the last 10 years came here for the lifestyle of a small community surrounded by outstanding natural beauty. Overdevelopment will ruin it. Therefore I am against most development. Asks as one can see by the hillside development, it has been done poorly. Clear cutting and removing all vegetation has created downhill runoff water issues that will prevail. What bothers me most is that the upper Arawana developments have been done so poorly.

Dont want developers to be funded.

We need to keep the mountains available to recreational users NOT developers!!!!

Low growth option.

Preserve our agricultural spaces

The rural nature of the Naramata Bench needs to be preserved. The geography and geologic setting of the Naramata Bench is not conducive to major changes in infrastructure that would be required for large scale residential and/or commercial developments.

(Reference the Drainage Related issues of the Outlook and Kettle Ridge Developments that occurred in 2017).

Some strength in preserving the agricultural history of the land.

Approve of protecting the hillsides and agricultural lands.

Because it is important to preserve the rural atmosphere of the village, and the hillsides and agricultural land in the context of caring for our world and environment, and thus manage all development accordingly.

Some of the funds forcibly provided by developers as rural lands are being developed should be used to improve amenities in the "highlands". Increasing taxes should not always be necessary.

Like the preservation of agriculture.

no further hillside development

Protect the watershed. Preserve old growth forests. Remove logging roads and stop clear-cut logging in the Naramata watershed to prevent soil erosion, climate extremes flooding, drought, extreme temperatures. Reduce the RDOS budget. The RDOS has utilized 'pandemic' restrictions to further excluded the public from participating in community decisions which is in contravention to RDOS legislation. So, an infraction to their own bylaws.

Willing to pay fair share of costs

I do not mind paying my fair share for properly run local services. It makes sense that any infrastructure improvement is paid through taxation.

It makes sense that any infrastructure improvement is paid through taxation.

Any substantial growth ideas need to be largely borne by the developer in question. Some tax money from us might be appropriate in some situations.

I do not mind paying my fair share for properly run local services in order to protect the natural environment.

pay and pay.

This is very appealing to those who can afford it.

Sounds more affordable

Need new infrastructure and amenities

I like the idea of the new infrastructure and more services and amenities. Things get old and upkeep is necessary. We need an adequate sewer system.

Investing in things like sewer in the village will help with being able to promote some growth and attract more families ensuring the village continues as a home not just a vacation destination.

Things get old and upkeep is necessary. We need to keep renew for generations coming. IT is good for the community to make the decision about how the village should maintain itself

More amenities are good for the community as a whole.

Improvements for current residents and the village is always a good thing - but to really grow, it will likely not just come from taxes & fees.

We need an adequate sewer system. Not for high rises, but for duplex and 4 plex houses that create more condense single family homes. We have the in-village land to do it, and it would be a great investment for property owners

Any enhancement to the Village is ok with small increases in taxes and fees.

We need updated/more services, infrastructure and public amenities - commercial growth in the village wouldn't be terrible and would help support tourism.

This is one of my ideal scenarios. Upgrade some of the things we have and look to incremental community growth, while keeping low taxes.

I like the idea of the new infrastructure. Not being connected to sewer is not desirable with how close we are to the lake and everything. I like the idea of more services and amenities.

Allows community control over investment

Like the idea of the community prioritising the direction of the area. Self funding of growth will keep development in check.

Preservation of hillsides & agricultural land, and that new amenities are prioritized by the community before they are added to the tax bill.

This seems like the way to go if new things are needed, they are determined and voted on by the community, as compared to a Developer Driven approach to village growth.

The full time residents should decide how their money is being spent and which projects are prioritized.

the growth must provide for affordable housing, the village is being priced out and the school is slowly shrinking.

public input for priorities is essential, preserve space reduce growth

I like the local angle. Ensuring projects and growth serves locals first.

Self-funded rural appeals to me because it gives the power to the community to do what they want! I think every community - on some level - wants to have this freedom of choice.

Preservation of what is left of the hillsides and agricultural land is a must. New infrastructure that is well planned with lots of public consultation is good.

Increasing taxes for services that Naramata residents ask for is the best option.

I think this option allows the residents to have a say in what goes on. We didn't get a say on the recent development in the village and I think people are feeling disheartened by the project because it doesn't fit our quaint little village style. There is room for development and growth, but in the right way.

It lets the community decide what is needed and wanted

Minimal growth of the village preserves its charm, tranquility and history.
Self funding of growth will keep development in check

Strongly support protection of the existing character. The community has the ability to make changes to infrastructure etc if we want. Self funding insures that the community truly supports the changes.

Preservation of agricultural land is desirable for future food security. The community can clearly understand the costs and benefits to themselves when amenities and infrastructure improvements are considered.

I am in favour of preservation of hillsides and agricultural land and relatively little change to the size of the village. That being said, I support some new infrastructure and village vibrancy as long as it can co-exist with new and affordable housing in the village. I worry about self-funded village because villagers do not have significant means.

Naramata residents have the power to decide what they want for their neighborhood. They moved to this area because they like what it is, not because they want to make big changes. Community spirit grows through increased volunteer work by all.

Like the idea of the community prioritising the direction of the area

Any new infrastructure etc. should be decided and paid for by the community.

Seems like most realistic conservative option.

The residence of the area decide what is developed. Also reduce the sprawl of the area.

I like this idea for the protection but also for the idea of community driven decision.

Let the community determine the changes to Naramata while preserving and protecting the surrounding hillsides but we still need to help promote the small commercial opportunities in the village

is the second best option proposed in this survey. Not in favour of much development but if there are things the community wants we will participate in the discussion and financing if the improvements are agreed upon by the community .

This approach is working/status quo

Maintains the look, feel, and culture of Naramata. Things stay relatively unchanged and we only develop what we can afford.

Keep the community similar to what it has been

Things stay relatively unchanged and we only develop what we can afford.

Hard to argue with success . The village is a pearl.

The beauty of Naramata is what it is now - a quaint little village. It is making an international name for itself for being what it is. Visitors come to Naramata to experience this. Food for thought - what if Naramata become Kelowna?

Keeping what we live here for intact

Sure I don't want anything to happen.

This option will help to preserve the small village character of our community.

Less commercial and more residential charm.

In favor for little change overall.

Prioritizing is better than nothing

Pretty much keeps the status quo, and preserves much of what we love about Naramata.

It has worked so far, so not a bad problem.

This option feels like the grass roots of Naramata, I love it.

I want to see full preservation of the hillsides and agricultural land, maintaining the beauty that we have around us is key. We don't need to build out the mountains any more than they already are. I would rather pay tax dollars myself than split it with a greedy developer.

Status quo?

Other than limiting developments up on the hills (ALR will do the rest in any case on agricultural land), what is this option for?

Maintains the look, feel, and culture of Naramata

Seems a romantic idea, no change, I'm comfy.

I like the community the way it is. It is small and friendly and you know your neighbours. You can just walk down the roads and do not need to worry about the traffic. I am not in favour of significant develop as I moved here because the community was small and quiet. I can go into Penticton if I need anything

Naramata is a beautiful, picturesque community and it is important to preserve its quaint character.

Keep the village feel and maintain the area to cater to year round residents. The idea that this will become a summer playground for the rich from elsewhere is not appealing.

This is much the same as it is now. I support the status quo.

Good option to retain existing character, prioritize improvements.

This plan keeps what makes the village great.

There is no need to bring commercialize Naramata. Penticton is 15 minutes away and we need to preserve our simple and quiet lifestyle.

It will keep development based on the interests of the residents, while keeping the sleepy small town charm of Naramata

Would allow for some improvements while keeping the essence of Naramata if it is not already lost to all the "second" or "fifth" homes that are being built by people who don't know or care about the essence of Naramata.

This option appears to maintain the peaceful vibe with no significant change to the population.

I don't want Naramata to get overpopulated

Maintains the small town charm and focus funds on priority projects

Naramata village will get to retain it's character and the reason we moved here.

this option is preferable to welcoming the world and housing focused development of the village. This would allow for maintaining the rural village character of Naramata

Preserving the current rural lifestyle in Naramata is critically important

Strikes the best balance between preserving the things we love about Naramata while funding the services everyone wants. This option does not preclude commercial and residential growth in the Village, it facilitates it at a moderate pace.

The beauty and tranquillity of existing residents Naramata lifestyle should never be compromised and developed to be just like other towns. It is also a number one reason to visit - and tourism keeps the place afloat commercially. This option basically still preserves the tranquillity and continues the status quo.

Con

Community won't be able to decide/come to consensus

Allowing the community to prioritise capital investments will pit one segment of the community against the other. I am afraid of lobby group(s) that could sway community officials.

Many locals are highly resistant to change and are likely to come to a stalemate on what things are most important.

With the influx of high end homes in the area it changes the focus to more upscale Village for all the new residents that has moved into the area!

Community prioritized amenities rarely lead to the best decisions for the long term sustainability and vibrancy of a community.

Yes to sewage system to protect the lake, no to any other infrastructure

This scenario feels like it could get sticky, with decision-making getting mired in arguments, too many choices, and differing opinions. It would have to be structured intentionally, with an oversight committee or some entity helping guide the decision-making process.

Too resistant to development.

Not convinced the increased opportunity for housing will be prioritised for those that need it most

I am afraid of lobby group(s) that could sway community officials.

Nothing has been prioritized by the community . It's all being decided by a small group of RDOS personnel without the interests of the community being heard. The tax payers are seen by those RDOS personnel as nothing but a source of over taxation to make the RDOS appear progressive while aggressively destroying this community.

This model could become driven by groups with their own vision and ability to convince and drown out quieter voices.

No one likes the prospect of increased taxes, and the community direction may not (won't?) be favoured by all leading to potential for neighbour x neighbour conflicts.

Concern could be that there will be no new services as the community might not want to pay for them.

Allowing the community to prioritise capital investments will pit one segment of the community against the other - what is the point of having staff and elected officials if the decision making is done by the community. Has the potential to create divisions in the community - those that can afford and those that cant. This is a terrible option

I am hopeful that this OCP process will articulate a balanced, values-based OCP which will provide guidance for balanced, reasonable development. I am hopeful that the decisions that follow are guided by that PLAN.

I am willing to pay reasonable increases in taxes and I expect RDOS Staff and Elected decision makers to make decisions in accordance with the OCP. It is not practical for the community to decide upon those priorities.

Opposed to "prioritized" by the community for does not indicate that community will have say on actual choices to be implemented, only the community will have ability to prioritize.

Big money has a toe hold in the village already, as evidenced by the Naramata Inn and several very large houses under construction. These forces should NOT determine the direction of growth for the village.

Concern that there will be developer influence on community decision-making which may reduce affordability of housing for workers and existing community members. Question need to increase taxes given the current catchment of Naramata. Isn't the existing tax base sufficient to maintain the village infrastructure for residents who aren't looking for city living? conditions.

Infrastructure like sewer in the village being helped paid for by the community not living in the village who doesn't new the sewer as septic systems work just fine

No opportunities for more businesses/services/employment

Commercial activity will keep locals living and working locally. Any small town needs services to support residents.

I think that some increase in the commercial vibrancy is good, and that some of the costs of increase can be paid for by developers of new businesses/infrastructure/housing,

No opportunities for employment within the village.

I do think some focus should remain on attracting businesses and services as well.

The Village has to have higher density that can only be achieved through more housing and commercial development. Currently, about one-third of the homes in the Village are seasonal. Commercial and residential growth cannot not be allowed to stagnate. The need for improvements to existing infrastructure can only be achieved through growth.

Don't agree with little change to commercial retail in village

Welcome the world to develop the village, provide services, employment and livable wages for residents.

Would like a bit more focus than described towards making the village more of a self sustained community hub.

To not allow the village to develop will just keep Naramata as a bedroom community to Penticton and will be a poor support for the growing tourism activity.

Would like to see a bit more vibrancy in the village.

Little change to the commercial vibrancy of the village would limit employment opportunities for residents.

The commercial vibrancy of the village needs to increase. Businesses pay taxes, too.

Nothing changes without commercial vibrancy

Again, progress. Any small town needs services to support residents. It can still remain a sleepy boring town if that's what the majority wants, but more commercial services would be welcomed and can be supported year round. Why are we forcing residents to drive 25 minutes to Penticton to big box stores? It's hypocritical that the tag line here is 'Shop Local'....?? Where would we shop local or support local?

we need some more services in the village

We think the village needs more affordable housing for families and workers, and more vibrancy is not a bad thing. There is room for more commerce without drastically changing the character of the village.

Not opposed but unrealistic to think no new housing should be built, commercial vibrancy is key to Naramata functioning as a town instead of a Penticton suburb

There is the opportunity for the village centre to grow without rural sprawl. However the developers should be paying a share of the cost of infrastructure improvements.

There is a strong need to increase the vibrancy of the village to increase the tax base and take the strain off residents to pay for everything.

I do believe that that some services and commercial infrastructure in the village would provide necessary amenities and prevent the need for longer drives for citizens.

I would like to see a continued increase in vibrancy in the village.

I think additional housing and commercial is also needed.

We need more commercial vibrancy in the Village!

We need to revitalize the commercial and provide amenities for residents to choose to shop for necessities in the village, and to provide tourists with something to do when they stay or visit This plan doesn't allow that.

A viable village, in the social sense, requires a demographic range that encourages families at all stages of development, in particular a viable school community and enough local infrastructure to keep community meeting in our community. Commercial activity will keep locals living and working locally. I'm opposed to the Whistlerization of Naramata which will continue to drive out young families and in turn limit the viability of Naramata's local amenities.

Would like to see more commercial opportunities in the village.

Misses out on developer contributions

Developers should be required to provide infrastructure and community beautification.

Hefty parkland dedication fees are some of the upfront monies developers are obligated to pay upfront, prior to being granted the right to develop. Some of these fees should be called "self-funded rural". I am in favour of using some of these funds throughout the geography of our town.

Think if there is any development the developers need to bear some cost with infrastructure

opposed - as I know investors are already here and want the development to go forward. they may as well be paying more if they want to make a profit off the tranquility and quiet living of Naramata

Developers should be required to provide infrastructure and community beautification. Look to Sidney and Langford on the island for examples.

It will be very expensive/community cannot afford it

Don't think we currently have the year-round population to really support services and public amenities. I am opposed to having our taxes increased. Why limit your opportunities.

No one wants to pay more taxes, we already pay reasonable taxes and have poor quality roads in and around the village.

Increased cost, don't think we currently have the year-round population to really support services and public amenities

The existing community, without any growth, lacks the economic resources to provide the new infrastructure, services and amenities needed.

Don't like the sound of higher taxes. With all the tourism, having the locals paying for the things they will use seems improper.

New infrastructure and public amenities are limited with limited tax base. A lot of volunteer work is required.

First let the people know how much the taxes and fees will increase.

AFFORDABLE housing must be prioritized

This model puts all the weight of development on tax payers and doesn't bring anything new to our village.

There will never be enough money from a small community like Naramata to self funding

I think that the community will need more services than this can provide

Again, assurance needed that increased taxes would actually go where they say

There is no growth projection. Taxes will increase, but the pool of taxpayers will remain static until there district becomes run down.

Increased taxes and fees are going to make it impossible for "common people" to live here. Already there is division between those who live in huge mansions on the hill or lakeside, and the rest of the village who live in modest houses. We need diversity, year-round residents and people who love and support their community.

It could be expensive and limit opportunity

We already pay high taxes so I would like to see the money spent more wisely

Some projects that would benefit the community may need financial support from other sources outside the taxpayer group. Taxes are part of housing which may be already too steep for many.

Because not everyone can afford to pay more/extra over and above their already high cost of living here, especially long term residence who are already having a tough time paying higher taxes because of low wages, retirement funding, un-able to work because of being handicapped etc. Having to sell their house because they can no longer afford to live here because of the artificially high assessment of their home.

Residents may be resistant to support any tax increases, thereby stifling development opportunities and much needed infrastructure upgrades (eg. sewer).

I would need to know in advance what the new infrastructure, services, amenities are and what the increased taxes and fees would be.

Why is this option linked to increased taxes and fees for infrastructure, services, and public amenities which are ordinarily paid for by taxes in any case?

Does this suggest the community currently receives all of those sub-standard, and any improvement/adjustment automatically results in increased taxes & fees?

Why limit your opportunities. There are many things we can do to make sure things are done right. We will never have enough resources to do what would make a difference to improve the quality of life.. You can attract outside investments that will share our values to guide future development.

The looming cost of sewer installation seems daunting

I am opposed to having our taxes increased.

I am leery of this option as it may prevent us from making necessary improvements in Naramata due to (natural) hesitancy or opposition to tax increases.

costs and increased taxes

The village/RDOS would have to apply for other government grants and assistance for major projects

The local population can only afford so much of their income in taxes and fees.

How are we going to fix all roads, water plants, and any other infra-structure.

Taxes and fees will always keep going up and if one does not allow the tax basis to broaden the cost could become unreasonable.

Taxes will go up and up to pay for each new legacy project

I don't believe there is a large enough population base to fund new infrastructure without an increase in small businesses

Not the increase of taxes, unless a sewer system is put into place.

Increased taxes are never welcome when they already increase every year without new infrastructure.

It is unclear what the new infrastructure will involve or what the new taxes will gain for us.

Increased taxes.

We don't need a lot of public amenities.

The village would remain unchanged, and we need a more vibrant village.

Not sure what type of services and public amenities we need.

I do like this idea, but am worried for some Naramata folks unable to cover higher taxes. Price of life is rising quickly and they are already struggling.

Increase taxes

This will never happen as people won't agree to pay out of their own pocket to improve the much needed infrastructure. Outside investment is a must!

Need opportunities for growth to keep community strong

If we do not provide *controlled* growth in housing and commercial activities, we will not be able to attract young families and workers to keep our community vibrant.

A bit more growth is desirable.

Again I am open to growth and new infrastructure. As long as we can create a balanced community. We need housing for families, school, daycare, amenities. We need to attract young - old for balance. We need to have the ability for many different income levels to live here in order to create the balanced village life many of us moved her for or have grown up here with.

No growth and not sustainable

Currently, Naramata is full of 'old' people. Hardly any young people. We need the young people to stay & be able to earn a living without having to leave for a large city to earn that living. There is NO life here except during the 'season' when people of all ages visit.

The self-funded concept, while possibly wonderful for some, is most likely suicidal for Naramata & the Village itself.

Unless people are wealthy (& retired!) they can't afford to live in Naramata.

So selfish and NIMBY. This is a glorious neighbourhood to share with others. If we do not provide *controlled* growth in housing and commercial activities, we will not be able to attract young families and workers to keep our community vibrant and alive and growing. Who will look after all the oldies (like me) if we do not have something to attract young people?

I am not opposed but also feel that places do not remain the same so it is better to plan for a given direction rather than create random exceptions for each planning application.

Right now, the enhancements to the village are limited and sometimes leave the village looking underinvested in - this scenario feels like the status quo.

Currently both the Village and Hillside communities are growing with out any change in Village development strategy so the default option is already happening (along with an increase in property taxes), so this option is 'business as usual' without much in the way of major infrastructure improvements . The Hillside particularly has evolved in the last 30 years from a few houses to a suburban sub--division without the addition of sidewalks, street lighting and adequate drainage.

I believe it's too late to take this approach in the village, development is well underway and more focus should be on community and year-round village life.

The ALR will protect the rural nature of Naramata . the commercial should grow in a very controlled manner to keep the village atmosphere. Any commercial development should pay 100% of any needed upgrades to the infrastructure caused by the development . increase in public amenities should be paid for by the community .

This describes the withering away of Naramata as a vibrant, living community.

I don't see this as a realistic option in our growing and expanding population.

In principal I like self funded models. In this case though with the development & desnsiifcation of Robinson Street & the opportunities to have a diverse cross section of sustainable built market & non market housing in the Naramata Centre lands as they are released is too much of an opportunity to shape Naramata for the next 100 years

Seems a bit small-minded and conservative to me. we have the scope to improve and grow - within reason.

I believe we need to grow as a village and a community. I believe we need to attract small businesses and build more parks in Naramata to keep our residents in Naramata instead of needing to access outside resources (Penticton) to fulfill our needs. Let's keep our community strong and have more access to resources through small businesses and parks here.

Neutral to slightly negative on this option, which is basically status quo. I much prefer it to rampant development of the hillsides, but think that it is too conservative by restricting growth of the village, particularly its commercial aspects.

We are social animals at heart. The notion of living in a location such as Naramata is a function of people, places and community. We all want to experience the outdoors, our neighbors, vistas and friends. The attraction of a place is its ability to adapt and grow with the times we live in and the welcoming arms of the community. The more welcoming a community, the more desirable and friendly its residents. Some of the most wonderful times we spend here are not planned, but happen organically.

Every community deserves to have some basic services and public amenities provided that like schools, are paid for by everyone even though not everyone makes direct use of them.

This scenario is probably not realistic as the village has been growing and the hillsides have as well. Difficult to put the brakes on now!!

Every community requires growth and this option prevents sufficient growth

New infrastructure and services are rarely attracted if there is little growth in population

I see it as status quo and no opportunity for growth.

Again, I think it is unrealistic to think we can stop the clock. Its a bit like the old expression, "pull the ladder up Jack I'm all right".

probably not sustainable in the long term

We can't resist change out of fear. It will come whether residents want it or not. We cannot be frozen in time , or in the last century, forever. The church properties are decrepit/need new painting, landscaping etc and are often look lonely/abandoned. Yes, it's quiet, but not a great atmosphere in some respects. We need increased vibrancy in the village,.

Self funded limits the growth potential of the central village. This growth is shat will attract mor tourists and visitors.

the village will gradually die

There needs to be some growth, or the community will stagnate.

I don't believe Naramata should be kept static and needs to grow into more of a commercial downtown area to better serve both visitors and locals.

It sounds like it would create a stagnant community.

This is unrealistic, Naramata of 10 to 20 years ago no longer exists and Naramata in 10 to 20 years will also be different.