

SUBMISSIONS

(File No. CT 23-01 Rosewood Reservoir)

NO.	DATE RECEIVED	TIME RECEIVED	RECEIVED FROM
Submissions included with agenda to Council			
Submissions included with late agenda items to Council			
1.	March 23, 2026	3:08 pm	Emma and Scott Hennings
2.	March 23, 2026	3:32 pm	Kirk and Diane Licht
3.	March 23, 2026	3:57 pm	Bailey D'Amato and Tyler Friesen

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City of West Kelowna Submissions](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Attn: Corporate Officer File Number (Z 25-10)
Date: Monday, March 23, 2026 3:08:14 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. **The City will never ask for personal or account information or account password through email.**

From: Scott Hennings and Emma-Jane Hennings 920 McKay Road West Kelowna, BC V1z 2C4

To Whom it May Concern:

This email is in opposition to proposed zoning bylaw amendment from R1 to RP1 at 942 McKay Road.

As long time residents (21 years) at our current property, we are opposed to the development proposal at 942 McKay Road. We chose to purchase our home and remain in this neighborhood because of low density housing. We appreciate living on a quiet street, with neighbours who look out for each other and the children who play on our street. We have the following the concerns with the proposal for a medium density housing complex on our street:

1. Traffic & Safety Impacts

- Even medium-density housing adds more vehicle trips than the road network was originally designed to handle.
- Increased congestion at key intersections and more cut-through traffic raise risks for pedestrians, cyclists, and children.
- Specific to McKay Road - Narrow road, no sidewalks, no street lights, and driveway visibility challenges worsen safety concerns.

2. Neighbourhood Character & Fit

- Medium-density buildings can be out of scale with surrounding single-family homes.
- Height, massing, and reduced setbacks may impact privacy, sunlight, and views.
- Growth should respect the established character of the neighbourhood while addressing housing needs.

3. Infrastructure Limitations

- Without upgrades (stormwater, and electrical systems were not designed for increased demand), service strain and long-term costs could increase for both the municipality and residents.
- Stormwater issues (runoff, pooling, erosion) may worsen as permeable surfaces decrease.

4. Parking & Street Congestion

- Medium-density projects often under-estimate real-world vehicle usage.
- Spillover parking onto residential streets creates safety hazards and reduces emergency access.
- Low-density neighbourhoods were never designed for multi-unit parking spillover.

5. Alignment With the City of West Kelowna Official Community Plan (OCP)

- While the community supports more housing, growth is typically intended for:
 - Town centres
 - Areas with existing high-capacity infrastructure
- The OCP highlights infill and densification **within designated growth areas**—not scattered medium-density up-zoning in established low-density neighbourhoods.
- Introducing medium-density where infrastructure is not prepared may conflict with OCP objectives.
- Upholding the OCP ensures consistent, sustainable, and community-supported growth.

6. Better-Suited Alternatives

- Gentle density (secondary suites, carriage homes) may provide compatible growth.
- Medium-density is more appropriate near commercial areas/major roads—where capacity already exists.
- Housing growth should enhance—not overwhelm—existing neighbourhoods.

We do support housing solutions, but **location and scale matter**. Medium-density development must be placed where infrastructure, streets, and neighbourhood design can support it—without compromising safety, character, or livability.

Thank you,

Emma and Scott Hennings

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City of West Kelowna Submissions](#)
Subject: Re: Fw: Attn: Corporate Officer File Number (Z 25-10)
Date: Monday, March 23, 2026 3:32:49 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. **The City will never ask for personal or account information or account password through email..**

To all this may concern:

I oppose the development of 942 McKay rd.

I am in agreement with what neighbor has put together and written, I too am a long time resident of the area, I purchased this home in 2001 with my wife and two children, we purchased the home because of the quite family oriented neighborhood.

Below is a copy to reiterate my concerns for this proposal.

Thank you
Kirk and Diane Licht

From: Emma-jane Hennings [REDACTED] >
Sent: March 23, 2026 3:08 PM
To: submissions@westkelownacity.ca <submissions@westkelownacity.ca>
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Attn: Corporate Officer File Number (Z 25-10)

From: Scott Hennings and Emma-Jane Hennings [920 McKay Road West Kelowna, BC V1z 2C4](#)

To Whom it May Concern:

This email is in opposition to proposed zoning bylaw amendment from R1 to RP1 at 942 McKay Road.

As long time residents (21 years) at our current property, we are opposed to the development proposal at 942 McKay Road. We chose to purchase our home and remain in this neighborhood because of low density housing. We appreciate living on a quiet street, with neighbours who look out for each other and the children who play on our street. We have the following concerns with the proposal for a medium density housing complex on our street:

1. Traffic & Safety Impacts

- Even medium-density housing adds more vehicle trips than the road network was originally designed to handle.
- Increased congestion at key intersections and more cut-through traffic raise risks for pedestrians, cyclists, and children.

- Specific to McKay Road - Narrow road, no sidewalks, no street lights, and driveway visibility challenges worsen safety concerns.

2. Neighbourhood Character & Fit

- Medium-density buildings can be out of scale with surrounding single-family homes.
- Height, massing, and reduced setbacks may impact privacy, sunlight, and views.
- Growth should respect the established character of the neighbourhood while addressing housing needs.

3. Infrastructure Limitations

- Without upgrades (stormwater, and electrical systems were not designed for increased demand), service strain and long-term costs could increase for both the municipality and residents.
- Stormwater issues (runoff, pooling, erosion) may worsen as permeable surfaces decrease.

4. Parking & Street Congestion

- Medium-density projects often under-estimate real-world vehicle usage.
- Spillover parking onto residential streets creates safety hazards and reduces emergency access.
- Low-density neighbourhoods were never designed for multi-unit parking spillover.

5. Alignment With the City of West Kelowna Official Community Plan (OCP)

- While the community supports more housing, growth is typically intended for:
 - Town centres
 - Areas with existing high-capacity infrastructure
- The OCP highlights infill and densification **within designated growth areas**—not scattered medium-density up-zoning in established low-density neighbourhoods.
- Introducing medium-density where infrastructure is not prepared may conflict with OCP objectives.
- Upholding the OCP ensures consistent, sustainable, and community-supported growth.

6. Better-Suited Alternatives

- Gentle density (secondary suites, carriage homes) may provide compatible growth.
- Medium-density is more appropriate near commercial areas/major roads—where capacity already exists.
- Housing growth should enhance—not overwhelm—existing neighbourhoods.

We do support housing solutions, but **location and scale matter**. Medium-density development must be placed where infrastructure, streets, and neighbourhood design can support it—without compromising safety, character, or livability.

Thank you,

Emma and Scott Hennings

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City of West Kelowna Submissions](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Attn: Corporate Officer File number (z25-10) Bailey D'amato 930 McKay road
Date: Monday, March 23, 2026 3:57:45 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. **The City will never ask for personal or account information or account password through email.**

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am writing to express my concern regarding the proposed rezoning from R1 (Single Detached and Duplex Residential) to RP1 (Residential Plex) at 942 McKay road. I am the property owner at 930 McKay road, immediately next door to 942 McKay, sharing my West property line.

While both zones permit up to four dwelling units, the difference in permitted building form and overall impact is significant. The R1 zone maintains a low-density, house-scale character, where additional units are typically subordinate to a primary dwelling (e.g., suites or carriage houses). In contrast, the RP1 zone enables townhouse development, allowing multiple units to be consolidated into a single building form. This represents a material increase in development intensity and a shift away from the established character of the neighbourhood. Additionally, our neighbourhood and specifically McKay Road does not have the appropriate infrastructure in place to begin densification as this rezoning would allow. We do not have street lights or sidewalks to safely accommodate additional housing and traffic. Furthermore, when we look at this property, it is accessed on a near 90 degree corner with limited visibility. Based on the current conceptual design, the usable land is almost all used by building spaces allowing for no parking outside of garages. This would increase parking on the street and create a significant and meaningful increase in risk for the many kids who play on the street and the community members that regularly walk dogs along our street. We have seen first hand "near miss" incidents of individuals attempting to access this property and narrowly avoiding pedestrians. Increasing density on this specific property and to our neighbour prior to additional infrastructure in place is not in the best interest for the city or our community.

In addition, the RP1 zone introduces reduced setback requirements compared to R1. These reductions allow the building to be placed significantly closer to our shared property line. This has a material impact on our privacy and ability to enjoy our yard in peace. This would be a significant change from the existing building location, and a great detriment to our property.

I respectfully request that Council considers the specific concerns for rezoning on this street and this specific property and decline this application. After reviewing the conceptual design plans and with our understanding of the rp1 zoning, we strongly oppose the development proposal at 942 McKay road. I believe that densification of our city will in fact be very beneficial for our community and alignment with our community plan can be achieved, however this must be done in a thoughtful and carefully executed manner to maintain the

safety, culture, and privacy of our beautiful city.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely, Bailey D'Amato and Tyler Friesen

930 McKay Road