

Christine & Shane Jordaan
156 Blackstock Rd
100 Mile House, BC
V0K 2E1

September 21, 2026

Mayor and Council
District of 100 Mile House
385 Birch Avenue
100 Mile House BC
V0K2E1

RE: Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 1483, 2026

Dear Mayor Pinkney and Council

We are the property owners immediately adjacent to the two lots proposed for rezoning on Blackstock Road. We understand that the process is for us to provide input at this rezoning stage, not at the time of subdivision. Our comments below are reflective of the proposed subdivision plan. We appreciate the opportunity to have input and trust that the final plan won't substantially change in a way that would negatively impact us.

We are generally supportive of the District encouraging the development of quality housing for our growing community. It is, however, important to us that the proposed subdivision does not negatively affect our property value or quality of life. We request that the subdivision consider sight lines and privacy of the neighbouring lots, including ours.

On first review of the proposed concept, we noticed a couple of errors that may cause confusion. While the proposed subdivision plan indicates that six of the 21 properties will be greater than 2 ha (4.9 acres), Proposed Lots 12 through 15 are in fact less than 0.3 ha (0.74 acres). While these are within the ER-2 minimum required area, four of the lots are not as large as indicated on the plan.

Of concern to us is Proposed Lot 1 (0.200ha), which is triangular in shape. The only dwelling location could be in the wide end of the lot, which would directly overlook our home. Is Proposed Lot 1 consistent with ER-2 minimum width requirements? Would the developer consider blending the first three lots of 0.200ha into two larger lots, which would reduce the impact on our home and provide buyers with a couple of more desirable lots. Blending these lots from three to two would also improve sight lines and privacy for our neighbours at 147, 166, and 171 Blackstock.

Beyond the issue with Proposed Lot 1, we have a few requests. The noise and dust arising from the development of the subdivision are concerns. We are asking that timing windows for activities be implemented and dust control applied if operations are taking place during dry periods. We request that the Council require a fenceline be established. Finally, a covenant to leave and/or create vegetated screening (i.e. shrubs and trees) along our common boundary would minimize the visual impact on our home, our neighbours, and new subdivision homeowners.

There appears to be a discrepancy between the OCP Schedule B map, which designates the properties in question as Rural Residential, and the 100 Mile House OCP Table 2: Table of Concordance, which indicates that the OCP designation for A-1 is Agriculture, not Rural Residential. Is this discrepancy an error in the OCP and is there any implication for this rezoning? This question is intended to help our understanding of the process.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input. While we are generally supportive of the rezoning, we are requesting that several considerations be incorporated, as noted above. Please keep us informed as this rezoning / subdivision proceeds.

Sincerely,

Shane and Christine Jordaan