



Penticton Indian Band
Natural Resources Department
841 Westhills Drive | Penticton, B.C.
V2A 0E8
Referrals@pib.ca | www.pib.ca
Telephone: 250-492-0411
Fax: 250-493-2882

FN ID: L-250616

Consulting ID: L-250616-X2024.017-ZONE

Project Name

L-250616-X2024.017-ZONE (Vacation Rental Review).

Consulting Organization:

Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen

16-Jun-2025 13:55 PDT

Attention: Ben Kent

RE: 40 (forty) day extension

Thank you for the above application that was received on 22-May-2025.

This letter is to inform you that due to current levels of internal capacity, we are unable to review your referral in your proposed timeline. With additional time, snpink'tn (Penticton Indian Band) will be able to ensure that an informed review process will occur. We are setting the new timeline to be 40 days from the existing timeline.

syilx (Okanagan Nation) Title includes snpink'tn right to proactively use and manage our resources. In Tsilhqot'in, the Supreme Court of Canada emphasizes the need to seek the consent of the title-holding Aboriginal group, and warns, without consent for a project, the proponent risks having the project cancelled. The obligation to seek free, prior and informed consent is further required by the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People (UNDRIP). UNDRIP requires that Indigenous peoples shall be consulted and cooperated with in good faith in order to obtain their free and informed consent prior to the approval of any project affecting their lands or territories and other resources, particularly in connection with the development, utilization or exploitation of mineral, water or other resources.



Penticton Indian Band
Natural Resources Department
841 Westhills Drive | Penticton, B.C.
V2A 0E8
Referrals@pib.ca | www.pib.ca
Telephone: 250-492-0411
Fax: 250-493-2882

Please note that not receiving a response regarding a referral from snpink'tn in the pre-application, current or post-application stage does not imply our support for the project.

I appreciate your co-operation.

limlæmt,

Caroline Stewart
Office Administrator
snpink'tn (Penticton Indian Band)
Natural Resources
email: cstewart@pib.ca
office: 250-492-0411 Ext: 241
address: 841 Westhills Drive
Penticton, British Columbia
Canada V2A 0E8



Penticton Indian Band
Natural Resources Department
841 Westhills Drive | Penticton, B.C.
V2A 0E8
Referrals@pib.ca | www.pib.ca
Telephone: 250-492-0411
Fax: 250-493-2882

FN ID:

L-250616

Consulting ID:

L-250616-X2024.017-ZONE

Project Name

L-250616-X2024.017-ZONE (Vacation Rental Review).

Consulting Organization:

Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen

16-Jun-2025 13:55 PDT

Attention: Ben Kent

We are in receipt of the above referral. This proposed activity is within the snpink'tn (PIB) Area of Interest within the Okanagan Nation's Territory, and the lands and resources are subject to our unextinguished Aboriginal Title and Rights.

The Supreme Court of Canada in the *Tsilhqot'in* case has confirmed that the province and Canada have been applying an incorrect and impoverished view of Aboriginal Title, and that Aboriginal Title includes the exclusive right of Indigenous People to manage the land and resources as well as the right to benefit economically from the land and resources. The Court therefore concluded that when the Crown allocates resources on Aboriginal title lands without the Indigenous peoples' consent, it commits a serious infringement of constitutionally protected rights that will be difficult to justify.

snpink'tn (PIB) has specific referral processing requirements for both government and proponents which are integral to the exercise of our management right and to ensuring that the Crown can meet its duty to consult and accommodate our rights, including our Aboriginal title and management rights. According to this process, proponents are required to pay a \$500 processing fee for each referral. This fee must be paid within 30 days. Proper consultation and consideration of potential impacts cannot occur without the appropriate resources therefore



Penticton Indian Band
Natural Resources Department
841 Westhills Drive | Penticton, B.C.
V2A 0E8
Referrals@pib.ca | www.pib.ca
Telephone: 250-492-0411
Fax: 250-493-2882

it is only with payment that proper consultation can begin and the proposed activity/development can be reviewed.

Invoice Number: L-250616-X2024.017-ZONE

Referrals Processing Fee

Sub Total \$ 500.00

Tax \$ 0.00

Total \$ \$500.00

INVOICE AMOUNT FOR PRELIMINARY OFFICE REVIEW \$500.00

We accept cash and cheque via mailing as well as EMT. Our mailing address is 841 Westhills Drive Penticton BC, V2A OE8. Our EMT is PIBPayments@pib.ca.

Please have 'ATTN: Natural Resources File # [insert invoice number] PC:132 ' in the notes if you are using EMT or if you are using another method, please supply the referral number with it .

Upon receipt of the processing fee, we will commence our review. You may then expect to receive a letter from us notifying you of the results of our review of potential impacts of the project within 30 to 90 days.

If the proposed activity requires a more in-depth review, snpink'tn (PIB) will notify the proponent and all parties will negotiate a memorandum of agreement regarding a process for review of the proposed activity.

Please note that our participation in the referral and consultation process does not define or amend snpink'tn (PIB) Aboriginal Rights and Title, or limit any priorities afforded to Aboriginal Rights and Title, nor does it limit the positions that we may take in future negotiations or court actions.

If you require further information or clarification, please do not hesitate to contact me.

limlæmt,



Penticton Indian Band
Natural Resources Department
841 Westhills Drive | Penticton, B.C.
V2A 0E8
Referrals@pib.ca | www.pib.ca
Telephone: 250-492-0411
Fax: 250-493-2882

Maryssa Bonneau
Referrals Coordinator
snpink'tn (Penticton Indian Band)
Natural Resources
email: mbonneau@pib.ca
office: 250-492-0411
cell: 250-486-3241
address: 841 Westhills Drive
Penticton, British Columbia
Canada V2A 0E8

Lesley Gibbons

From: Adrian Samuel [REDACTED]
Sent: June 20, 2025 9:33 AM
To: Planning
Subject: Feed Back on Short -Term Rentals in Electoral Area "E"

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear RDOS Planning Department,

We invested in Naramata three years ago with the clear intention of retiring here within the next five years. Currently, we occupy approximately 10% of the time, as we continue to fulfill our professional obligations in the Lower Mainland with plans to increase this time as we get closer to retirement. Our retirement strategy was thoughtfully planned, with short-term rentals forming a critical part of our financial model—long before the provincial government introduced sudden and sweeping regulatory changes, absent consultation or grandfathering provisions for existing property owners.

We are committed advocates of responsible short-term rentals and strongly believe in the rights of property owners to utilize their properties accordingly. To that end, we *fully support* licensing amendments that:

- Streamline the application process
- Promote certainty in real-estate investment
- Provide a clear framework for the enforcement of safety standards and compliance within fair and reasonable bylaws
- Promote mandatory use of property managers for absent owners
- Require regular in-person inspections by owners or their agents of vacant rentals
- Keep the playing field level and fair for all types of real estate owners

Short-term rentals make an outsized contribution to the local economy. Unlike long-term tenants, (generally speaking) short-term guests will dine out, rent recreational equipment, visit wineries and attractions, and make retail purchases—particularly wine—that fuel small business revenues much more frequently than a long term renter. Restricting these short term stays will have a chilling effect on local commerce, especially in a community that thrives on tourism and weddings but at the same time has so few affordable hotel spaces.

Notwithstanding the above, **we are firmly opposed to the *principal residency requirement***. We understand that the BC Government believes this restriction will help return “homes” to residents, but we believe this is a misguided approach. It undermines existing investments like ours and is based on a flawed assumption: that allowing short-term rentals only in secondary suites or outbuildings attached to principal residences will meaningfully increase long-term housing availability. In reality, the types of accommodation within principal residences frequently serve as essential housing for local workers, especially those in wineries, restaurants, and tourism-related jobs—and are often more appropriate than entire houses that have been tailored for short-term rentals.

Supporters of the principal residency condition appear to be less about housing supply and more about economic gatekeeping. By artificially reducing the number of legal short-term rental properties, this policy will inevitably drive-up rates and occupancy for those select few who remain eligible—consolidating advantage rather than broadening access. By no means are we suggesting that owners should not be able to provide short-term rentals in their principal residency. In fact, quite the contrary. We also acknowledge the need for a balanced and sustainable approach to housing and economic development. However, it is critical to recognize that most tourism and service industry employees working in Electoral Area E reside south of Naramata, closer to Penticton—just a 10-minute commute. (For perspective, many city residents, ourselves included, commute 35 minutes or more daily.) Rather than blanket restrictions which unfairly and arbitrarily decide which current owners are allowed to enjoy their properties and earn passive income and which are not, we recommend a data-driven approach: reevaluate the issuance of the number of **new** short-term rental licenses to be approved in subsequent years based on actual occupancy rates in Penticton and surrounding areas. This would provide a fair, flexible framework that aligns with both community needs and economics. Potential new investors would also then be given the opportunity to understand these risks prior to making their purchase.

Kind Regards,

Concerned Naramata Owner

RESPONSE SUMMARY

AMENDMENT BYLAW NOS. 3099 & 2800.50

- ☐ Approval Recommended for Reasons Outlined Below ☐ Interests Unaffected by Bylaw
- ☒ Approval Recommended Subject to Conditions Below ☐ Approval Not Recommended Due to Reasons Outlined Below

File: X2024.017-ZONE (Vacation Rental Review)
Amendment Bylaws No 3099, 2781.01 & 2800.50:

Approval Recommended Subject to the Conditions Outlined Below:

1. Each applicant for a building permit to construct a second dwelling of any type in Kaleden must apply to the Kaleden Irrigation District for a second water service to the property. All capital and connection fees will apply. Connecting off existing water services is not permitted. Under current rules, the RDOS does require "Proof of Water" confirmation from the KID for building permits.
2. Fire flow deficient areas within our service area, will not be permitted a second domestic water service unless mainline upgrades are completed to increase fire flow. If grant money were available to make improvements to the areas with fire flow deficiency, this would greatly affect the community's ability to densify and allow for more properties to have second dwellings.
3. The District currently can meet low density for servicing second dwellings; we are unable to meet medium density without significant infrastructure upgrades due to line sizes in some areas.
4. As always with greater density, the KID has concerns with the current septic systems in use, and any additional systems required to meet current standards. If a second dwelling or a suite is permitted on a low density residential lot, we recommend that both dwellings be inspected by a qualified company to ensure ability to meet capacity for both dwellings.
5. For billing purposes, we request that we receive a listing semi-annually of short term rental approvals and vacation rental licences issued within Area I, or a copy of each licence as they're issued.

Signature: Cheerl E. Della

Signed By: Cheerl E. Della

Agency: KALEDEN IRRIGATION DISTRICT

Title: Financial/Corp. Admin.

Date: June 23/2025.



Feedback Form

Regional District of Okanagan-Similkameen

101 Martin Street, Penticton, BC, V2A-5J9


Tel: 250-492-0237 / Email: planning@rdos.bc.ca

TO: Regional District of Okanagan-Similkameen

FILE NO.: X2024.017-ZONE

FROM: Name: Steve Jasper

Street Address:



RE: Electoral Area Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 3099
Okanagan Valley Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 2800.50

My comments / concerns are:

I do support the proposed amendment bylaw No. 3099 and No. 2800.50

X I do not support the proposed amendment bylaw No. 3099 and No. 2800.50

Please provide any comments you wish the Board to consider:

We have provided 2 B&B suites in our primary residence for 9 years now. In 2016, when we built our house, the 1980s bylaws allowed up to 3 B&B suites. There is adequate off-street parking for at least 6 vehicles on our property and to date we have no complaints from our neighbours about our B&B operations.

It is confusing to us that the proposed bylaw amendments in Area E would restrict our rental to one B&B suite. That makes no sense - restricting us to one B&B unit would not be 'returning' any rental space to be used for long-term accommodation or any other type of accommodation. In fact, the result would be to decrease the number of tourists that are able to stay in the local area. We know from talking to our guests that they spend a significant amount of dollars at local restaurants and wineries. These dollars are important to the economy of the Naramata area. In addition, decreasing our income potential would also result in undue financial hardship for us.

In conclusion, it is hard for us to understand the rationale for these bylaw amendments that apply to our specific location. Therefore we do not support them.

Steve and Susan Jasper

All representations, including names, will be made public if and when they are included in the Board Agenda.

Protecting your personal information is an obligation the Regional District of Okanagan-Similkameen takes seriously. Our practices have been designed to ensure compliance with the privacy provisions of the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* (British Columbia) ("FIPPA"). Any personal or proprietary information you provide to us is collected, used and disclosed in accordance with FIPPA. Should you have any questions about the collection, use or disclosure of this information please contact: Corporate Officer, RDOS, 101 Martin Street, Penticton, BC V2A 5J9, 250-492-0237.

July 24, 2025

Reply to the attention of Claire Buchanan
ALC Planning Review: 103929 and 103927
Local Government File: X2024.017.Zone

Ben Kent
Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen
EMAIL ADDRESS

Re: Amendments to Electoral Area "A", "C", "D", "E", "F" and "I" Official Community Plans ("OCP") for Short-Term Rental Accommodations and Amendments to the Okanagan Valley Zoning Bylaw No. 2025

Thank you for forwarding a draft copy of the Electoral Area "A", "C", "D", "E", "F" and "I" Official Community Plan updates (the "OCP") for review and comment (the "Referral") by the Agricultural Land Commission (the "ALC" or "Commission").

In March 2025, ALC provided comments on updates to the Electoral Area OCPs with respect to short-term rentals. The Referral provides an update and includes changes related to increasing the number of short-term rentals permitted on properties in certain electoral areas, and allowing year-round short-term rental of secondary suites and accessory dwellings.

Section 46 of the ALCA requires local governments to ensure their bylaws are consistent with the *Agricultural Land Commission Act* (ALCA), Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR) regulations, and any orders of the Commission. Inconsistent bylaws include (but are not limited to) those which allow a use of land in the ALR that is not permitted under the ALCA or contemplate a use of land that would impair or impede the intent of the ALCA. ALC staff provide the following comments to help ensure that the bylaw is consistent with the purposes of the ALCA, ALR regulations, and any previous decisions of the ALC. Please note that ALC staff cannot endorse any inconsistencies – that requires a resolution of the Commission.

Electoral Area "A", "C", "D", "E", "F" and "I" Official Community Plan

The Referral proposes updates to OCP policy statements regarding short-term rental accommodations to support these in residential, rural-residential, and rural land use designated through the issuance of a "Short-Term Rental Accommodation" permit.

ALC staff understand that the amendments proposed are applicable to land use designations that may contain lands within the ALR; however, there does not appear to be any mention of the ALR and the provisions that apply to land within the ALR.

ALC staff recommend clarifying that for parcels in the ALR, the short-term rental use must be consistent with the ALR Use Regulation or a decision of the Commission. More information on the short-term rentals in the ALR can be found in ALC Information Bulletin 06: Tourist and Agri-Tourism Accommodation in the ALR.

Okanagan Valley Zoning Bylaw No. 2025

Section 7.11 (Vacation Rentals) under Section 7.0 (Specific Use Regulations) will be entirely updated with the following:

7.11 Short-Term Rental Accommodations

The following regulations apply to short-term rental accommodation uses where permitted as a use in this Bylaw:

- .1 a short-term rental accommodation use is to be located within a dwelling unit that is also used for residential purposes by at least one person, or is located on the same parcel as another dwelling unit that is used for residential purposes by at least one person;*
- .2 the maximum number of dwelling units that may be used for a short-term rental accommodation use per parcel shall be as follows:*
 - a) in the Resource Area, Agricultural, Large Holdings, Small Holdings and Low Density Residential zones:*
 - i) one (1) per parcel in Electoral Areas "E" and "F";*
 - ii) two (2) per parcel in Electoral Areas "A", "C", "D" and "I";*
 - b) in the Medium Density Residential, Town and Village Centre and Comprehensive Development zones there shall be no limit;*
- .3 the maximum number of patrons that may be accommodated within a dwelling unit shall not exceed two (2) per bedroom;*

.4 despite Section 7.11.1, in Electoral Areas "A", "C" and "E", persons operating a short-term rental accommodation must be present and residing in the same dwelling unit as a patron during the patron's stay;

.5 despite Sections 7.11.2 and 7.11.3, for parcels situated within the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR), a short-term rental accommodation use is permitted only to the extent that it is consistent with applicable provincial legislation or an approval from the Agricultural Land Commission (ALC) has been granted for such a short-term rental accommodation use.

ALC staff appreciate the addition of the language under 7.11.5 noting that lands within the ALR must be consistent with provincial legislation or an approval from the ALC. ALC staff recommend including referring to the *Agricultural Land Commission Act* and ALR regulations for greater clarity of the provincial legislation that applies to lands within the ALR.

ALC staff note that the several agricultural zones will be update to reference the updated Section 7.11 Short Term Rental Accommodations. ALC staff have no concerns about these updates based on the language in Section 7.11.

The ALC strives to provide a detailed response to all referrals affecting the ALR; however, you are advised that the lack of a specific response by the ALC to any draft provisions cannot in any way be construed as confirmation regarding the consistency of the submission with the ALCA, the regulations, or any decisions of the Commission.

This response does not relieve the owner or occupier of the responsibility to comply with applicable Acts, regulations, bylaws of the local government, and decisions and orders of any person or body having jurisdiction over the land under an enactment.

If you have any questions about the above comments, please contact the undersigned at 236-468-2034 or by e-mail at ALC.Referrals@gov.bc.ca).

Yours truly,



Claire Buchanan, Regional Planner

Enclosure: Referral of X2024.017.Zone
CC: Ministry of Agriculture and Food

103929m2

103927m2

Lesley Gibbons

To: leslie ford
Subject: RE: New bylaws

Ok Jen here's the signed forms with additional comments to the board agenda

Feedback Form
Regional District of Okanagan-Similkameen
101 Main Street, Penticton, BC, V2A-5J9
Tel: 250-493-8237 / Email: planning@rdso.bc.ca

TO: Regional District of Okanagan-Similkameen FILE NO.: X2024 017-ZONE

Name: Leslie Ford (please print)
[Redacted]

RE: Electoral Area Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 3099
Okanagan Valley Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 2800.50

My comments / concerns are:

☒ I do support the proposed amendment bylaw No. 3099 and No. 2800.50
☐ I do not support the proposed amendment bylaw No. 3099 and No. 2800.50

Please provide any comments you wish the Board to consider:

[Redacted]

All representations, including names, will be made public if and when they are included in the Board Agenda.
Providing your personal information to us obligates the Regional District of Okanagan-Similkameen (RDOS) to protect it. Our policies have been designed to ensure compliance with the privacy provisions of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FIPPA). Any personal or proprietary information you provide to us is collected, used and disclosed in accordance with FIPPA. Should you have any questions about the collection, use or disclosure of this information please contact: Corporate Officer, RDOS, 101 Main Street, Penticton, BC V2A-5J9, 250-493-8237.

I am writing to express concern about the proposed Short-Term Rental regulations for Area E, particularly the clause limiting properties to only one STR per parcel.

Current Framework & Provincial Alignment

Area E currently permits short-term accommodations via Bed & Breakfast or Temporary Use Permit (TUP) categories. Under the provincial Short-Term Rental Accommodations Act, an on-site owner is allowed to operate their principal residence plus one additional legal suite or accessory dwelling unit, provided safety and licensing requirements are met.

The RDOS proposal to reduce this to just one STR per property removes flexibility that the province intended and risks harming tourism, small business, and economic resilience in Naramata.

Tourism Decline Is Already Happening

The tourism economy in our area is already struggling. Restaurants keep closing in Naramata — not because they can't find staff, but because they cannot afford to keep enough staff on. Many are operating with smaller crews, cutting hours, or closing entirely. Reduced visitor numbers from fewer short-term rentals only adds to this financial pressure.

Why Stricter-Than-Provincial Rules Are Unnecessary

The province's law already limits STR supply through the principal-residence rule, registration, and licensing. Adding an even stricter "one STR per parcel" cap:

- Removes safe, compliant, and owner-supervised accommodations from the market
- Harms small operators who follow the rules
- Further reduces visitor capacity when the tourism sector is already shrinking
- Risks deepening economic losses for restaurants, wineries, shops, and service providers
- Creates inconsistency between provincial and local rules, causing confusion for hosts and guests

Request to RDOS Council

I urge RDOS to align with the provincial model, allowing an on-site owner to operate their principal residence plus one additional self-contained unit, subject to licensing, inspections, and safety compliance.

Short-term rentals not only keep our tourism economy alive — they directly create local jobs for cleaners, landscapers, septic companies, handymen, contractors, winemakers,

and other trades and service providers. This balanced approach supports housing goals, preserves tourism capacity, keeps people working locally, and avoids unnecessary harm to our small businesses and overall economy.

Please add my name to the notification list for all public hearings and readings related to these bylaws.

Sent from my iPhone

Lesley Gibbons

Subject: FW: Short Term Rental Feedback

From: Alan Gove [REDACTED]
Sent: September 8, 2025 10:04 AM
To: Info E-Box <info@rdos.bc.ca>
Subject: Short Term Rental Feedback

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

To Whom it May Concern,

We were not able to be on the Zoom call last week, so we wanted to send a quick note to share opinions on the issue of short-term rentals, and the very distinct difference between B&Bs/Guest Houses, and houses that are rented to groups.

These are very distinct types of tourist accommodations, and do not in any way lend themselves to a "one size fits all" policy.

Any and all problems, both real and imagined (the very large majority of "problems" around accommodations are imagined, not real, that's a fact) can and would be solved simply by adopting a primary residence policy for short-term rentals (and obviously, B&Bs/Guest Houses/Inns currently abide by the policy by definition); this is the only policy that is necessary to control noise, disruption, control numbers of people who can stay at any given accommodation, and put a stop to speculative real estate purchases that are perceived to be the root of the problem of higher real estate prices, and lower long-term rental availability. This is the one and only regulation that needs to be adopted, full-stop, along with actual enforcement of noise complaints that come in. Those very few people who own multiple properties and use them as vacation rentals will no longer be able to do so, and therefore, logically, will sell them or rent them to full-time rentals (though, of course, the irony of this entire discussion is that the reality will be far different – as we discuss later, the buyers of these houses will only exacerbate the issues that are at hand, and prices will escalate even faster).

We would hope that the businesses who have been doing this properly for many years – places like Sutherland Blueberry, Suite Dreams Naramata, Singing Marmot, Bench D'or, Villa Magnolia Guest House – and diligently (*and in good faith*) paying B&B fees to the RDOS near \$400 annually, while making great friendships and business relationships throughout Naramata, and making positive impacts in the community (literally bringing in critical millions of dollars to this electoral district in direct revenue contributions, and indirectly to the region and Province through taxes) and being upstanding citizens of Naramata whose businesses never bother anyone, would receive consideration to grandfather their current status, and be exempt from policy that might result from these discussions. Again, a blanket policy thrown over the very, very different and distinct types of accommodators (a vacation rental is utterly different than a B&B) is wrong and unfair.

All of these accommodations (and more) regularly and diligently and properly collect and pay GST to the federal government, PST to the Province, MRDT to Discover Naramata; they pay B&B fees to the RDOS; they are registered as accommodations with the Province for the purposes of their tax assessments, and diligently

complete the Provincial assessment work every year; they are already diligent about safety; they already patrol noise; they already instill respect for Naramata and the neighbourhood they are in to all of their guests; their business model does not include groups of six or eight people renting their establishment, like vacation rentals, which is the cause of most noise problems; they bend over backwards to be a part of the community and promote Naramata – and respect for the neighbourhoods and people who live in them – endlessly and proudly. To have them included under a regressive policy blanket that burdens them with utterly needless regulation and hoops to jump through when they are not remotely part of the issues that are purportedly being addressed here would be deeply wrong and discouraging. These businesses should be buoyed and be given assistance to continue to do their job of lifting up this community, not be dragged down with needless further expense, regulatory burdens, and vilification.

And to consider a single allowable “unit” in a house is absurd; that would destroy the very notion of a B&B, and is deeply unequitable.

Consider this: What is the difference between a vacation rental with a single “unit” that can be rented to six people, or a B&B that accommodates three couples separately? **The biggest difference is that the vacation rental is this scenario will be far more disruptive to the neighbourhood, as it is a group rental** – six people together can and always do make a lot of noise, which places a heavier burden on the community. Three separate couples in three separate suites quietly enjoying their time in a B&B makes no negative impact on the neighbourhood whatsoever. It seems like it is the intent of the RDOS (or the people driving the RDOS to consider these policies) to destroy B&Bs within the RDOS, and drive these community-enhancing small businesses into bankruptcy or to sell their homes. To what end is unclear. But here’s the reality: If the RDOS destroys these B&Bs, it will have a strong negative impact on the economy of this community; it will cause most of the accommodations to change their business models to that of a vacation rental, and go from a quiet, respectful accommodation that bothers nobody to a group-based vacation rental that will disrupt the lives of their neighbours and themselves; none of these accommodators will get into the long-term rental market; and if any of these accommodators decide to sell their homes, there is a near 100% certainty that these homes will go to wealthy people from Vancouver/Calgary/Edmonton/Victoria, who will use them from time to time (and usually as a disruptive party house), and those homes will sit empty most of the year. And by the way, those sales will contribute to the escalatory curve of house prices in Naramata.

We would hope that the RDOS will understand that the simple adoption of principal residence will solve literally every problem that has been raised, both real and imagined (and, again, most “problems” are imagined). We would hope that resources would be put toward enforcement of noise complaints, bylaws that are already on the books, rather than funneling resources to an unnecessary licensing program that will divert time and resources that are apparently already scarce within the RDOS to unnecessary activities, and allow the RDOS to focus on more positive and constructive activities that support the community and the people who live here.

We feel that placing onerous regulatory conditions on this sector is regressive in every way. There is no “over-tourism” issue anywhere in the Okanagan that needs to be regulated - in fact, quite the opposite, and every aspect of government, every business, and every tourism association should be doing everything possible to increase tourism, as the drop in tourism that we have already experienced over the last two years - and the attendant drop of dollars brought into our communities - is a grave threat to the local and regional economies. Without tourist dollars – and more and more of them – Naramata will wither economically. Employment in tourist-facing businesses like the store, Sun ‘n Sup, the restaurants, winery tasting rooms this far out on the Bench, etc. will decrease. But the problem of higher housing costs will continue, because of

how and why houses are purchased in Naramata; something that will not change, as it is not related to Naramata's economic growth or well-being, or tourist numbers, or accommodations.

This brings us to another point, which is actually the top driver of housing prices in Naramata (and most resort towns worldwide) – people with means from Calgary/Edmonton/Vancouver/wherever who own houses and lots in Naramata and use them only part of the time, for themselves as a vacation property, and for friends to use. There are many people here who literally own multiple properties and only use them sparingly; the number of houses here that are owned and used for these purposes far exceeds the number of homes used as vacation rentals. This is far more prevalent and a far larger factor in escalation of housing prices (along with various other economic reasons that extend beyond this) and lack of rental availability in Naramata, along with the desirability of Naramata as a resort town. This has been going on literally for decades. It is bemusing to listen to people point their fingers at vacation rentals as a reason why someone who works in the service/tourism industry (ironic) or who are in a certain demographic or stage of life, cannot afford to buy a house in Naramata, when this has been true for decades. People want a villain, and vacation accommodations are the villain du jour. It is disappointing that an administrative/governing body would buy into this zeitgeist from a policy perspective.

Accommodations of every kind play an exceptionally important role in bringing people to our specific area, and make large contributions to the local and regional economies - it would be far more productive to help the operators of accommodations rather than continuously hinder, shame, and discourage them. Again, the policy of primary residence will weed out most of the "problem" people and accommodations.

Over-regulation is not something that the RDOS should be seeking, as it will place a needless administrative burden on RDOS staff, when those limited resources could be directed toward more progressive, economy-building activities, rather than regressive, economically-negative, and punitive policies.

Thank you for your time, and we hope that the correct decision is reached.

Best,

Alan & Anna Gove

Lesley Gibbons

Subject: FW: Vacation rental review

From: Emma Tones [REDACTED]
Sent: September 9, 2025 12:03 PM
To: Info E-Box <info@rdos.bc.ca>
Subject: Vacation rental review

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

Hello:

I am an owner of a property in the RDOS, electoral area C.

I am opposed to additional legislation regarding vacation rentals for the following reasons:

1. it isn't clear why additional regulations are needed? What problems are being solved? (or is permitting just a way to collect additional fees?). The province already regulates short term rentals, why is an additional level of regulation required? BC's regulation on short-term rentals does say that "Local government may prefer to have more restrictive short-term rental bylaws depending on local needs", but what are the local needs?

2. regulations will limit short-term rentals in some areas and short-term rentals are good for the local economy. Short-term rentals bring tourists and employ local companies. The community in/around my property (and my property) are heavily reliant on tourism. Tourists coming for a weekend are eating at restaurants, shopping at the local stores, hiring tour companies, buying cases of wine. In operating a short-term rental I hire house cleaners, landscapers, a pool maintenance company, event planners, etc.

In conclusion, if additional regulations solved problems associated with short-term rentals in the RDOS, and if solving those problems outweighed the loss of tourist revenue, then I could understand. Right now, I don't see any positive impact to additional regulation.

Respectfully, Emma O'Neill