

---

**From:** Village of Cumberland  
**Sent:** December 15, 2025 9:19 AM  
**To:** Kevin McPhedran; Planning  
**Cc:** Melissa Roeske  
**Subject:** FW: Saito House and Lot Sale; Urging council to clarify details, before OCP is voted on

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: December 13, 2025 8:16 PM  
To: Village of Cumberland <info@cumberland.ca>  
Subject: Saito House and Lot Sale; Urging council to clarify details, before OCP is voted on

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification> ]

Dear Staff and Council,

I have been keeping up with [REDACTED] many postings regarding the Saito land, and am troubled. If [REDACTED] is correct, it's then apparent that the reasons for the sale of that land and a buyer being pre agreed upon and rushed through at this time (OCP approval), is not the actions of the transparent council we voted for.

I urge you for the sake of honesty and true community to take time to explain your thinking before the community plan is voted into place. We put our trust in you.

As a community, we need more backstory information, equal opportunity and to see our council stand up and tell the story truthfully. Many of us who truly care about Cumberland just don't understand; this is your opportunity to clarify and show true backbone, please.

I myself am not interested in purchase, I am interested in truth and wanting to continue to support Cumberland council; to believe in each individual who has put themselves forward to work on our behalf and to serve the interests of all, for the good of everyone.

Please tell us,

Most sincerely, and with kindness,  
[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPad

---

**From:** Village of Cumberland  
**Sent:** December 15, 2025 9:33 AM  
**To:** Planning  
**Cc:** Melissa Roeske  
**Subject:** FW: Dec 15 Public Hearing Comment – Concerns About Bicycle Requirements in Zoning Bylaw No. 1238, 2025

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** December 11, 2025 5:33 PM  
**To:** Village of Cumberland <info@cumberland.ca>  
**Subject:** Dec 15 Public Hearing Comment – Concerns About Bicycle Requirements in Zoning Bylaw No. 1238, 2025

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am writing to express concern about the scale and ambition of the bicycle infrastructure requirements outlined in our new Zoning Bylaw No. 1238 (2025), and to respectfully suggest that adjustments be made to better reflect Cumberland's context and actual usage patterns.

As it stands, even a three-unit apartment (for example, above a commercial unit) would be required to include a dedicated bike room with a toilet, sink, shower, locker, bike repair station, and wash station with water access. While these features might be reasonable in large urban towers, they seem excessive and impractical for smaller-scale developments in a village like ours. These requirements increase construction costs and consume valuable floor space. This is especially concerning as we strive to create more affordable and flexible housing options.

Speaking personally, as a casual cyclist, if I lived in one of these apartments, I would likely shower in my own unit, where I have access to towels, clean clothes, and toiletries. The idea of showering in a shared bike room seems unnecessary for most residents, especially in a small building.

I also want to revisit concerns I raised earlier this year about the bicycle parking requirements for the Cumberland Community School expansion. At the time, the bylaw mandated an unrealistically high number of bike stalls—204 Class 1 and 287 Class 2—which would have required a significant amount of land to be cleared, including mature trees. While a variance was eventually granted, reducing the Class 1 stalls to 40, this was a one-off solution and did not lead to a broader revision of the bylaw to prevent similar issues in future projects.

Notably, at the April 28, 2025 Council meeting, Councillor Neil Borecky asked staff whether the loss of trees could be avoided by removing the electric bicycle charging station requirements. The planner responded that it would not make a difference. However, the site plan drawings clearly showed the trees

in question were directly impacted by the proposed infrastructure. Those trees were later cleared, as shown on the revised site diagrams. This included clearing for the bicycle charging area, as well as for the newly mandated electric vehicle charging stations. I question whether teachers will realistically choose to charge their bikes or vehicles at school using slow chargers, especially when many are likely departing from homes that already have access to personal charging. It will be interesting to see in a couple years if the usage matches the bylaw.

These situations highlight the growing tension between our bylaw's ideals and the practical realities of development in our community. We must find a better balance between supporting sustainable transportation and avoiding unnecessary project costs, urban canopy loss, and inefficient use of space, particularly in the case of retrofits or public infrastructure expansions.

I urge Council to revisit the bicycle-related provisions in the proposed zoning bylaw and consider scaling them appropriately to project size, actual local demand, and the rural-urban character of Cumberland. Let us aim for smart, effective regulations rather than idealistic ones that do not reflect how our community lives and moves.

Thank you for your time and thoughtful consideration.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED], Cumberland

---

**From:** Village of Cumberland  
**Sent:** December 15, 2025 10:18 AM  
**To:** Planning  
**Cc:** Melissa Roeske  
**Subject:** FW: Draft bylaw feedbeack

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** December 14, 2025 3:08 PM  
**To:** Village of Cumberland <info@cumberland.ca>  
**Cc:** Vickey Brown <mayor.brown@cumberland.ca>; Troy Therrien <councillor.therrien@cumberland.ca>; Neil Borecky <councillor.borecky@cumberland.ca>; Sean Sullivan <Councillor.sullivan@cumberland.ca>; Nick Ward <councillor.ward@cumberland.ca>  
**Subject:** Draft bylaw feedbeack

**Dear Mayor and Council and Planning Staff,**

As I will not be able to spend much time at the open house, and was unable to attend the APC meeting where these items were discussed, I am writing to share the following comments on the draft bylaws for your consideration.

**1. Accessory building exemption (p. 30)**

Accessory buildings up to 10 sq m are exempt from lot coverage; however, a fourplex would require a minimum shed size of approximately 16.6 sq m to meet long-term bicycle storage requirements. This would account for roughly 2.5–3% of total lot coverage. I respectfully ask whether either the bicycle storage requirements could be reduced or the accessory building exemption increased to better align these provisions.

**2. Home occupation (major) (p. 34)**

Limiting home occupations to a maximum of two non-resident employees and prohibiting this use in the R-1 zone feels overly restrictive. There are very limited commercial rental options available in the community. I am concerned about how this regulation would affect the many existing home businesses currently operating successfully in R-1 zones with more than two non-resident employees.

**3. Parking requirements – Village Core (p. 60)**

The proposed requirements include residential, commercial, visitor, and loading/unloading parking, with no cash-in-lieu option. The APC has unanimously recommended removing commercial parking requirements on two occasions. While parking is important, it comes with significant opportunity costs. I am concerned these requirements may make development in the village core financially unfeasible and instead push development outward. It is also unclear whether any existing village core properties meet all of these proposed standards. Given that village cores typically generate the highest tax revenue per hectare, these requirements require careful consideration.

**4. Bicycle requirements (p. 77)**

I am curious about the origin of these requirements. Long-term bicycle storage, hydraulic lift buttons, and end-of-trip facilities with showers appear costly and exceed what is typically provided, particularly in residential buildings where occupants have private bathrooms. I suggest allowing developers and homeowners greater flexibility to respond to their intended market.

## **5. Camp Road setbacks (p. 91)**

While this setback may be appropriate for some Camp Road properties, it creates challenges for properties already set back at a typical distance, such as 2522 Dunsmuir Avenue. The regulation could result in awkward building placement for secondary dwellings and may eliminate the feasibility of carriage houses. Historic photos show varied setbacks along Camp Road. Consideration could be given to a minimum setback of 0 metres without a maximum setback?

## **6. Mixed-use general regulations (p. 99)**

Requiring 10% adaptable dwelling units in buildings with three or more units, while also limiting ground-floor residential, may unintentionally necessitate elevators, significantly increasing costs.

## **7. Mixed-use development standards (p. 100)**

The minimum ground-storey height of 3.7 m (12.14 ft) across the entire downtown core and Coal Valley Estates mixed-use area seems high. Clarification on the rationale for this standard would be appreciated.

## **8. Zoning maps and urban containment boundary**

I would like to see more of serviced Cumberland included within the urban containment boundary, as well as mechanisms that allow larger lots to incrementally add density.

## **9. Subdivision standards (p. 89)**

The proposed doubling of minimum lot area and increased minimum lot width prevent subdivision of legacy lots (e.g., 60' x 120'). These changes significantly limit the ability of homeowners and small-scale builders to contribute to gentle density in serviced areas and risk undermining the intent of the Province's SSMUH legislation.

Larger minimum lot requirements push projects into more capital-intensive forms, increasing financing complexity and market risk, and may result in fewer viable housing projects overall.

I respectfully ask Council and staff to consider:

- How the revised subdivision standards align with the intent of SSMUH legislation
- The cumulative impact on housing supply, affordability, and small-scale development
- Alternative approaches that manage form and fit, rather than precluding subdivision outright

Cumberland has an opportunity to meet provincial housing requirements in a way that reflects local values: incremental change, housing diversity, and a built form that evolves while retaining community character. I encourage Council and staff to revisit these provisions and consider adjustments that allow reasonable subdivision while still meeting planning objectives.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I appreciate the work being done and hope this feedback is helpful in achieving a balanced outcome.

Sincerely,



---

**From:** Village of Cumberland  
**Sent:** December 15, 2025 1:30 PM  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** FW: Public Hearing 12-15-25 Bylaw Changes (OCP & Coal Valley Estates)

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** December 15, 2025 1:24 PM  
**To:** Village of Cumberland <info@cumberland.ca>; Seamus McConville <smccconville@cumberland.ca>  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Public Hearing 12-15-25 Bylaw Changes (OCP & Coal Valley Estates)

Dear Mayor and Council,

**Re: Urgent Need for Bylaw Amendments to Strengthen Development Oversight for Coal Valley Estates**

I am writing to respectfully request that the Village of Cumberland consider urgent amendments to the **Zoning Bylaw**, the **Subdivision & Development Bylaw**, and the **Development Permit Area (DPA) Guidelines** to ensure full alignment with the **Official Community Plan (OCP) Bylaw 1230, 2025**. These amendments are necessary to adequately protect the Village from the significant environmental, infrastructural, and public safety risks associated with upcoming phases of the Coal Valley Estates (CVE) development.

Coal Valley Estates is one of the largest and most environmentally sensitive development areas in Cumberland. It contains:

- steep and erosion-prone ravines
- groundwater recharge areas
- interface wildfire conditions
- limited evacuation routes
- major future transportation corridors
- significant hydrological vulnerability

Current bylaws do not yet fully align with the OCP, leaving critical policy gaps that could be exploited—particularly by a developer with a documented history of minimizing environmental, hydrological, and infrastructure obligations. To prevent these vulnerabilities and ensure responsible development consistent with community expectations, I urge Council to adopt the following bylaw amendments.

---

## **I. Recommended Bylaw Amendments**

### **1. Zoning Bylaw Amendments**

#### **A. Formalize Ravine & Stream Setbacks**

Add new section 8.12.3:

- (a)** For ravines <60 m wide: **30 m beyond the top-of-bank**, as defined by a QEP.  
**(b)** For ravines ≥60 m wide: **10 m beyond the top-of-bank**.

**(c)** For all streams: **30 m from the high-water mark** on both sides.

**(d)** No variances permitted.

*Justification:* Required under OCP environmental guidelines and RAPR alignment.

---

#### **B. Require EV-Ready Infrastructure**

“All multi-unit residential buildings shall provide energized outlets capable of Level 2 charging in 100% of parking spots/stalls.”

*Justification:* Implements OCP Section 7.7.5.

---

#### **C. Enforce Map C Requirements (Kendal–Penrith Corridor)**

“Where land is shown on OCP Map C as part of the Kendal–Penrith corridor, subdivision approval shall not be granted unless such lands are fully dedicated.”

---

#### **D. Strengthen Slope Protection**

“Development on slopes >20% is prohibited unless certified safe by both a QEP and a geotechnical engineer.”

*Justification:* OCP hazard avoidance requirement.

---

### **2. Subdivision & Development Bylaw Amendments**

#### **A. Require 100- and 200-Year Stormwater Modelling**

“Applicants must submit hydrological models evaluating 100- and 200-year storm events, including climate-adjusted IDF curves.”

*Justification:* Supports natural hydrology and hazard mitigation as required by OCP.

---

#### **B. Require Groundwater Vulnerability Assessments**

“Where land lies within DPA 2 or recharge areas, a hydrogeologist must prepare a groundwater vulnerability assessment.”

---

#### **C. Require Comprehensive Slope Stability Analysis**

“A geotechnical hazard assessment is required for all lands with slopes exceeding 15%. No subdivision may be approved where slope instability exists.”

---

#### **D. Prevent Improper Park Dedication**

“Environmentally sensitive areas, SPEAs, ravine slopes, wetlands, stormwater facilities, and all areas with grades >20% shall not count toward parkland dedication.”

---

---

## **E. Require Early Construction of Kendal–Penrith Emergency Corridor**

“No subdivision creating more than 10 lots shall be approved until the Kendal–Penrith corridor is dedicated and bonded.”

---

## **F. Fire Flow & Emergency Access Requirements**

“Developments in the Wildland–Urban Interface must provide:

- (a) Fire-flow modelling
  - (b) Two fully developed evacuation routes
  - (c) Fire hydrant spacing  $\leq 90$  m”
- 

## **3. Development Permit Area (DPA) Guideline Amendments**

### **A. Strengthen QEP Authority**

“Where QEP recommendations conflict with developer plans, the QEP recommendation shall prevail.”

---

### **B. Require Natural Asset & Ecological Corridor Retention**

Applicants must demonstrate preservation of natural drainage patterns, native vegetation, and wildlife connectivity.

---

### **C. Strengthen Groundwater Protection**

“Stormwater infiltration systems must be designed to eliminate any contaminant risk to aquifers.”

---

### **D. FireSmart Compliance**

“Vegetation, fencing, landscaping, and building materials must meet FireSmart BC standards.”

---

## **II. Additional Amendments Requested by the Community**

To address long-standing issues in the Coal Valley application process, we request the following **critical new protections**:

---

### **1. Road Grade Requirements**

“Road grades must meet TAC standards and may not exceed:

- 10% for collector roads
- 12% for local roads

Grades over 8% require documented safety measures (landing intervals, guardrails, sidewalks, etc.).”

---

## **2. Integrated Traffic Calming Requirements**

“All new subdivision roads must incorporate physical traffic-calming features such as raised crosswalks, curb bulb-outs, speed tables, chicanes, or lane narrowing. Paint-only measures are insufficient.”

---

## **3. Light Pollution Prevention (Dark-Sky Compliance)**

“All exterior lighting shall be dark-sky compliant, downward-shielded, warm-spectrum LED, and professionally designed. No uplighting is permitted.”

---

## **4. Mandatory Complete Application Package (No Piecemeal Submissions)**

“Any development application for Coal Valley Estates must be submitted as a complete, consolidated package. Partial or incremental submissions shall be deemed incomplete and will not be accepted.”

The complete package must include:

- stormwater modelling (100- and 200-year)
- groundwater assessment
- fire-flow and evacuation modelling
- full road network design with grades
- traffic impact study
- complete environmental / QEP report with SPEA mapping
- full geotechnical slope analysis
- consolidated parkland plan (usable land only, with fields, not more bike paths)
- erosion/sediment control plan

A professional developer submits a complete technical package, not dozens of disconnected fragments.

---

## **5. Mandatory Consolidated Constraints Mapping**

“All submissions must include a consolidated map showing:

- top-of-bank + ravine setbacks
- SPEA boundaries
- slopes over 15% and 20%
- flood pathways and overland flow routes
- groundwater recharge areas
- wildfire interface boundaries
- Map C transportation corridors
- proposed lot lines and building envelopes”

This prevents confusion, omissions, and contradictory information.

---

### **III. Policy Justification**

These amendments align with OCP directions on:

- environmental protection
- growth management
- infrastructure and servicing
- hazard mitigation
- climate adaptation
- legal obligations under RAPR and the Local Government Act

They protect the Village from:

- environmental degradation
- slope instability
- stormwater and flooding risks
- aquifer contamination
- wildfire evacuation failures
- unusable or misleading parkland dedications
- developer attempts to “game” the system

Together, they close loopholes that could otherwise result in unsafe or irresponsible development outcomes.

---

### **IV. Risks of Not Adopting These Amendments**

If the Village does not adopt these updates:

- Council will have reduced authority to enforce standards
  - Developers may proceed under outdated policies
  - Flooding and drainage failures will become more likely
  - Emergency evacuation may remain inadequate
  - Groundwater contamination risks heighten
  - Environmental and public safety impacts may be irreversible
  - Staff and Council will continue to receive piecemeal, confusing application materials
- 

### **V. Requested Motion**

I respectfully request Council consider the following motion:

**“THAT Council direct staff to prepare amendments to the Zoning Bylaw, Subdivision & Development Bylaw, and Development Permit Area Guidelines as outlined in the Bylaw Amendment Package titled *Strengthening Regulations for Coal Valley Estates*; AND THAT these amendments be brought forward for Council consideration prior to acceptance of any new rezoning, subdivision, or development permit applications related to Coal Valley Estates.”**

---

Thank you for your continued commitment to the long-term safety, sustainability, and livability of our community. These amendments will ensure that development in Coal Valley proceeds responsibly and in full alignment with our

shared goals and the Official Community Plan. Here is the appendix: [Cumberland Bylaw update reference guide.odt](#)

Respectfully,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** December 15, 2025 1:34 PM  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Bylaw feedback

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

Hi there,

Just finished a quick review of the proposed bylaws and I must say that there are quite a few things that fall into a grey area or are unclear in how they are worded. I will attempt to detail them below.

- 5.3 (1) talks about what can be done within the setbacks. The wording here makes it seem like if you currently have a building that is encroaching in a setback, you will not be able to do anything to it. I know the intent of this, but the way it's worded could allow the village to disallow any renovation or repair of buildings that are encroaching. If my house is encroaching and the exterior wall is totally rotten. This bylaw would not allow me to repair that wall in any way.
- Why are cantilevered sections of buildings being removed from what is allowed to project into setbacks? They used to be allowed under the 40% max length allowance.
- Table 5.4(1), note #11 This wording makes no sense. The term cantilevered should be changed and rather it should reference the height above finished grade. Cantilever is a building term and not all decks/etc included cantilevered elements.
- Just note that all landscape oriented pages in the PDF that I viewed were cut off. I was not able to see the right side of any of these pages
- Table 7.2(5) requiring outdoor lighting to have the Darksky seal. While the intention here is good, the number of fixtures available and their cost will be quite problematic. Could this not read that lighting should follow Darksky principals? This requirement will also lead to significant lighting cost increases for projects.
- Table 7.3(5) screening for home accommodation occupation. This would read that if I have a legal Airbnb in my house, I would have to fence my backyard. How will it be determined whether the yard is or isn't used for the home accommodation? In my case, our guests have no access to "yard" space but do have use of a portion of driveway that runs alongside the house. Would I be required to fence my entire yard?
- Table 7.3(5) screening for outdoor storage. This is very troublesome. So we are saying that anyone who has essentially anything in their yard that isn't inside a building, is required to provide screening? The definition of "outdoor storage" would include a backyard that has a canoe sitting beside a shed, or some bikes, or a compost bin, or a boat or camper or swing set...
- 9.2(2) One does one pay cash in lieu for 30% of their parking when 2 spaces are required? You would be required to have only one space, but can only pay cash-in-lieu for part of the other space?

- 9.4(1) The partial parking spot amounts don't work for small scale projects. For example, in the village core, how is a person supposed to provide 2.4 parking spots for their property that has 3 dwelling units? Or someone with a single bedroom AirBNB, how are they to provide 0.6 parking spaces?
- Table 9.4.5(3) properties with 2 or more dwelling units are prohibited from having RV parking on their properties?
- Table 9.5(4) Wall mounted racks with hydraulic lifts? I would like to see you provide an example of a commercially available hydraulic wall mounted bike rack that a person can afford for their rental suite. What about wall mount racks where you don't have to lift the bike off the ground? This is a very odd requirement and should be removed. And what's the deal with the automatic door? My rental suite has indoor bike storage currently...if I were to build it now, the entry door would require an automatic opener? Why are we adding this insane cost to simple projects? Apartment buildings, sure, but single suites or principal dwellings? These bike parking bylaws are absurd.
- Table 9.5(6) I build an ADU and now I have to provide bike storage for 1 bike long term and 0.25 spots for short term. How does one provide 1/4 of a bike parking space?
- Table 10.3(1) What's up with the increase in minimum lot frontage in R1? The village's way of putting the brakes on the province's aim to densify? Why go away from the 9M minimum?
- Table 10.4 Build a 4 unit building and make 10% of the units accessible...do that math.
- Table 10.5(1) Max 2M setback on camp road? So no more building ADU's or secondary dwellings of any kind in that neighborhood? This seems short sighted and a very NIMBY take on a need for housing. I don't see the ADU height restriction in here any more which targeted ADUs on camp road specifically. I guess this is the new way of preventing them from being built.
- Table 10.5(2) No provision for reduced setbacks for buildings that don't require permits because they are less than 10m2? Sheds, saunas, etc?

Principal dwelling units and secondary dwelling units need to be defined separately.

Running out of time to get this submitted! Based on this small sampling of issues and things that are unclear or undefined, the village is creating way too much need for interpretation. Bylaws and Codes need to be clear and prescriptive. Overall I am quite disappointed with how messy this bylaw is and am shocked that it has made it through 2 readings already.

Please let me know if any of these points are off base or if I am missing something.

Thanks  
[REDACTED]

**VB****Vickey Cell**

Hi Vickey ; I'd like to discuss the urban containment boundary with someone who can let me know why it has been laid out the way it is; what reasoning is behind it etc ; as it does not make any logical sense to me or anyone that I have talked to about it. Also the dirt road portion of hope rd is constantly being worked on and in about two days it's back to having a ton of potholes. The village should stop wasting \$\$\$ maintaining it and pave it. R1a zoning is residential zoning just like R3 so both zones should have the same rights to vacation rent their properties based. It's not fair to have one residential zone allowed to operate as a vacation rental and not others. The reasoning for leaving out other residential zones makes no sense. Overall I'm very disappointed and dissatisfied with Cumberland for these reasons. Call me to discuss.

Who should I email to get my concerns addressed?