

**Lesley Gibbons**

---

**From:** Adrian Samuel [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** September 15, 2025 9:50 AM  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Re: Concerns Regarding Proposed Principal Residence Requirement for Short-Term Rentals

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Due By:** September 16, 2025 4:00 PM  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

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

**Dear Regional District of the Okanagan Similkameen ,**

I am writing regarding the proposed bylaw amendments that include a *principal residence requirement* for short-term rental (STR) operators in Electoral Area E. I am an investor, homeowner, part time resident and soon to be a full time resident of Naramata.

At the public hearing on September 4th, it became clear that both the public and, at times, council members themselves were uncertain about the rationale behind this provision. When asked why the principal residence requirement was being introduced, the response given was only that it had been “recommended.” No substantive explanation or evidence was offered as to how this restriction would address specific community concerns or why it is preferable to other regulatory tools.

This lack of clarity has understandably created confusion within the community. More critically, it has left residents without any clear rationale as to what concrete benefits could possibly outweigh the substantial economic harm of restricting STRs to principal residences — a measure that would directly undermine the interests of homeowners, visitors, and local businesses alike. It is difficult to see how such a policy could be considered balanced. Moreover, it appears the perceived challenges associated with STRs have not been thoroughly substantiated, nor has there been any meaningful effort to explore less disruptive, targeted solutions before moving to dismantle a system that contributes significantly to the local economy.

Before such a bylaw amendment is enacted, it is vital that:

1. The public be provided with a clear rationale and supporting evidence for why the principal residence requirement is necessary;
2. The anticipated community benefits be weighed transparently against the **substantial economic contributions STRs provide in a rural tourist area** like ours;
3. Residents have a genuine opportunity for dialogue, questions, and input on this matter; and;
4. Any disruptive measures that are proposed are fully and fairly considered.

In a small community, decisions of this magnitude must be made with clarity, transparency, and broad public understanding. Implementing a principal residence requirement without clearly articulating its purpose or expected outcomes risks eroding trust and undermining the balance between community needs and economic sustainability.

I respectfully urge the RDOS to ensure that these concerns are fully addressed — and that meaningful dialogue takes place — before moving forward with this bylaw amendment. It is only through such meaningful dialogue that fair, well thought out and balanced public policy can be successfully implemented. I certainly support the business licence requirements and strict governance on public safety; community needs and a reduced environmental impact - but any such governance needs to be applied fairly to all interests and not just favour one set of investors over another.

Thank you for your attention and commitment to a fair and transparent process.

Sincerely,

Adrian Samuel