



COPIED TO

PLANNER

LTC

GURZ 2014.1 wibj

Galiano Island BC  
VON 1P0

July 3 2016

Galiano Island Local Trust Committee

RE: Crystal Mountain and Draft Proposed Bylaws 256 and 257

Dear LTC Members

I wish to express my strong disagreement with the direction you have taken in response to the Crystal Mountain Society's expressed goals and desires for developing a retreat centre on their F1 Zoned parcel.

In the following points I attempt to describe my main reasons why....

- 1) The number of "huts" for meditation guests and caretakers they wish to create and/or make legal is too high by half. It far exceeds the maximum allowed in any Visitor Accommodation zone.
- 2) The density proposed creates the opposite effect from what Land Use Policy a) vii) states is desirable.
- 3) The foot print, impacts of and accesses to this proposed development is NOT clustered in one 25% portion of F1 area. The upper area using a separate access via private land should be disallowed completely. The private easement access that is used to access that area from Cook Road should only be used for purpose of forest management and fire protection access. Numerous examples exist about Galiano of why private easements accessing residential or visitor accommodation are problematic. (if you can't envision these I can put together a list of the worst examples for you).
- 4) The scale of development (density and footprint and sprawl) within the F1 area far exceeds what would be permitted by rezoning to F3 zoning for one dwelling, yet you propose to grant it for merely a covenant on the remaining land which is the same as required for F3? How is this equitable? A covenant is not as strong as title transfer. With the track record of Crystal Mountain is this in the public interest of truly protecting the forest land in perpetuity? Stating that it is "site specific" does not change the fact that this is not supported by forest policies.
- 5) The draft proposed bylaws for development of this Retreat Centre is NOT providing a community benefit. It benefits Crystal Mountain Society and meets their goals.
- 6) While Crystal Mountain (CM) supporters have used OCP Principle m) as a support for CM's goal, that clause speaks only to access to the forest which surely does not extend to mean "building huts (30) in the forest for the accommodation of meditation retreat guests".
- 7) Putting this in Health and Wellness zone under heading of Community Facility when it actually proposes higher numbers of accommodation units than the maximum for Comprehensive Resort in Visitor

Accommodation (along with buildings for accessory uses and caretaker dwelling) is questionable if not completely irresponsible! Using a Health and Wellness zone also skirts the requirement of Transportation Policy f).

- 8) The LTC proceeding to make a significant change in how F1 Land can be rezoned and with what public benefit in exchange for increased density is a violation of our OCP document and the governance procedures and rights we as a community have participated in, to plan and direct land use changes and outcomes in the Galiano Local Trust Area. Such irreverence for the OCP combined with years of ineffective or inactive bylaw enforcement has created a pressure now to make Crystal Mountain legal. I believe the pressure should be on Crystal Mountain to change their plans to fit the community's direction.
  - a. For example, they could build a residence and a cottage on their residential lot and rezone the F1 lot to F3 and build another dwelling on that F3 parcel. Then they could use both dwellings as a B& B, with 3 retreat guest rooms in each, plus the cottage. This could let them operate on a smaller scale more suitable to Forest zone and to the adjacent residential area. A covenant for sustainable forestry on the F3 outside of the residential envelope would enable them to wander freely through forest trails on their own land. No conflict with OCP or LUB.

Please stand up for our OCP and for our community's right to OCP Review before significant changes are entered into in the name of one party's special interest but with potential broad and long term impact.

Sincerely,

Sheila Anderson  
