

COPIED TO

PLANNER
LTC
LC/Web

RECEIVED
NOV 03 2016
ISLANDS TRUST

Regina Robinson

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, November 03, 2016 1:27 PM
To: George Harris; Sandy Pottle; Laura Busheikin; Kim Stockdill
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Crystal Mountain development plans, Forest Lot 89, North Galiano, B.C.

This letter is to express my continued concern about Crystal Mountain Society's development plans for the Forest Lot [REDACTED]. I find it quite dismayed that the Islands Trust has allowed this situation to progress as far as it has. The proponents of developing a "retreat" (read "tourist attraction") on that land, plan to provide accommodation in individual wooden "huts" for "30" people. What is wrong with this picture?

One of the major produce providers for the Society over several years has said that he has been supplying food for "60" people on the site for the last two summers. Who will be making a head-count at the gate?

A member of the Society has told residents that visitors pay "\$300 per week" to stay at Crystal Mountain. Even at 30 people per week, this works out to a fairly large sum - and certainly more than Galiano's registered providers of accommodation earn over the same period, while paying commercial taxes for such an enterprise.

A quick look at Google's "Buddhist Societies/Tourism" will show that this type of travel accommodation is spreading rapidly - could it be because of lack of regulation and proper taxation?

The owners of properties adjoining Lot 89, the property in question, are very concerned about the effect such over-use will have on the water supply, especially for lots on the waterfront. One hydrologist has said that the effect of overuse on the upland (proposed "retreat"), will eventually lead to salt-intrusion into the lower wells. The proponents have claimed that they have installed sufficient tank-storage of rainwater to supply their needs. How much is sufficient, and how can they rely on that supply? Furthermore, we are very concerned about the disposal of human waste from such over-use. We understand that the "wetland" disposal system originally suggested by the proponents has been rejected by Municipal Engineers in other situations.

In order to provide "input" from owners of adjacent properties, the proponents canvassed the area, and considered that visiting the properties on that occasion represented "input". No-one was asked for an opinion about the possible transfer of title of 75% of the subject land to the Land Trust, or any other public body. Of the 8 waterfront lots visited on that occasion, most of the owners were off-island, and contact with others was minimal. There was no public record of this visitation. This is hardly a proper investigation into how the adjoining property owners viewed the proposal.

Lastly, it is crucial that the Islands Trust provide protection against such violations of our Land Use By-Laws, in view of other similar plans now being considered by other groups. We hear that the Galiano Conservancy hopes to provide accommodation on its Learning Centre property, and that the owners of some 300 acres at the South End of the Island, adjacent to Mount Sutil, are considering 40 or more "huts" on their property.

Obviously it is now becoming "open season" on our by-laws, and we need our elected Trustees and Trust management to protect our properties.

Phyllis Stafford.