

August 26/26

CONCERNS RELATED TO THE “UPDATED” STAFF REPORT (PL-TUP-2025-0060)

1. Why has the “Background” section (pg.1) been abbreviated (from the September 29/25 Report)? If anything, it should be more extensive given the feedback from the community. Also, it was difficult for folks to read about the meeting because the minutes were extremely difficult to access, particularly as there was no meeting in October or November, 2025.
2. The original application was discussed at the Sept.’25 meeting but was only recently posted on the website under “Current Applications.” I note that other applications (i.e. Baker-Costello) were available for several months prior to the meeting. The public correspondence was not available either. Please explain WHY this omission occurred (for almost one full year)?
3. On pg. 4, the Report asserts that this is “not considered a commercial activity.” This is completely nonsensical as the pieced together floating island does not magically drop from the sky. Rather, the 9 docks are disassembled elsewhere and subsequently towed in/out of Horton Bay twice a year by Island Marine Construction Ltd.. This is a time-consuming process. Those of us who live on Horton Bay have borne witness to this commercial activity multiple times. Furthermore, Island Marine is clearly identified on the technical drawings (storage and elevation plans.) **Lastly, and most importantly, the application is**

literally identified under “Current Applications” as belonging to Island Marine (not Neil Pilller). You cannot have it both ways.

4. On page 13, you assert that the floats are stored during the winter months. In fact, they remain in the Bay for at least 6 months each year. Also, the base float *has never been removed*.
5. I have many concerns about the “Rationale for Recommendation” (pg.5). For instance, the assertion that “the proposed use would not compromise future or current uses within Horton Bay” is untenable as it does not stand up to any form of scrutiny. It is a prediction based on nothing but personal conjecture. The Bay is and has already been” compromised” for many years now. Additionally, bullet #3 states that “the use has been occurring for many years without concerns.” This statement is erroneous: we have multiple emails and photographs dating back to the fall of 2022, 2023, and 2024. Further concerns were expressed at the September 2025 meeting. This is, in fact, the 5th (FIFTH) year that we have expressed concerns to the various authorities. Bullet #4 states that using the TUP is an opportunity to “test for compatibility prior to (rezoning) the water zone to outright permit the use.” This makes no sense given that multiple concerns have already been clearly addressed by a variety of community members. *This illegal situation does not require further testing*, nor does this long-standing illegality merit a rezoning of “the water zone to outright permit the use.”

As my earlier written submission made clear, I am opposed to the application.

Respectfully,

Debbie Pawluk

