From: Meg Bradfield <████████████████████

Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2024 7:47 PM

To: Jeanine Dodds; David Maude; Tobi Elliott; Robert Kojima; Charly Caproff; Risa Smith; Susan Yates; Charles Kahn; Ken Thomas; Lisa Gauvreau

Subject: Oceanwood development feedback File No.: MA-RZ-2023.1

Hello,

I regularly read the Mayne Island Local Trust Committee Meeting Agendas and based on what I read in the January 29 Agenda I would like to share some of my concerns regarding the Oceanwood development proposal and its potential to move forward in the application process.

I am not averse to the redevelopment of the Oceanwood building with a similar number of accommodations to what it originally had, assuming it is properly managed and there is a business plan in place. However, the existing proposal must be denied until more factual details are included so that the community can accurately assess their support or not.

Note: I live on Mayne Island and am a neighbour within 100 metres of the property.

I appreciate that the LTC made the Sept 25 resolution to "request that prior to proceeding further, the applicant consult with surrounding neighbours, host a Community Information Meeting, provide their feedback to the Local Trust Committee for consideration, identify additional options for amenity contribution and water management, and explore archaeological potential." ([Page 18, Jan 29 meeting agenda](#))

I also appreciate that the LTC now outlines the status of the information requested from the applicant, and I would like to focus my feedback on the analysis of the information requests ([Page 19-22, Jan 29 meeting agenda](#)). Specifically:

Surrounding Neighbour Consultation

I attended the November consultation and supplied my email so that I could receive the survey. At the in-person meeting, many ideas were shared about potential amenities (e.g. laundry mat) and water treatment (e.g. desalination) scenarios. The community was assured that these were ideas and not yet formal parts of the application.

After the meeting, I chose not to fill out the survey as I found the questions to be crafted in a way that forced respondents towards supporting the development, information boards and community info session, without taking a critical look at specific components of the actual development application in question.

Specifically, question #6 ([Page 30, Jan 29 meeting agenda)](#) asks "which amenities would you believe is the most helpful to the community?" The way this question is posed suggests that a respondent should rank the items, and therefore the outcome of the question would result in that the project should focus on the one aspect which receives the highest ranking. According to respondents, "provision of easements or rights of way for utilities or trails" was not as highly ranked as other items in question 6, so, will the proposed idea for a "tree walk" ([Page 38, Jan 29 meeting agenda)](#) not be considered as the community did not rank it as highly as other items? The provision for a laundry facility ranked higher, so is the "proposed" laundry facility now definitely being built?

My point is, that of course the community supports most of the items listed in question 6 in a general way, but now we need to know exactly what is going to be built, protected or not. The survey was poorly constructed and only gauges what ideas are slightly more popular than others and I suspect many people chose to not fill out the survey, because, like me, they saw it as insufficient.

I suggest that the application documents be revised to show the definitive plans for all aspects of the final development (including the plan for water management) and then the community be resurveyed through an objective third-party survey, overseen by a professional community engagement specialist, to see which components we support or not. We were initially surveyed on ideas, not actual deliverables, and now we need to be engaged again to gauge what we support before considering any movement in the application process.

Water management

The survey brought forth the concern of an "explanation on water management information; specifically suggested to show current vs proposed and how to mitigate the differences."

The initial proposal suggested desalination be used and that was met with dislike from the community. I agree that desalination is not a good solution, but before this application moves forward, we need to know exactly what the plan is for water management so we can express our support or not. And if a decision is made and accepted, we need to ensure the developers will be held to the plan.

If the applicant decides to use the existing well or add a new well, I am concerned about the proximity to VPID wells. I know that the VPID has continuing issues with maintaining their water reservoirs and the highest-producing well is adjacent to the Oceanwood. My father owns a house in the VPID water system and last week received an email from VPID to suggest that residents avoid coming to the island for the weekend as reservoirs were low. (I can supply a copy of this email if required).

If the plan is to do rainwater catchment, can details of the infrastructure be formally included in the development proposal before moving forward? Can the proposal explain what will happen if reserves run out?

As a community, people who live in the Village Point area need to know that local aquifers will be protected and not overused. There needs to be a plan in place before it is too late. I cannot support this application until we do not know the facts about the Oceanwood's water management plan.

I agree with the LTC staff that there needs to be a professional water assessment done: "Staff have recommended that the applicant provide reports from qualified professionals and have the Senior Freshwater Specialist provide comment on the project as proposed" (Page 2, Jan 29 meeting agenda). I would suggest that the LTC ensure an objective third-party water specialist is brought in to make recommendations. It is important to be objective in the assessment and not have the applicant work with someone they have worked with before. Furthermore, I would expect that representatives from VPID be allowed to give their recommendations as they have specific knowledge of the local aquifers.

Traffic – what's the projected increase in the business plan?

According to the Proposed Site (Page 39, Jan 29 meeting agenda), approximately 41 parking spots will exist with potential "overflow parking" on the property. If the Oceanwood plan is to be a successful business running at capacity for tourists with parking spots full, this will greatly increase traffic down Dinner Bay Road. Therefore, I have concerns about pedestrian safety as many people walk to Dinner Bay Park and the Japanese Garden. But we do not have access to any kind of business plan or projection of traffic so how can we support this application proposal?

From an environmental and local sustainability standpoint, as this is a tourist destination and most travellers bring vehicles, more cars will mean more air pollution, noise pollution, ferry congestion, and road wear and tear (Mayne has limited resources for maintaining roads). I would like to see a business plan where these environmental and transport factors are addressed.

Pollution and waste – is there a business plan?

Before taking any steps forward with this proposal, it would be prudent to have (in writing) what plans are for firepits and resort waste.

It appears that there are outdoor fire pits in the drawings of the proposal (Page 39, Jan 29 meeting agenda). If there are 20 firepits used, then I have some concerns about the amount of air pollution being

created. I would like to know exactly how many fireplaces, wood-burning stoves or firepits will be added to the Oceanwood footprint.

Has local recycling and garbage been consulted on their capacity to deal with more product? If so, can we be ensured that they have capacity? Written proof is welcome.

Noise, a restaurant and event space – is there a business plan?

The old Oceanwood was a self-contained building where 12 suites were inside with a restaurant. The new proposal shows 20 separate cabins along with various other outbuildings, including an "event space" and "restaurant facility." There will be more noise in the neighbourhood because of this.

The community needs to see some kind of business plan that includes noise curfew info, restaurant guidelines (including potential rent proposition and profit projection) as well as event rental details (Mayne Islanders won't appreciate an event space or restaurant facility if the spaces cannot be rented at an affordable rate or are generally unavailable to them).

Housing vs tourism – is there a business plan?

The applicant notes that "More information should be provided regarding the proposed market for the tourist accommodation units." I recall this topic being anecdotally referred to at the community engagement session. There was an assumption that Mayne needs more tourist rentals, but I would like to see data from the applicant to confirm this. For example, is the Mayne Island resort at capacity all year? I know many people who have Airbnbs and they do not run at capacity, even in the summer. Do residents who rent portions of their homes to help them deal with the cost of living and mortgages support this proposal? Perhaps people and businesses who have tourism rentals should be surveyed to understand if there is a need for more tourism rentals.

Is the priority for Mayne to be a tourist destination or have more affordable housing? I believe the community would agree that more affordable rental housing is most important, so we need to see specific details about exactly how many units will be available for local rentals and see the exact size and pricing scheme for long-term rentals. I would also like to see how local long-term housing rentals fit into the Oceanwood business plan.

In summary

The application proposal needs to be modified so that it captures the actual/final plans for the development before moving along in the application process. The initial proposal was full of ideas, now the community needs to see facts and be re-engaged/resurveyed so that we can accurately show our support, or not, for specific building, conservation, environmental, housing and water details.

- I cannot support this application until we know the facts about the Oceanwood's water management plan. And if a management plan is made and accepted, we need to ensure the developers will be held to the plan.
- I cannot support this application until we have facts about affordable and staff housing details (i.e.: a business plan).
- I cannot support this application until there is more transparency about the expected increase in traffic in the area so that conversations can be had to ensure pedestrian safety and avoid excess street and park parking.
- I cannot support this application until we know the exact number of fireplaces and firepits as well as a waste plan. (i.e.: a business plan).
- I cannot support this application until we see an explanation of the owner's approach to noise curfews and restaurant and event space rentals (ie: a business plan).
- I cannot support this application until we see details of the expectations/projections of tourism rentals and ferry impacts (ie: a business plan).

On a final note, I am not averse to the redevelopment of the Oceanwood building with a similar number of accommodations and a restaurant space to what it originally had, assuming it is properly managed and there is a business plan in place. However, the existing proposal must be denied until more factual details are included so that the community can accurately assess their support or not.

Thank you for your time,

Megan