

From: Chris Roehrig <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Friday, January 26, 2024 2:33 PM

To: Jeanine Dodds <jdodds@islandstrust.bc.ca>; David Maude <dmaude@islandstrust.bc.ca>; Tobi Elliott <telliott@islandstrust.bc.ca>

Cc: Robert Kojima <rkojima@islandstrust.bc.ca>; Charly Caproff <ccaproff@islandstrust.bc.ca>

Subject: Oceanwood Rezoning

Dear Trustees,

We are neighbours of the Oceanwood and attended the public meeting and have been awaiting the applicants' updated proposal which has just this week appeared in the Staff Report for the Jan 29th meeting. We have some serious concerns regarding the proposed rezoning.

Firstly, we would like to say that we support and welcome the resurrection of the Oceanwood Country Inn. It was the first place we stayed on Mayne Island. We knew Jonathan and had many lovely meals in his restaurant. The Oceanwood was a wonderful asset to Mayne Island, a good neighbour, and it would be great to see something like that again.

However, we don't support the proposed development as it currently stands.

We urge you to not proceed with major outlays for engineering studies and redrafting of bylaws until there is a much better understanding and agreement on the scope and scale of this project, as well as the amenity.

EVENTS FACILITY

The scale of the proposal is massive compared to the existing Oceanwood, and appears to support a very different usage: that of an events facility with accommodation rather than a country inn.

I did a comparison of the proposed lot coverage vs the existing Oceanwood (in green; all data taken from the CRD maps site and the proposal):



The proposed lot coverage (33,615 sf / 3123 m²) is a four-fold increase over the existing buildings (7,580 sqft / 704 m²).

The size of just the 4 proposed accessory buildings (totalling 21,222 sf / 1971 m²) dwarfs the existing inn building (4,950 sf / 460 m²). By comparison, the Ag Hall main building is only 2,831 sf (263 m²). In addition the PROPOSED USES page mentions a fifth accessory building which I could not find on the drawing.

A fully-booked events facility with a continuous stream of traffic, crowds and noise is completely against the quiet rural nature of the existing neighbourhood. How often do they plan to have events? How large are the events? What is the nature of the events? How are the septic, water, parking, noise issues handled?

Even without events, what is the expected increase in density/load when you account for the difference between inn rooms versus detached cottages and extra staff accommodation? This

appears to be a huge increase in density, with all the associated issues about water, septic, parking, noise, etc.

Unlike the Oceanwood's quiet forest setting, the proposal would also appear to require the removal of the majority of the trees on the entire lower part of the property (which would eliminate much of its charm, in our opinion).

MARINE TRAFFIC

With waterfront on a cove and a stated focus on high-end luxury units, there is a strong possibility that the operators will cater to yacht-based guests. Such a dramatic increase in yacht traffic and anchorages would be devastating to both the marine environment as well as the quiet character of the neighbourhood. Just a single diesel yacht starting up or idling while running a generator causes an unpleasant amount of noise and stink in the area. What can be done to ensure the neighbours don't end up living next to an equivalent of a truckstop appearing next door?

AMENITY

None of the amenities mentioned in the proposal are well defined. I did not see any offer to transfer title to property (or other "provision of land") in the proposal. By comparison, the Housing Society development amenity was a title transfer of 1/3 of the subject property in exchange for a density increase of a single extra lot.

I do not think any such application should proceed until the amenity is established in greater detail and subject to a more thorough review by the Trust and community.

CONSULTING WITH NEIGHBOURS

We don't feel like the applicants made an earnest attempt to consult with their actual neighbours who will be directly affected by this development. We're disappointed that the applicants didn't contact us directly, but instead chose a community public presentation and impersonal survey. It feels like we have been bypassed. We attended the public meeting and signed up to receive a survey and did not hear anything back.

The survey results do not include any information about the comments provided. Were the raw survey results provided to the Trust? I think it is really the Trust that should be conducting such surveys instead of relying entirely on the applicant to interpret and summarize them.

Chris Roehrig
[REDACTED]