

From: Sheila Sperling-Law [REDACTED]

Sent: Thursday, May 21, 2026 7:23 AM

To: sbothwick@islandstrust.bc.ca; David Graham <dagraham@islandstrust.bc.ca>; Marlis McCargar <mmccargar@islandstrust.bc.ca>

Subject: Opposition letter for 4100 Pinecrest Road Denman Island

Dear Trust Members,

We are writing to you, again, to express opposition to the proposal **PL-RZ-2025-0464 (3Ravens Land Share Non-Profit Affordable Housing Co-operative)**

Location: 4100 Pinecrest Road, PID: 028-639-928 for a coop style housing project at 4100 Pinecrest Road, Denman Island by Paul Weyner and Tara Richardson.

In addition to our initial letter of opposition for this location (Pinecrest Road in the Parklands North Island) please consider the following.

We have spoken to:

- two real estate agents
- five business owners
- farmers market vendors and
- dozens of members of the general public who do NOT think this location is appropriate for affordable housing.

They all declined to write letters. This is not easy. Denman, although accepting to many differences, is extremely harsh and quick to judge.

Here is some of what they had to say about writing a letter of opposition:

- I can't, it may influence people so they won't use my services
- I can't because some Denmonites will not look favorably towards me.
- I can't because I have a table at the farmers market
- I'd like to say that I am brave, but Denman people can be rude and judgmental.
- I wish there was an opportunity to feel safe stating my opposition without backlash.

Other comments include:

- you are experiencing our worst nightmare
- we are so sorry this could be happening to this neighborhood
- this location (Pinecrest Road) is completely wrong
- the perceived urgency of the need for affordable housing better not mean that proposals like this are approved before there is a clear overall plan for the island.
- wasn't the last meeting about changing zoning for R2 and R1 to help with this already? We don't need to cluster people.
- once the floodgates open for these proposals, where does it end?

- this proposal won't help the people who really need housing!
- why doesn't the Trust and the island focus on getting the one downtown one going. These people should put their money there if they really want to help.
- (as a real estate agent) if this project was next to me I would have similar concerns.
- if a developer offered this it would be rejected.
- whats to stop everyone from doing this? It's madness for the island.
- i can't even build a second dwelling for my kids to live here. They can't afford their own home. Isn't keeping families together and sharing space of value? I can help them.
- we all moved to the lot (north end) we bought for our peace!
- this proposal goes against the policy of NOT impacting neighbours. It does.
- people are writing letters of support without really understanding. They like the notion.
- I'd never go up there (north end). The roads are too bad.

The people making this request signed a legal contract to purchase an R2 zoned property with plans to change it without considering their neighbours.

If "The object [mandate] of the Trust is to preserve and protect the Trust Area and its unique amenities and environment for the benefit of the residents of the Trust Area" not only does the housing proposal not fit the mandate, the neighbourhood, or the wildlife. The applicants have entirely fenced their property without need. It makes sense for those with marketable crops and huge gardens or ornamentals to fence deer out. Wildlife is part of the forest ecosystem.

As neighbours we had our land assessed by a forester who worked with forests and fire mitigation. He indicated that the proposed project property poses a fire risk with piles of deadwood from fence building, the overall absence of maintenance and because of the slope of the land. Fire travels quickly uphill where the proposed new dwellings will be situated. We are happy to provide you with the fire assessment of our forest should you require or desire to have it.

With respect to other environmental concerns we note the following. We have already stated the absence of bus service due to road conditions and the ridiculous notion that bicycles could be used by the average person, and we note that although Paul and Tara hope people use electric vehicles the costs of those are prohibitive to most. Dust created on these roads is terrible. Added traffic will not help. In contrast to Paul and Tara's proposal comment, these north end roads are NOT regularly used by cyclists (save one man). We know several people who use bikes and motorbikes who avoid this part of the island because of the washboard gravel that happens every dry spell.

The location and line up of houses proposed along Pinecrest Road according to the site plan is NOT in keeping with the visual environment of the neighborhood or of the Parkland development. This is a quiet neighborhood. The potential addition of 28 people is destructive to the peace and tranquility that exists here. The noise (pollution) will be deafening as compared to the quiet experienced here by residents and wildlife.

It is interesting to look at where the proposed clustering of dwellings will be located as per the site plan. Approximately 7 acres on the site plan, where the owners current dwelling exists, will be left alone and the clustering of the proposed dwellings will primarily impact the neighbours.

Basically, this proposal is asking for a subdivision of the 15 acre property. The center is the approx 5 acres left as (unmanaged) forest. The lowest elevation is approximately 7.9 acres in which the owners divided themselves from the other proposed dwellings by forest and part of the existing driveway. That driveway is a switchback because of the steep incline. Finally the third part is and a long thin line of 2.1 acres (0.3 acres per proposed dwelling) facing the neighbours along the end of Pinecrest Road which is the proposed space for 7 dwellings. There is no indication on the site plan as to where their composting toilets will go through their final stage of composting, and no indication about their grey water system or rain catchment. We all share the aquifers.

We have been told by real estate agents that this proposal will reduce the value of our property especially during times of construction, if there is no screening from view, if the proposed new home owners aren't "low key (quiet). There was also the agents comment "the value in the north end is related to the quiet."

Those things will change if this proposal is approved. We have that email should it be required and would redact the name of the real-estate agent.

On a practical note, this will not help individuals who are most in need of housing on Denman it's simply not affordable.

It is our opinion that people buying into any plan that looks like this is not looking at their future. We spoke to First Choice Credit Union and were told that they, in general, support affordable housing projects. They also stated "if we are to finance a construction project, we require the budget and proposed plans and see if there is enough equity to justify the project." This will be a total equity of 4.5× the median income of Denman.

Applicants have to buy-in at 35,000.00 for a voting share, clear their site and build a home who's resale value (equity) is capped at a price 4.5 times the median income of Denman. (Approx 4.5 x 35,000.00). The cost of clearing the site, building the home plus the membership fee far exceeds what the home will be worth. So, if for some reason, the lives of members of 3Ravens force them to move, they may be financially unable to do so because of the proposals plans around value.

If a small developer came to Denman and offered a similar financial offer they would be shut down without hesitation.

In addition, should the creators of this development consider themselves part of the group there are inequities in the division of land and space as all other equal members have a small .03 acre space and

the existing home will always have the 7plus acres. Is that home value also to be considered as 4.5 the median income if sold?

Lastly, we all have to consider access on and off the island. Everyone who resides on Denman and Hornby is keenly aware of the hours in ferry wait times well before tourist season starts. The number of residents on our islands cannot exceed the capacity to properly service those who reside here. Should new housing cooperative applications be put on hold until Denman has a clear and comprehensive plan for the R1 and R2 lots in general and a documented plan as to how the proposed capacity of the island will be supported by necessary services?

We asked Paul Weyner how his proposed neighbourhood would make decisions. He replied that it would be by consensus.

We reminded him that he already lives in a neighbourhood and that the majority of his immediate neighbours want him to drop the proposal.

Fred Law and Sheila Sperling-Law