

Jas Chonk

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, July 6, 2025 11:14 AM
To: vicphsub
Subject: Galiano Island Proposed Bylaw No. 296 Application : PLRZ20240003 (Palmberg)

Dear Galiano Island Local Trust Committee,

Re: Galiano Island Local Trust Committee / Public Hearing Notice / Proposed Bylaw No. 296 / Application : PLRZ20240003 (Palmberg).

Last Thursday (July 3 2025) I had a wonderful conversation with the applicant while riding the ferry about his application for rezoning. It is one of the special features of island life to be part of a community and observe the young people grow and thrive. I was so impressed with Lief Palmberg's optimism for the future. It was inspiring to hear his dreams.

After the conversation I remembered it is the responsibility of Local Trustees and their Staff to zone the Land and not the Owner because Ownership can and does change over time. To review the application outside the personal associations of the applicant is for the protection and integrity of all the land-use planning undertaken by elected officials. Asking myself this question - I looked over the maps - what would I do ?

The property is directly above and adjacent to the catchment well for the largest subdivision on Galiano Island (more than 40 registered residential lots (house & cottage) that all rely on one community water system). This subdivision was created through Bylaw # 7 in 1978. Since then CRD have posted cautionary water advisory signs to the residents of this subdivision during the summer months (low water recharge times).

The parcel of land (19 acres approx.) in the proposed rezoning application is marked as an elevated water recharge area on all maps dating back to 1978.

Thinking about this, I asked myself are the proposed uses in the rezoning application compatible with water recharge required to protect the largest subdivision on the island's community well ?

Soil degradation could be minimized by restricting hauling road width and length within the area and within the watershed; Prohibiting logging and road construction on ecologically sensitive sites (such as the riparian area which is the Findlay Lake drainage basin marked on the rezoning map); Fitting hauling roads into the terrain, not remaking the terrain with roads; Pre-locating roads on the ground before logging/clearing begins for **planting an orchard of one-thousand fruit trees**; Considering the effects of Slash burning on the soils that such variety of land-uses would require initially and going forward as on-going maintenance.

Water degradation could be minimized by maintaining riparian forests and the riparian zone of influence around all water courses, streams and wetlands; Maintaining natural drainage patterns and avoiding concentration of water flows by hauling roads, landings or skid roads; Cleaning and regularly maintaining all drainage structures, particularly following major storms, spring runoff and fall rains.

Consider the Land Owner's discretion in decision making and knowledge with regards to soil degradation and water degradation with this application. The Trustees have in place in two Development Permit Bylaws - Tree cutting Development Permit area and Riparian area Development Permit area Protection but the Trustees have the discretion to ignore these provisions should they chose.

The Beverage processing and product making component to the rezoning application needs a real numbers assessment - the daily projected water use on one residential lot is defined in the Community Plan any use beyond that amount is commercial - will such proposed drawdown affect the adjacent Sticks Allison Community Water well supply ? (Remembering that the application is not restricting or eliminating residential use of the property.) The question is real -Galiano Island is the driest of all the Gulf Islands with an average record rainfall of 27 inches a year.

Road frontage on Galiano Way - the access point to this application. Is the road frontage long enough for access and egress to all the purposed uses - considering the sharp turn on the hill on Galiano Way ?

The rock and soil storage at the Highways Yard (for example) requires a lot of surface area , compaction of surface soil is a given thereby restricting water recharge of the land greater than from what would happen on a residential lot. Could the rezoning application state (identify) or limit the size and area that will be designated for this purpose ?

Large Storage Shed and Milling area - could the rezoning application state (identify) or limit the size and area that will be designated for this purpose ?

Noise mitigation - the processing of timber is a very noisy activity - could the application identify on a map the area that the activity will be sited as adjacent to the Forest lot on DL 14 and Galiano Way?

I believe that the rezoning application Public Hearing is pre-mature and should be postponed.

I have empathy for the applicant who has stated in the application all his dreams for his working future and should the application be denied at the end of the Public Hearing process he will be faced with another rezoning application and more cost to re-define his application.

I believe that part of the application (rock and soil storage, shed and timber milling) has merit if it is defined and sited carefully; continuing with the residential uses that exist today.

I think this application for a zoning change would fit better under Industrial zoning because apart from the uses identified in the application is the storage of a gravel truck, excavator, other machinery and lumber associated with this type of tradesman's business. (Industrial zoning has a residential component.)

I am not in support of the Beverage processing and product making component of Rezoning Application PLRZ20240003 . I stand in support of preserving the water quality and quantity of the Sticks Allison Community water well system that is adjacent to the applicant's property and that has had the protection of the mapped water recharge area since 1978 .

Our young people are very important - we delight in their success - but part of the satisfaction of watching them grow is the hope that they are going forward responsibly interacting with our environment and its limitations - planning for the future for their children's children.

Sincerely

Debbie Holmes

From: Jennifer Margison [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, July 6, 2025 2:44 PM
To: vicphsub; Lisa Gauvreau; Ben Mabberley; Timothy Peterson; Kim Stockdill
Subject: Re: Palmberg Application- LUB & OCP Amendments

Dear Planner Stockdill and LTC

In continuing to look closely at the OCP and LUB and talking to those who were involved in its writing, it seems to me that what the LTC and Planner are regarding as an oversight in the OCP that warrants correcting with Bylaw 296 is not necessarily so. On what evidence have you determined this is an oversight and not deliberate wording? People who were involved at the time seem to think otherwise.

In the OCP 1.5 Rural is under the category of **Residential Zones** (my bolding):

This area is intended to allow for larger lot developments to provide opportunities for **a variety of rural activities without impinging on neighbours.**

and

a) The principle uses shall be **residential and agriculture**

and

e) Within this designation **a number of different zones may be applied allowing differing levels of uses accessory to residential uses.**

How are a) and e) inconsistent? The emphasis here appears to be on residential use while allowing activities such as agriculture that **do not impinge on neighbours.**

R2 zoning in the LUB currently permits:

Dwellings

Cottages

Home occupations

Farm use

Secondary suite

And says specifically “and **all other uses are prohibited**”.

The Palmberg application seems to be incompatible with both the OCP and LUB as it proposes land uses beyond Home Occupations and Farm Use and that are not accessory to residential use and appear to have the distinct possibility of Impinging on neighbours. It appears there is an attempt to add Light Industrial Use and Agriculture Zones to R2. This seems a huge leap from the current LUB R2 permitted home occupation uses or farm use associated with residential use.

It is increasingly difficult not to see this as a convenient “fix” to pave the way for a single application rezoning, one it appears the LTC and the Planner have already determined should be allowed; and one that seems to be incompatible with the current OCP and LUB. This assumption of intent is based on a startling lack of information and discussion at the LTC meetings about both the LUB and OCP amendments and the impacts of the application itself in terms of the land use proposed.

With an OCP review in the near future, this single application “fix” or “site-specific” zoning for a R2(a) Table 7.3 has significant implications for allowing these other “not accessory to residential use”

activities on every R2 lot. There needs to be open and detailed discussion about this, which I certainly have not heard during the LTC meetings I have attended.

Surely one aspect that should be discussed is that LUB and OCP amendments for an application like this present all kinds of potential issues in a residential neighbourhood (commercial and industrial activities with significant impacts on water use, noise, traffic), in addition to setting potential precedents for other R2 lots. The number of R2 lots this could potentially affect has not been mentioned. I count 16 R2 lots on the zoning maps. This needs to be clearly presented to the public.

I see nothing in the Staff Reports that acknowledges the possible ramifications of what you are proposing. These are all dense topics for members of the public, including me, to understand, especially when it comes to “unintended consequences” for the future. I believe it is the responsibility of the Planner and the LTC to present all sides to the public, not to just advocate for an applicant. The intention is not to make difficulty for the applicant, Leif Palmberg, a valued member of the community but to make sure there is a transparent informed process being followed for any amendments that respect the OCP and LUB that many community members worked so hard to craft, and to respect the basic principle that such decisions should never be about the individual who among other considerations may not always own the land, but about the land use, its impact on the environment and the neighbouring community.

I request that you consider and approve either alternative below to this Bylaw 296 at the July 8 LTC meeting to enable a more complete consideration of these changes and this application and not proceed with further approval steps:

1. Request further information - which I would see as an entailing much clearer and open discussion of the ramifications of the LUB and OCP bylaw amendments

or

2. Send the rezoning to the Galiano APC.

(A number of residents put their names forward in good faith to serve this community and as yet have not been given any work. This would be a good opportunity to consider such proposed amendments in preparation for an upcoming OCP review)

Sincerely,

Jennifer Margison
[REDACTED]

On Sun, Jun 29, 2025 at 10:34 AM Lisa Gauvreau <lgauvreau@islandstrust.bc.ca> wrote:

Hi Jennifer, my Office hours are on Monday, 9-11. I have two appointments already scheduled this Monday, but we should be done by 10:30.

This PH is for the OCP amendment only. It sounds odd, but this enables sequential advancement, not early completion. The PH is for **Bylaw 296**, we need to focus on what adding Agriculture to the Rural policy "e" means.

***Final decisions on whether to adopt **Bylaw 297** will still hinge on receipt of the groundwater plan and covenant.

Lisa Gauvreau (she, her, hers)
Galiano Island Local Trustee
Islands Trust Conservancy Board/Chair
Islands Trust
200-[1627 Fort Street | Victoria BC V8R 1H8](https://www.islandstrust.bc.ca)
[islandstrust.bc.ca](https://www.islandstrust.bc.ca)

Preserving and protecting over 450 islands and surrounding waters in the Salish Sea

I respectfully acknowledge that the Islands Trust Area is located within the treaty lands and territories of the BOKEĆEN, Cowichan Tribes, K'ómoks, Lyackson, MÁLEXET, Qualicum, scəwəθən, səlilwətał, SEMYOME, shíshálh, Skwxwú7mesh, Snaw-naw-as, Snuneymuxw, Songhees, Spune'luxutth', STÁUTW, Stz'uminus, ɬaʔəmen, Ts'uubaa-asatx, Wei Wai Kum, We Wai Kai, WJOŁŁP, WSIKEM, Xeláltxw, Xwémalhkwx, Xwsepsum, and xʷməθkʷəy̓əm First Nations. Islands Trust is committed to reconciliation and to working together to preserve and protect this ecologically, culturally, and spiritually significant region in the Salish Sea.

From: Jennifer Margison <[REDACTED]>
Sent: June 25, 2025 9:23:52 AM
To: Lisa Gauvreau
Subject: Palmberg Application

Hi Lisa

I would like to meet with you regarding this application. I am surprised to see it already at the Public Hearing stage, without any restrictions being placed on the many uses over multi-years that are being proposed for this site, including ones that are in fact not agricultural in nature. And the agricultural ones that are proposed are water use intensive and as yet the public has not received any information about water sustainability on this site and how it might impact the surrounding neighbourhood - and the households dependent on the Community Water System. I have not as yet had time to look through all the information but will do so before meeting with you. I would appreciate some of your time.

Thanks,

Jennifer

From: Sandy Pottle [REDACTED]
Sent: July 6, 2025 10:18 AM
To: Timothy Peterson <tpeterson@islandstrust.bc.ca>; Ben Mabberley <bmabberley@islandstrust.bc.ca>; Lisa Gauvreau <lgauvreau@islandstrust.bc.ca>
Cc: rkojima@islandstrust.bc.ca <rkojima@islandstrust.bc.ca>; kstockdill@islandstrust.bc.ca <kstockdill@islandstrust.bc.ca>
Subject: Palmberg Application Public Hearing submission

Dear Chair Peterson and Trustees

There is no definition of contractors yard in the OCP or the LUB because contractors yards are considered a home occupation for the purposes of the OCP and by extension the LUB.

I am requesting that the definition of "contractor yard" be eliminated from proposed LUB bylaw 2.2.1 and that the LUB be brought into compliance with the OCP

The matter of contractor yards was a top priority of a previous LTC .The definition and requirements of " contractor yard "was studied and researched extensively. It was also referred to the APC. These provisions were then included under the home occupation regulations. This project was overseen by RPM Robert Kojima.

I have included below a copy of the definition of home occupation and regulations below:

LUB General Regulations 2.2

Accessory buildings and structures may be constructed on a lot before the construction of the building or structure to which they are accessory, but no home occupation may be conducted in such an accessory building or structure until the building or structure to which it is accessory is constructed and occupied

2.28.8 Home occupations are permitted in secondary suites subject to the following: 2.28.8.1 no non-resident employees are permitted.

3.1 The purpose of the regulations set out in this Part is to ensure that the conduct of home occupations including bed and breakfast home occupations and short term vacation rental home occupations does not give a non-residential appearance to premises on which they are conducted.

3.2 A home occupation is not permitted unless the premises on which it is conducted are concurrently occupied as a dwelling.

BL240 3.3 Home occupations must be conducted entirely within the operator's dwelling or permitted accessory building except that this restriction does not apply to the use of the land

for pottery kiln or for outdoor activities associated with a kindergarten, nursery school, daycare, agriculture or horticulture, and no exterior storage of materials, products or equipment is permitted.

BL240 3.4 No dwelling unit may be constructed or altered to accommodate a home occupation such that the external appearance of the dwelling unit in which it is conducted plainly indicates the presence of a home occupation use.

BL240 3.5 Except for one unilluminated nameplate not exceeding 0.6 square metres in area in respect of each residential lot upon which the home occupation(s) is occurring, no sign or other advertising matter may be exhibited or displayed on the premises where a home occupation is conducted, and no exterior artificial lighting may be installed or operated on the premises for a purpose associated with the home occupation unless it is a type in keeping with the residential character.

3.6 No more than three persons may be employed in any home occupation, at least one of whom must reside permanently on the premises on which the home occupation is conducted.

BL240 3.7 Except for the retail sale of goods produced, processed or repaired as part of a home occupation, and retail sale of articles directly related to a service provided as a home occupation, the following activities are not permitted:

1. Retail or wholesale selling of any products or material 2. The serving of food or drink products on the premises as part of a home occupation except for bed and breakfast home occupation in which case a morning meal may be served to paying guests.

BL278 3.8 No restaurant, cafe, commercial water bottling enterprise, boarding kennel, fur farm, feed lot or manure-based mushroom growing enterprise is permitted as a home occupation.

3.9 No home occupation may generate waste, noise, vibration, glare, fumes, odours, illumination or electrical interference ordinarily detectable off the lot on which the home occupation is conducted or consume more groundwater than would normally be consumed by a residential use of land.

Thank you

Sandra Pottle

[REDACTED]

Galiano

From: Sheila Anderson [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, July 7, 2025 3:58 PM
To: vicphsub
Subject: Public Hearing Galiano OCP Bylaw 296
Attachments: Submission to GILTC PH OCP Bylaw.docx

Please accept this submission to the PUBLIC HEARING July 8 2025 Galiano.

Please confirm it is received and submitted to the GILTC.
Sheila Anderson

Date July 7 2025

To: All members of the Galiano Island Local Trust Committee and the Public Hearing July 8
2025 RE: OCP amending bylaw NO. 296

From: Sheila Anderson [REDACTED] Galiano Island BC

I write as a resident, landowner, former Local Trustee, and former chairperson of the Galiano Island Advisory Planning Commission.

I write to communicate my opposition to bylaw 296 for the following reasons.

- 1) I question and challenge changes being made to our OCP policies outside of the broad base community discussions and information sharing that typically goes with OCP reviews. When they are done in response to a single land use change application there is never enough considerations of broad impact and precedent.
 - a. When OCPs are reviewed, various focussed Advisory Committees are formed to come up with recommendations for changes, or no changes, to policies that exist in that focus area. BUT it is the job of a Steering Committee and the LTC to balance all the various focussed committee recommendations and come up with actual amendments for the public to consider.
 - b. Changing the OCP because it doesn't work for one applicant's development plan is not a fair or equitable way for land use change to be managed, because it becomes more of a popularity contest and less about how the changes will impact the neighbours and set policy or precedent that can impact many neighbourhoods and the island as a whole.
- 2) I feel there is a lack of clear explanatory information available to the public about this bylaw. The description in the public hearing notice is pretty useless.
 - a. What IS the reason for it? Is it simply because the applicant has not constructed a residence? Why can't the LTC just tell the applicant to build a small dwelling? It is residential zoning after all.
 - b. How many other lots are withing this Rural OCP designation?
 - c. What can be actually meant by "uses accessory to Agriculture uses" ? *"Within this designation a number of different zones may be applied allowing differing uses accessory to residential and agriculture uses."* It is important to know what this COULD mean in future. It seems like the sky is the limit to me.
 - d. What are the alternative ways that the applicant can make his application better fit the existing OCP policies?
 - e. If the Palmberg application was for a lot in the ALR and in our AG zone would this amendment be needed?
 - f. Does Staff and the LTC consider the current wording of e) to be an error or and oversight? It seems to align very closely with LUB General Regulations ...*"2.1.3 accessory uses, buildings and structures including, in all zones permitting residential uses, agricultural and horticultural uses that by their nature are*

accessory to and compatible with residential uses, except that boarding kennels, fur farms, feed lots, the keeping of pigs and manure-based mushroom growing are not permitted as accessory uses in any zone, and farm animals including poultry must be confined to their owner's property; “ . By setting a limit on the scale of agriculture allowed in residential zones the LUB attempts to avoid problems in terms of noise, odours, water quality or quantity etc. I see the revised wording in the OCP amendment conflicting with this LUB regulation because it can allow for accessory agriculture uses that might **NOT be compatible with residential uses. The OCP states that the Rural designated area “is intended to allow for larger lot developments to provide opportunities for a variety of rural activities without impinging on neighbours.” The present wording of OCP policy e) is achieving this intensification by making the agriculture use to be servient to the residential use. And the LUB reinforces that.**

- 3) The fact that this OCP amending bylaw is listed as part of the Palmberg Application but is advancing to Public Hearing in advance of the associated Land Use Bylaw amendment is very troubling. The reason for this decision is not evident. If you proceed with and actually close this first public hearing it will certainly make giving and receiving input on the LUB amendment in future very complicated and challenging.
- 4) This public hearing being planned for the North End hall and in the absence of on line coverage further adds to the lack of accessibility by the community.

I urge the GILTC to either postpone this public hearing and bring it forward at the same time as the LUB amendment for the Palmberg application. If you do proceed refrain from closing it because the two bylaws are closely associated within the application and cannot be considered separately. Please refrain from making a decision on this proposed amendment.

I will close by stating again that I am opposed to Bylaw 296. And I sincerely hope that the reasons I have described will give you pause for thought.

Respectfully
Sheila Anderson