



ADOPTED

Minutes of the Galiano Island Advisory Planning Commission

Date: May 26, 2026
Location: Galiano Island Community Library

Members Present: Gilian Dusting, Chair
Art Moses, Vice-Chair
Danica Berginc, Member
Karen Harris, Member
Jann Helssen, Member
Jennifer Margison, Member

Members Regrets: Gerald Longson, Member

Staff Present: Carly Bilney, APC Secretary (electronic)

Members of the Public: There were no members of the public present.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Dusting called the meeting to order at 10:03 a.m. Vice-Chair Moses acknowledged that the meeting was being held on the territory of the Coast Salish First Nations.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

By general consent, the agenda was approved as presented.

3. GALIANO MAY 19, 2026 APC MINUTES (FOR ADOPTION)

The following change was suggested:

- On Page 3 change “has ended” to “expired” in the following: “A Commissioner noted the prohibition restricting the submission of private moorage applications in the Southern Gulf Islands has ended”

By general consent the Galiano Advisory Planning Commission meeting minutes of May 19, 2026 were adopted as amended.

4. DISCUSSION OF REFERRAL – ASSOCIATED ISLANDS REGULATIONS REVIEW PROJECT

Chair Dusting commented on an email she sent to Commissioners prior to the meeting with the following list of questions for consideration:

1. Do we recommend the bylaw as proposed?

2. Should we make recommendations for Wise only?
3. What are the pros and cons of detailing a number: one solar array, one set of stairs etc?
4. Size of solar panels – 5 sq meters or 10 sq meters?
5. Should “existing wooden platforms (of a defined size)” be added to the exemptions list?
6. Are there additions that we think should be added to the bylaw?
7. Is it possible to recommend a test period using Wise as the model?
8. Should construction materials be noted?
9. Other questions?

Discussion ensued about the referral and the following comments were made:

- Mixed opinions were expressed about allowing solar panels within the setback to the sea for islands that have BC Hydro
- A comment was made that solar panels seem to be the least controversial item in the bylaw compared to platforms, docks and stairs
- Concern was expressed about extending the bylaw to include all water-access-only islands
- A comment was made that residents of Wise Island have suggested Wise is unique and support was expressed for applying the proposed bylaw only to Wise
- It was suggested that an exemption from the setback to the natural boundary of the sea is a major deal and there is a lack of rationale from staff to justify the exemption
- Concern was expressed about the ecologically sensitive foreshore and the importance of the marine setback
- Concern was expressed about the lack of information regarding the environmental impact of a reduction to the marine setback for the proposed uses
- A comment was made that shoreline protection is too important to approve a blanket rezoning in the way that has been proposed
- A suggestion was made that if Small Lot Residential zoning changes for water-access-only areas, it should apply to all water-access-only areas (Wise Island should not receive preferential treatment)
- It was noted that residents of areas other than Wise that would be impacted by the proposed bylaw have not requested the change
- Concern was expressed about setting precedent for other waterfront properties
- Support was expressed for allowing a solar array to be sited as outlined in the proposal if it can be demonstrated that a property owner has no other option to locate the solar array on the property
- A comment was made that the goal of the bylaw, for Wise Islanders, is to permit existing structures on Wise Island and stop complaints made about them from triggering bylaw enforcement
- It was noted that should this bylaw pass, there would still be existing structures on Wise Island that would require variance
- A comment was made that some may find solar arrays on the shoreline to be visually unappealing
- A suggestion was made to only allow solar panels within the marine setback for islands that are not connected to BC Hydro, and only if no other locations for siting the solar array are possible

- A comment was made that encouraging the use of solar panels is good, but there is need to be careful about setting a precedent that impacts sensitive habitat in the foreshore and creates an eyesore
- An assumption was expressed that, in the absence of enforcement or complaints, people who own land in the subject areas will do what they want (e.g. Wild West) and a suggestion was made that applying the proposed bylaw might provide guidance for good management practices
- A need was expressed for clearer definitions of the permitted structures
- Opposition was expressed to including all of the structures in the proposed bylaw other than solar panels
- Support was expressed for applying the bylaw to Wise Island only because residents of Wise Island are the ones who have come forward with particular requirements
- Support was expressed for the proposed bylaw with the addition of Clause 2.14 A.5 “Existing wooden platforms with an area of up to 30 square meters to offload materials”
- Concern was expressed that no feedback has been received by First Nations
- Concern was expressed about the lack of consultation with First Nations
- A comment was made that no response from Penelakut Tribe does not mean they do not care about the issues in the proposal
- A recommendation was suggested that the Local Trust Committee arrange a face-to-face meeting with relevant First Nations to review the proposal and seek input
- Commissioners noted a shared concern for environmental impacts and a commitment to preserve and protect the island
- A Commissioner recommended that an environmental impact assessment be provided to the Local Trust Committee to assess the impact of the proposal

The Chair listed each question previously sent to the Commissioners and asked them to comment.

1. Do we recommend the bylaw as proposed?

Two Commissioners expressed support; one Commissioner expressed opposition; others expressed varying opinions including applying the bylaw to Wise Island only, or to all proposed areas excluding Phillimore Point. Some Commissioners suggested specific changes to certain clauses.

2. Should we make recommendations for Wise only?

- Preference was expressed for restricting the bylaw to Wise Island only
- A comment was made that it is clear the intent of the bylaw is to legalize the majority of the non-complying structures on Wise Island
- A comment was made that removing the non-complying structures could be more environmentally detrimental than leaving them in place
- Support was expressed for recommending the bylaw apply to all boat-access-only islands in the waters around Galiano (it was noted that an

argument can be made that Phillimore Point is not an island in the waters around Galiano)

- Support was expressed for explicitly not including Phillimore Point in the proposed bylaw because it is not an island and a road and power could extend there in the future
- A distinction was made between a “boat-access-only” category and a “boat-access-only small island” category and a comment was made that, out of fairness, Wise Island should not be a category on its own

Commissioners weighed the pros and cons of including Phillimore Point in the bylaw. While some Commissioners expressed support for excluding Phillimore Point from the bylaw, they also made suggestions as to why it might be included. The following comments were made:

- Phillimore Point is not heavily treed and has a more open landscape than on Wise Island
- Solar panels could perhaps be used on Phillimore in the proposed setback only after all other options for locations have been exhausted
- If the bylaw is accepted as written, Phillimore Point will still be designated Small Island Residential if the road-access eventually opens, and the Local Trust Committee would have to amend the use through a bylaw amendment; amending the use is complicated and some residents might be opposed
- We don’t know what the consequences of some of the arguments put forward might be

3. *What are the pros and cons of detailing a number: one solar array, one set of stairs etc?*

A suggestion was made that the bylaw allow “a set” of stairs to access the foreshore, and “one” solar panel array of 10 square meters within the marine setback. (The rationale given for the increase to 10 square meters from 5 is that 10 square meters would provide power for an average household.)

4. *Size of solar panels – 5 sq meters or 10 sq meters?*

- One Commissioner was opposed to increasing the size of solar arrays to 10 square meters while the others expressed support
- A recommendation was made to add to Clause 2.14 A.1 “Solar panel arrays for the purpose of supplying power to the lot on which the structure is located and must not exceed 4 metres in height and a total solar array surface of 10 m² providing they have exhausted all other viable locations for a solar panel array
- A comment was made that the aim is to encourage the use of solar panels, but not to have them all located in the setback to the sea
- A suggestion was made that, as part of the Development Permit Area process, there needs to be an assessment done that shows the solar panels

cannot be located anywhere else on the property; a comment was made that while this is out of the scope of the referral, some language should be included in the bylaw – to provide guidance for property owners – about how solar arrays can be situated in the marine setback only if no alternative locations are available

- Support was expressed for including Phillimore Point in the bylaw because it does not have BC Hydro power
- A comment was made that Phillimore Point is effectively an island

5. Should “existing wooden platforms (of a defined size)” be added to the exemptions list?

6. Are there additions that we think should be added to the bylaw?

- A suggestion was made to add Clause 2.14 A.5 “Existing wooden platforms with an area of up to 30 square meters to offload materials”
- A comment was made that any new wooden platforms or alterations to existing wooden platforms would be subject to the Development Permit Area process

7. Is it possible to recommend a test period using Wise as the model?

A comment was made about how this would not work given how unique Wise Island is from the other areas.

8. Should construction materials be noted?

Commissioners agreed to not specify construction materials in the bylaw.

9. Other questions?

Commissioners discussed a question from Commissioner Longson sent via email prior to the meeting that asked: *Will a CRD Building Permit be required for the construction of new wooden platforms, or alterations to existing wooden platforms, stairs, walkways, ramps and solar array installations?* It was suggested that the question is out of the scope of the present referral.

Discussion continued and mixed opinions from the Commissioners as to whether or not to include Phillimore Point in the proposed bylaw were expressed. One Commissioner commented that there is little information in the staff report, and another suggested the pros and cons of the impact of the bylaw should be presented.

5. NEXT MEETING – None

6. ADJOURNMENT

By general consent the meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

Gilian Dusing, Chair

Certified Correct:

Carly Bilney, Recorder