

From: Dan Rogers
Sent: Thursday, July 22, 2021 9:24 AM
To: Gambier Island Local Trust Committee
Subject: FW: July 22 Island Trust meeting - Keats Shore Line
Attachments: 2021 Keats Shoreline Dan Rogers July 22.docx

Sent from my Galaxy

----- Original message -----

From: Sheila R [REDACTED]
Date: 2021-07-22 9:09 a.m. (GMT-08:00)
To: Dan Rogers <drogers@islandstrust.bc.ca>
Cc: Ian Roote [REDACTED], Lisa Hemman [REDACTED], Jennifer Roote [REDACTED]
Subject: July 22 Island Trust meeting - Keats Shore Line

Hi Dan,

Attached please find my letter regarding the staff report on the Keats Shoreline. I apologize for the late submission, but it only came to my attention yesterday. I have outlined a few of my concerns, but would like more time to review in depth. Like me, many Keats property owners are on holiday with limited or no internet access and the timing for this report is poor, please request it be shelved until the fall.

Sheila Roote
Sointula, BC

[REDACTED]

Sheila Roote
25 Kallio Road
Sointula, BC V0N 3E0
604-619-1796
sheila@sheilaroote.com

July 22, 2021

Dan Rogers
drogers@islandstrust.bc.ca

Re: Gambier Island Local Trust Committee – July 22, 2021 Meeting
Keats Island Shoreline Protection Project – Staff Report

Dear Dan

The timing of presenting this report at today's meeting during prime holiday season when many property owners are on holiday with limited or no access to the internet and their computers to properly respond is very poor. I would like to request this report be shelved until a fall meeting date at which time more Keats Island property owners will have had time to review and properly respond.

I am opposed and concerned about a number of items in this report but since time is of the essence and today's meeting is imminent I will high light a few in the hopes this report will be shelved until we have more time to review

I am opposed to the revised set back of 15 metres to 7.5 metres. One of the rationales states:

“Updating the setback also aligns with provincial “Flood Hazard Area Land Use Management Guidelines” that indicate buildings should be setback at a minimum of 15 metres from the future estimated natural boundary of the sea at Year 2100.”

Yet according to the Province of British Columbia's Coast Flood Hazard Area Maps the risk of shoreline flooding by the year 2100 is virtually non-existent with a very low risk in a very few small areas. Why is this used as a justification to revise the set-back when there is no risk?

With regards the consultation process the following is stated on page 23 of the Staff Report there is a requirement for consultation with persons ... considers will be affected during an OCP amendment. We the property owners will be affected significantly yet are not listed. Again I ask this report be shelved until the property owners can be added to this list and properly consulted.

“Consultation

The Local Government Act requires local governments consider opportunities for consultation with persons, organizations and authorities it considers will be affected during an OCP amendment. The general process for proposed bylaws after first reading

includes referrals of the bylaws to First Nations, provincial agencies, local governments and other referral agencies. Staff have identified the following agencies to refer the Bylaw Nos. 153 and 154 to:

- Ministry of Forests, Lands, Natural Resource Operations and Rural Development,
- Sunshine Coast Regional District,
- Islands Trust Conservancy,
- Lasqueti Island Local Trust Committee,
- Gabriola Island Local Trust Committee, and
- Galiano Island Local Trust Committee.”

I note there is a lot of emphasis placed on protecting native vegetation with extreme restrictions on any disturbance, pruning, topping, removing of native plants. Our property consists of mature second growth with vigorous growth. The restrictive nature of limited pruning, trimming, topping, limbing etc. will have many of our properties engulfed in the forest in a very few years. Our views will be blocked, the fire hazard of increased with the vegetation surrounding our structures and our enjoyment of a shoreline with high recreational value will be greatly diminished.

Of note the report states “Pruning of not more than two trees in one growing season”. It is incredibly impractical to trim just two trees when most properties have numerous ones surrounding their buildings. It is difficult to find professionals able to do the work and to then offer them the very limited work of trimming just two trees is unrealistic. It takes a lot of time, energy and expense to transport these professionals to the island and then mobilize a work party to help clean up afterwards.

This limitation is also unrealistic when one considers that many of our native ever greens will put on one to two feet of growth each year.

I also note the term “lawful structures” in the report, but did not see a definition. Many of the cabins and structures along the shoreline of Keats are decades old, some may even be approaching a century and were not subject to building codes, permits etc. when built. Where do they fit in? This needs to be better addressed.

I once again request this report be shelved until the fall when more property owners can have a chance to properly review this report and respond accordingly.

Respectfully,

Sheila Roote
Plumper Cove, Keats Island, property owner