

From: Paul Milley [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, October 6, 2021 1:30 AM
To: Dan Rogers; northinfo
Cc: Glen Donaldson; Joshua Lepin; Paul Milley
Subject: Fwd: Development permit proposals

Dan

Over the past few days following the information meeting I have been trying to sort my thoughts on these proposals. Here you are;

1) There is a sense of depersonalization on these topics from the Trust staff and bureaucrats. The proposals are written and presented as if no people are impacted by these changes. This is promoted by comments like, "we don't consider inconvenience to people," or "we're not into preserving view lines."

Is it any surprise that people who have owned and cared for these properties feel that this is being imposed on them? There is also a sense that the people who develop and promote these policies do not live in situations where they personally experience the results of living with them. Most of them do not live on Keats Island. There is no sense that we are coming together to discuss these goals and these proposals and consider what is reasonable for the community and what is unreasonable.

These proposals are supported by statements like; "this will represent only one more step in the development process," or

"The variance process will allow us to be much more site specific."

This will mean that the trend will continue that we will be much more dependent on government and the Islands Trust decisions to determine how we use our property. This does not build trust.

2) All of this is justified by professional opinions and government guidelines. At no point is it acknowledged that, **PEOPLE LIVE HERE. People have lived here for many generations.** These communities have been in place for many, many years. These proposals impact how people will live on their private property and how they view the Islands Trust for many years to come. There are other significant priorities to consider yet the only factors presented are the scientific and planning objectives.

3) These proposals will only impact waterfront residents creating a separate class of property holders. How many waterfront taxpayers were involved in creating these proposals? So far I have heard no support from waterfront residents. If these proposals are finalized as written we have a whole new set of regulations applied to Keats Island property that will have an impact on waterfront property values. No impact on the value of upland lots.

We recently acquired a vacant waterfront lot beside our current cottage which our family has enjoyed for 30 years. Due to the shore line this new lot is more shallow than our original lot but we thought we could still build with the current setback. This new setback will greatly restrict where we build and what we build and possibly even mean that we can't build on this lot. At the least, it will have a negative impact on the lot value and possibly mean it is worthless.

4)The Islands Trust has trouble enforcing the current regulations. Look at the property east of Pebble Beach. How much more will this new level of regulations complicate enforcement? How much more will people be incented to ignore the rules?

5)There is an air about these presentations and responses to questions that suggests no amount of feedback will result in any adjustments to the proposals. If this attitude continues throughout this process there will not be a tree on private property within 25 meters of the high tide line by the time this is finalized. This will allow much more sunlight on the shoreline. The planners talked about the deeper setback allowing for more shade on the shoreline. What is the objective, sunlight or shade?

Keats Island does not look like Gambier which does not look like Pasley which is different from Bowen Island. I don't want a set of regulations just so we can copy some other island. The extent of these proposals is overdone in many ways. Current issues and many future issues could be managed with much less impact on so many people.

For the reasons mentioned above, I feel like I am throwing good feedback into the wind.
Hopefully it will be considered.

--

Paul Milley
Grandfather



--

Paul Milley
Grandfather