

From: Paul Milley [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, October 13, 2021 10:04 AM
To: Dan Rogers
Cc: Glen Donaldson; Joshua Lepin; northinfo
Subject: Re: Development permit proposals

Dan, all these presentations and responses are put forth as “motherhood and apple pie” so that any and all criticism is treated as if we are opposed to the environment. Most Keats residents are there because they appreciate the environment and we are happy to preserve it.

As one questioner asked, “Where is the science?” There has been no discussion of the issues and no background science to the solutions. The whole presentation is focused on the changes to regulations that we have lived with for many years with no background as to why these changes are needed. It’s no surprise that people feel like we are being railroaded.

Most of us could be quite favourable toward a DPA if some background was explained. The idea of controlling waterfront development is good. However these changes just come across as arbitrary and extreme when they are presented in this way in addition to the new concept of a DPA. Why do we need to reduce maximum float area by 45% for residential floats? Why is Barnabas maximum waterfront area reduced by 66% with no consultation. That original limit for Barnabas was negotiated with lots of discussion.

The DPA alone could be very helpful for environmental issues and could be established with much less impact and that alone would go a long way toward the objectives. This approach will only undermine the relationship between the Islands Trust and the residents whom you represent.

Paul Milley

On Tue, Oct 12, 2021 at 11:21 AM Dan Rogers <drogers@islandstrust.bc.ca> wrote:

Good morning Paul. I have been thinking about your email(s) over the past few days considering whether to or how to respond. Generally my practice is to listen to comments (written or verbal) and only respond when specific questions are asked. I am going to respond briefly to a few of the comments you make.

1) In your paragraph 1 below, I don't doubt that is what you thought you heard but I don't think that is a fair representation of the planners comments. My understanding of the planners comments was that the **purpose** of a DPA was not to preserve view lines but rather the purpose was to protect the ecosystem. We are deeply aware that people are impacted by our bylaws. The Trust is mandated by the Islands Trust Act to "preserve and protect the Trust Area and its unique amenities and environment for the benefit of the residents of the Trust Area and British Columbia generally.....". That requires the Trust to take into account not just landowners and residents considerations but also the environment etc.

2) I and others are acutely aware that people live here . And the families in many cases have been here for generations. It is one of the joys for a lot of people of Keats. We are also acutely aware that indigenous people have been here for millennia and we have to listen to those voices as well.

3) We are listening intently to the comments of those who have written. It is not lost on me in any way that folks are concerned about the proposed change in the set back. I am also acutely aware that settlement patterns that are present on Keats are somewhat unique in particular with the number of small lots on the waterfront. I agree that Gambier is not like Pasley nor like Keats but mostly because of the way it was developed. The ecosystems are similar.

Your feedback is always welcome and I hope you will accept my assurance that it is not going into the wind. I am listening as I have been throughout this process.

Dan

Daniel J Rogers

Islands Trust Vice-Chair and Gambier Area Trustee

604-220-1500

Preserving and Protecting Over 450 Islands and the Surrounding Waters in the Salish Sea

I am humbly thankful that I live and work in the territory of the BOKEĆEN, Cowichan, Halalt, Homalco, K'ómok, Klahoose, Lake Cowichan, Lekwungen, Lyackson, MÁLEXEL, Penelakut, Qualicum, Scia'new, selíwítulh, SEMYOME, Shíshálh, Snaw-naw-as, Snuneymuxw, Sḵwxwú7mesh, SṪÁUTW, Stz'uminus, SXIMEŁŁŁ, T'Sou-ke, Tla'amin, Tsawwassen, We Wai Kai, Wei Wai Kum, WJOŁŁŁP, WSIKEM, and x"məθk"əyəm.

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 may 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

--

Paul Milley
Grandfather