

COPIED TO

PLANNER

LTC

From: Oliver Baecker [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, July 19, 2020 8:15 PM
To: Dan Rogers
Subject: Mayne Island Housing Society Village Bay Proposal- Neighbour Letter

Dear Island Trust,

My husband and I own a small home on [REDACTED]. We are writing in concern of the proposed Mayne Island Society development on the Sean McHugh property fronting on Village Bay Road. We support the need for affordable housing but have the following concerns regarding this project:

1. Water & Land
2. Density
3. Community Blended Planning for Affordable Housing, and Future Development

1. Water & Land

We are greatly concerned with the information provided in regards, to water viability/ and the possibility of how such density will affect our wetland, stream and current water supply.

We request a proper assessment of how site characteristics will be used to implement a higher density site. We are wary that the allocated resources will not allow proper surveys and site analysis as the budget will need to be utilized for the development. Therein lies our concerns for a project that has no proper ecosystem preservation and water shed protection plans. They have not completed an adequately detailed site plan with appropriate conveyances. We would hope that the official plans will demonstrate, individual water consumption calculations against averages, water and waste management and environmental impact calculations. We have reservations at prior assurances being made and would like the issues addressed at the pre-development stage, and not during the development (post approval). As residents we are not concerned with the abundance of surplus water supply but ensuring that future uses and needs are properly addressed. How will current higher density proposal address the potential contamination of wells with the use of a commercial grade septic systems – upgradient from

residents of Maple Dr? The signing off of these important factors should have more than just the interested parties providing assurances and should have an impartial recognized accredited third party, as well as the Mayne Island Water Society and the CRDC compliance. We feel this is important to not just consider current water and environment but to the overall forest health, watershed and supply for the future of Mayne Island.

Oliver and I are also mindful that the Mayne Island Housing Society development description thus far is focussed on esthetics and lifestyle rather than environmental practicalities. The focus should be on both environmental preservation and building a better community. How will the development preserve and protect the existing wetlands, stream, forest, springs and water table? How will they not be directly fragmenting the forest area? Our example of concerns include: the proposed long driveway and turn-around set back, situating the development in a position to increase the negative impact on the wetland portion of the property; the unaddressed legally required parking spaces for each unit thus the potential damage from the run-off of large hard surface construction. Will the trust consider a covenant and a natural barrier in consideration not only of the loss of privacy for residents bordering the development but for protection of the winter stream and wet land area? How will the trust handle the situation if surrounding residences suffer well contamination, water supply drying up, and severe degradation of forest and wetland areas resulting much of the area dying? We already bear witness to the ill planned effects of deforestation and don't wish to see even more impacts to already fragile balance. Will the trust endeavour to provide a baseline of well contaminants and water flow prior to the development, from an independent hydrologist not connected to the development? How will high need hours impact surrounding wells? Aside from Water, what type of heating systems will be used, as high concentrations of smoke and particulates would not be fitting of the Trust's mandate.

We would request that they have an independent assessment of environmental impact to ensure they are complying with Environmental impact on our surrounding area per the ISLANDS TRUST COUNCIL BYLAW NO. 17: A POLICY STATEMENT FOR THE TRUST AREA particularly Part III and Part IV.

Part III: Policies for Ecosystem Preservation and Protection, with focus on sections 3.2 and 3.3:

3.2	Forest Ecosystems
3.2.2	Local Trust Committees and Island Municipalities shall, in their official community plans and regulatory bylaws, address the protection of unfragmented forest ecosystems within their local planning areas from potentially adverse impacts of growth, development, and land-use.
3.3	Freshwater and Wetland Ecosystems and Riparian Zones
3.3.2	Local Trust Committees and Island Municipalities shall, in their official community plans and regulatory bylaws, address means to prevent further loss or degradation of freshwater bodies or watercourses, wetlands and riparian zones and to protect aquatic wildlife.

Part IV: Policies For the Stewardship of Resources, with focus on sections 4.2 and 4.4

	4.2	Forests
N/A	4.2.6	Local Trust Committees and Island Municipalities shall, in their official community plans and regulatory bylaws, address the need to protect the ecological integrity on a scale of forest stands and landscapes.
N/A	4.2.7	Local Trust Committees and Island Municipalities shall, in their official community plans and regulatory bylaws, address the retention of large land holdings and parcel sizes for sustainable forestry use, and the location and construction of roads, and utility and communication corridors to minimize the fragmentation of forests.
N/A	4.2.8	Local Trust Committees and Island Municipalities shall, in their official community plans and regulatory bylaws, address the designation of forest ecosystem reserves where no extraction will take place to ensure the preservation of native biological diversity.
	4.4	Freshwater Resources
N/A	4.4.2	Local Trust Committees and Island Municipalities shall, in their official community plans and regulatory bylaws, address measures that ensure neither the density nor intensity of land use is increased in areas which are known to have a problem with the quality or quantity of the supply of freshwater, water quality is maintained, and existing, anticipated and seasonal demands for water are considered and allowed for.
N/A	4.4.3	Local Trust Committees and Island Municipalities shall, in their official community plans and regulatory bylaws, address measures that ensure water use is not to the detriment of in-stream uses

2. Density

The goal of the Mayne Island Housing Society is to increase both the quantity and the quality of affordable rental units in our community. Why does the plans need to encompass such a level of density? The subsequent response of Mayne Island residents to previous failed propositions leads us to believe that the community recognizes the need for affordable housing but rejects the density of the project itself. Why would the propositions set forth not alter in order to create lower density and utilize more areas to allow the goal to be achieve while still preserving the integrity of both water supply and environmental preservation. How will the density of this project fit into the current landscape of Mayne Island? What are the detailed rules and regulations that will be set down for noise control and site management? How can this be effectively enforced and monitored to preserve the first 4 objectives of the Mayne Island Community Plan? Would not a smaller development meet all 5 objectives?

SECTION 2 OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES FOR LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT

One of the main functions of the Mayne Island Official Community Plan is to establish agreed upon patterns for future land uses. The designations are based on historical development patterns, physical features or constraints, initiatives of senior government and specific objectives defined by the community. Policies for each land use are contained in this Section.

Schedule B, the land use map, specifies areas of present and future land uses.

Objectives

The objectives of this section are:

- 1) to ensure that all land uses are based on the sustainability of the natural systems of the island,
- 2) to maintain the characteristic rural island lifestyle,
- 3) to protect the environmental qualities of the area and maintain natural topography of the landscape and minimizing impacts on adjoining properties,
- 4) to maintain the stability of ground and water catchment potential, and,
- 5) to encourage a land use pattern that results in a more compact, complete and connected community, with new residential development occurring in areas accessible to existing transportation and services.

With the density level, as a neighbour and only part-time residents, we have other concerns related to safety and maintaining the characteristic rural island lifestyle. We have concerns over noise, trespassing through ours and neighbouring properties for quicker access to amenities and a potential increase in property crime. These are not unfounded concerns and have been present in other communities with higher density rental housing.

The details provided suggest an onsite manager but how will the rules actually be enforced? What is the recourse for unruly tenants? The management of 20 – 30 individuals in a small area is more pronounced than the abstract idea of 10 units.

The density being proposed at this time is roughly 10 Units on 3 acres approximately broken down gives one a number of 0.3. Most Mayne Island properties have to conform with set MAYNE ISLAND LAND USE BYLAWS section and on average do not reflect such a level of density.

When exploring the proposed building units by other housing committees on our fellow Islands, most of the properties are much larger with less density, thus making impact on one specific area much less:

- Dragon Fly Commons: 30 units 10.5 Acres = 0.35
- Rainbow Ridge: 20 units 51 acres = 2.55
- Denman Housing Project: 10 buildings (20 units, one common laundry facility) 20 acres = 1.00

It would seem logical that to conform with the existing Mayne Island Community Planning Guidelines that the 3 Acre Parcel actually be sectioned into allowing three buildings of two units.

This would allow for 6 units on the space of land conforming with most of the properties surrounding build levels; allowing for development with optimum environmental preservation, community acceptance and less taxation on the existing watershed and providing affordable housing. 6 units on 3 acres = 0.5. This seems equitable for area growth as most properties on the back of the property are 1 unit per an average of 1.5 acres with the ability to have secondary suites. That being said we also would like addressed the future development plans for the other two 3 acre lots being created with this application. We would like to ensure a precedence for High Density is not being set to further erode our wetland and forest area. We would like the Trust to set out clear property zoning detail for all three lots being created by the landowner's donation "in kind" for the re-zoning and development of his property. One of our concerns is that once the society has completed subject site and achieves stabilized rental income, it has the ability to finance and look to purchase neighbouring site and expand site with a similar development (10 units), thereby, fulfilling its overall long-term mandate.

3. Community Blended Planning for Affordable Housing, Jobs and Future Development

The Gulf Islands are a special place and we feel extremely privileged and proud to be a part of the Mayne Island community. We have been kindly welcomed by each neighbour and stranger alike. In our last four years we have found ourselves volunteering, enjoying our cabin, supporting local business, and relishing in the natural splendour of the Island. We feel that being part-time gives us a slightly different perspective at times. We are immeasurably impressed with the initiatives set forth by the different groups on Mayne Island, but wonder why projects are not resource sharing to optimize funding. We see the new beautiful park at Cotton, the initiative for Affordable Community Housing, the campaign to build an Archives and improved Thrift Store; and we cannot help but pause... if the Island has need for affordable housing why tear down the Cotton house? If we look for alternatives, why could 8 acres not facilitate a couple of affordable residences, or could other community held land parcels not utilize smaller unit clusters? These may have already been explored or have practical reasons for not being appropriate, but our point is, have our current resources been fully vetted to ensure the best utilisation of our limited resources and ensure housing is met and distributed across our community.

A wider distribution would seem possible given the description presented the Trust, with the inclusion of electric car charge stations, and parking spots in the plans, proximity to the city center does not seem necessary. Another example for additional units being implemented to current initiatives - Why the new Archives and improved Thrift Store could not have a few affordable units attached? Combining funds, grants and utilizing all to the best advantage.

Sincerely,

Megan & Oliver Baecker