

**From:** L/C Whitehead <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 14, 2024 8:46 AM  
**To:** SouthInfo <[SouthInfo@islandstrust.bc.ca](mailto:SouthInfo@islandstrust.bc.ca)>  
**Cc:** Kristina Evans <[kevans@islandstrust.bc.ca](mailto:kevans@islandstrust.bc.ca)>; Dag Falck <[dfalck@islandstrust.bc.ca](mailto:dfalck@islandstrust.bc.ca)>; Tobi Elliott <[telliott@islandstrust.bc.ca](mailto:telliott@islandstrust.bc.ca)>  
**Subject:** South Pender Island max house size and setbacks

Hello,

I have owned property on South Pender Island for over 35 years and our property has been in the family since my grandfather purchased it in 1910, then sold it to my father, [REDACTED], in 1954.

Although the change in bylaws have not affected me I have felt personally ignored over the past years when previous trustees seemed unable and unwilling to listen to the voices of the landowners who attended the meetings and submitted many letters. Workshops were attended, petitions were signed, yet voiced opposition to changes in bylaws i.e. increasing the house setbacks and decreasing maximum house size were ignored. The Trustees brought the Bylaw No. 122 changes upon the community with no regard to the large number of people who opposed this. There was no vote or survey undertaken by the LTC to determine whether or not to proceed with the Bylaw changes and many landowners voiced concerns regarding the process. These changes have put problematic bylaws in place and dealing with them through variances is a poor solution. The increased setback to the natural boundary of the sea from 7.6 metres to 15 metres, increased side lot setbacks, new building height regulations, decreased maximum floor area in RR, ALR and Forestry zones are restrictive and will likely now create numerous Development Variance Permit applications. Information provided at a recent workshop indicated that 80 % of the lots are already developed and 1900 sq feet is the average house size, not 3500 square feet people keep referring to. The Bylaw changes have created many “legal non-conforming” dwellings and owners are being told there could be additional insurance fees.

Landowners at a recent workshop presented some good suggestions and I hope some of them will be considered. Some examples were

- Sliding scale of house size relative to property. Siting based, making for bigger set-backs. This is less obtrusive on small lots, with less visual impact, maintaining more privacy.
- Reduce basements to reduce carbon.
- Square footage could be between old and new rulings. This will assist in meeting family needs..
- Spot zoning to help larger homes that no longer meet the new set back or house size criteria. This could reduce the number of non-conforming homes.
- Varying setbacks which could be determined by lot size and whether there is an existing home on neighboring lot.
- Combine guest cottage and house size. I.e. no cottage built, the house size could be larger.
- Secondary suites would assist with the current housing crisis.

Thank you for the workshops provided and for your efforts in finding a solution that will meet the needs of both those that oppose the Bylaw changes and those that are in favor of the changes.

Regards,  
Cathy Whitehead