

March 26,

Members of the SP LTC,

My comments regarding Bylaw 129 are as follows:

I'm not sure that either of the suggestions to prove the location of an existing building with respect to the natural boundary of the sea is necessary because the siting is required for the building permit application and the foundation of the building would be obvious. It may be simpler to remove this requirement altogether.

I am opposed to any amendment to the height regulation for dwellings and cottages.

I am opposed to allowing additional shipping containers without adequate siting and shielding requirements.

Any amendments to recreational vehicles regulations should include that they not be used for habitation. Should temporary use be necessary, a permit should be required to ensure proper sewage disposal and a safe power supply.

I am opposed to any amendments to revert the setback from the exterior and interior side lot line for dwellings and cottages from 6 metres (20 feet) to 3 metres (10 feet).

I am opposed to any amendments to the Agriculture zone to remove the floor area requirements for dwellings and cottages. Should agri-tourist accommodation be considered, then a Commercial Zoning application should be required (not unlike any other tourist accommodation), so neighbours have some input into the scale and type of operations.

Deleting the 'basement floor area' definition seems to ignore that basements exist. If the definition needs clarifying, then consider how that might be done but I am opposed to deleting it. The increase in the height of a storey from 1.5 metres to 1.8 metres is acceptable.

I am opposed to any increase in the floor area of any structures. The rationale for the current sizes has been presented and accepted by a majority of residents and should be left as they are currently.

I am opposed to having Attached Garages not included in Dwelling Floor Area as staff has recommended.

I support any amendments to clarify or improve the current Land Use Bylaw but I do not support any significant changes to setbacks, floor areas, or height, etc. These amendments being brought forward by the trustees have been justified by their assertion that the previous trustees did not listen to their constituents, an accusation the current trustees are following to an even greater degree. There has not been a "significant majority" who have approved of this project which, in the words of trustees, would be necessary for them to move forward. Continuing this charade of 'community involvement' to 'bring the community together', is unfortunate and unnecessary.

Steve Wright,  
S Pender.