



**200 – 1627 Fort Street, Victoria, B.C. V8R 1H8**  
**Telephone: (250) 405-5151 Fax: (250) 405-5155**  
Email: gsaxby@islandstrust.bc.ca

**BACKGROUND TO THE “KEATS ISLAND RURAL LAND USE BYLAW - STAFF COMMENTS on COMMUNITY RESPONSES”**  
TABLE, February 2002

The review of the current Official Community Plan (OCP) for Keats Island (Bylaw 107) commenced in June 2000. An information mailer was sent out to all Keats Island residents and property owners that included a workbook/questionnaire as well as more detailed information about the review process. Two orientation and visioning community forums were held – one in North Vancouver, and one at Barnabas (Corkum Farm) on Keats. A “Keats Island Community Profile” report was also provided as a reference document for Keats Island. In the spring of 2001 the local trustees and staff met with the Keats Island Advisory Planning Group (APG) to design the second phase of the community consultation process. A second island-wide mailer, including the First Working Draft of the RLUB– Part 1 and a response form, was sent to all Keats Island residents and property owners. A second round of community information meetings were held in July.

The community responses form the questionnaire (communityresponsetable2001.doc) and the staff comments (STAFFCOMMENTStquestionnaire.doc) have been prepared. All information and documents relating the Keats Island RLUB review process are available for viewing and downloading at [www.keatsisland.net](http://www.keatsisland.net) and [www.islandstrust.bc.ca](http://www.islandstrust.bc.ca), or upon request.

**COMMENTS**

All June 6, 2001 “Community Response Forms and Questionnaires” have been assembled into a “Community Response Table 2001”. The following “KEATS ISLAND RURAL LAND USE BYLAW - STAFF COMMENTS on COMMUNITY RESPONSES, February 2002” table is a summarization and analysis of the “Community Response Table”. This work has been prepared by the Islands Trust Staff Project Planner for the Keats Island Planning Review Process, Gillian Saxby.

These analysis tables will form the basis for the Project Planner to make recommendations to the Gambier Island Local Trust Committee regarding suggested amendments to the policies in the Second Working Draft of the RLUB– Part 1

**KEATS ISLAND RURAL LAND USE BYLAW - STAFF COMMENTS on COMMUNITY RESPONSES February 2002**

<b>COMMUNITY Questionnaire for WORKING DRAFT June 2001</b>	<b>STAFF COMMENTS</b>
1. What are three priority areas on Keats for parkland acquisition? (See OBJ2 and P15)	The comments specified various priority areas on Keats for acquisition such as beach accesses, look out areas and trails. The areas of the island that several people commented upon for acquisition were: Salmon Rock, Pebble Beach, Cotton Point and the 400 acre Eastbourne/ 10 acres subdivision area. There were also several comments stating that there was no need for additional parkland acquisition on Keats.
2. Would you like to see an outdoor recreation playing field established near Eastbourne? (see P9)	Of the people who responded, the majority of people said they would like to have a playing field near Eastbourne and many comments were given under to clarify that this should happen only under certain conditions such as ensuring environmental impacts are addressed and that the affect on neighbouring properties must be addressed - negative impacts such as traffic, noise, and litter. Concerns were also raised about costs outweighing the benefits and questions were raised as to who pays for it – suggesting that it should be at the costs of Eastbourne properties owners only. Locations were suggested such as at the Eastbourne/ 10 acre subdivision areas, DL1594/95, subject to Policy 16
3. Would you like to see a community hall-type facility established near Eastbourne? (See OBJ 9)	Of the people who responded, more people said that they would like to have a community hall type facility near Eastbourne; however, concerns were raised about location, costs and impact on neighbouring properties. Concerns were expressed about a development precedent being established and negative impacts on surrounding properties such as increased traffic, noise, and litter and decreased peace and quiet. Concerns were also raised about costs and questions were raised as to who pays for it – suggesting that it should be at the costs of Eastbourne properties owners only.
4. Would you like to see a small corner-type store established in Eastbourne? OBJ 9 and P83:	Of the people who responded, more people did not want a small corner type (commercial) store established in Eastbourne. Many ideas were stated on location, type and scale of this type of use as follows: would create a friendly environment, bring a sense of community and a gathering area; that the store could include small grocery with hardware perhaps with small library and coffee shop (no retail alcohol) ; and that maybe it could be open in the summer only - or by order. Concerns were about the following: the environmental and neighbourhood impacts, that it may increase full time residency - it may contribute to development/ density increases, that a store would not be viable on Keats as it is too small a population base, that Keats may loose is self sufficiency and independence, that a store would negatively impact on the atmosphere and character of the island and that Keats should be maintained as a non commercial island.

<p>5. Should proposals for future marine orientated uses such as additional public wharf sites or public moorage facilities, new public barge ramps or boat launches, or changes in uses at existing facilities be subject to redesignation and rezoning, including a public hearing? (see P39 and P2120)</p>	<p>The majority of the people who responded stated that they would like marine orientated uses such as additional public wharf sites or public moorage facilities, new public barge ramps or boat launches, or changes in uses at existing facilities be subject to redesignation and rezoning, including a public hearing. The comments emphasized a need for a community review process prior to the public hearing including making information available to the public and an open community wide meeting on the specific details of the proposal. Concerns were raised as to the environmental impacts to foreshore and stated that an environmental assessment information must be made available at the community meeting and public hearing. Concerns were raised about the following: obstruction or limiting access to public beaches, safety issues around the foreshore, the need to avoid over regulation, that no more wharves, ramps or moorage are needed (more available then more people).</p>
<p>6. Should the existing residential density of two dwellings per lot be changed such that lots under 2.5 acres would be limited to one dwelling per lot; and lots larger than 2.5 acres but under 10 acres be limited to one dwelling and one guest cottage of limited size? (see P53)</p>	<p>The comments did not give a clear indication of the community desire to change the existing residential density of two dwellings per lot such that lots under 2.5 acres would be limited to one dwelling per lot; and lots larger than 2.5 acres but under 10 acres be limited to one dwelling and one guest cottage of limited size. The comments address various options such as the following: all properties should be permitted a guest cottage limited to 100 sq. ft., to limit the size of the guest cottage to 500 sq. ft., that properties greater than 50 acres should be allowed 5 guest cottages, and that a 2.5 acre property be allowed one dwelling and one guest cottage. Comments were also given stating that the existing dwelling density is adequate, that the existing dwelling density should be one dwelling per lot and that the existing regulations should be changed such that one cottage and one guest house per 10 acres is allowed.</p>
<p>7. Should the existing density on residential lots 10 acres or larger be allowed to be increased to a maximum of 2 dwellings and two guest cottages if a conservation covenant is placed on the land protecting a natural area of at least 5 acres, or if a public trail corridor and greenway buffer are dedicated by the owner? (see P53)</p>	<p>There was not a clear direction from the community comments regarding the community desire to change the existing density on residential lots 10 acres or larger be allowed to be increased to a maximum of 2 dwellings and two guest cottages if a conservation covenant is placed on the land protecting a natural area of at least 5 acres, or if a public trail corridor and greenway buffer are dedicated by the owner. Comments suggested that support for the density change would be given under various conditions such as: if tax relief is given for conservation, if legal subdivision occurs, if the definition of guest cottage must not allow 4 dwelling per 10 acres and if water supply issues have been resolved. Several comments supported the idea of a public trail corridor. Concerns were raised such as the need to retain low population density, that there would be too much density for too little infrastructure, water supply and waste disposal issues, that this would lead to rental properties, and that this would increase densities and result in too many dwellings. A suggestion was made to lower the density to one dwelling and one guest cottage/10 acres and another to increase density allowed so that would allow one dwelling and guest cottage per 2.5 acres.</p>
<p>8. Should a Rural Comprehensive Designation, as described in P56 through P60 be considered? P56, P57, P58, P59, P60</p>	<p>The majority of the community comments thought a Rural Comprehensive Designation should be considered. Comments stated that the concept was useful to minimize impacts and that more information should be given. Concerns were raised about water issues needing to be resolved and the increase in densities, problems and government intervention.</p>

<p>9. Should home occupations (small scale home-based business enterprises) be allowed as a secondary use? P68,P69</p>	<p>The majority of the community comments stated that home occupations (small scale home-based business enterprises) should be allowed as a secondary use under certain conditions such as the following: if kept in the dwelling, if they are indoor activities, if they are of minimal impact to environment and community, provided they do not increase traffic, and if they are small scale, quiet and non obtrusive. Types of home occupations suggested that should not be allowed are: no heavy machinery or building material not for use on the site, no storage of materials or manufacturing, no commercial saw milling (only on site short term) , and no commercial type buildings or signs. Concerns were raised as to the island becoming a commercial island versus recreational only, that this would cause more development, and change the ambience of Keats.</p>
<p>10. Should Commercial Visitor Accommodation uses be allowed? P91</p>	<p>There was not a clear direction from the community comments stating whether Commercial Visitor Accommodation uses should be allowed. There were many concerns expressed such as the following: commercial is not desirable on Keats, it should be recreational island only, there is no need , Keats is too small , Keats is too limited to provide for infrastructure, destroy atmosphere , increase vehicular traffic, concerns about rental accommodation, that there is no need and there is ample camping. Those responding favorable to Commercial Visitor accommodation being subject to redesignation and rezoning also gave conditions such as the following: that there be no hotels allowed, that this be for B&amp; Bs only, only small scale B&amp;Bs that are limited in number (1 or 2 on island) and limited in scale (such as 4 bedrooms/dwelling, or island wide # bed/unit cap) and that water issues should be resolved such as user pay system.</p>
<p>11. Should there be parking restrictions associated with use of the existing public wharves? P99 :</p>	<p>The majority of the community comments stated that parking restrictions should be associated with use of the existing public wharves (both Eastbourne and Keats Landing wharves). Comments were made regarding the number and type of parking, the length of time allowed for parking and location. Suggestions were made such as: this should be determined by those communities affected (ie Eastbourne), people could park at Hydro shed for Keats Landing or at the top of the hill, limited designated parking should be allowed, no parking on the dock, that short term handicap parking should be provided and that emergency only parking should be allowed, limited parking say 15 min or unloading only and no permanently parked cars - people should park at home. Concerns raised for parking at Keats Landing and that it is not a problem at this time.</p>
<p>12. Should island speed limits be lowered as described in P.102?</p>	<p>The majority of the community comments stated that island speed limits should be lowered. Several comments questioned whether these would be enforceable limits and that the 30km is too slow on Keats Road. Other suggestions were for 30km only island wide, 15 km in Eastbourne, to lower the speed to 20km or less for the safety of pedestrians and children in populated areas, lower speeds especially for cars and trucks and that the speeds should be posted. Those opposed to lowering the speed limits stated that Keats should be self regulating that 10km is too slow, that speeds should remain the same and that the speed limit is adequate as it is.</p>
<p>13. Should an additional Dogwood Princess ferry drop off at Plumper Cove Provincial Marine Park during the summer months be considered? P112(g)</p>	<p>The majority of the community comments stated that an additional Dogwood Princess ferry drop off at Plumper Cove Provincial Marine Park during the summer months should not be considered. Reasons for no additional ferry drop at Plumper Cove were that it has been tried before and did not work, that the residents have expressed concerns about this, it is too crowed already and concern for loitering, vandalism and noise.</p>

<p>14. Should proposals for enhanced water taxi access to Eastbourne, Gibsons, Horseshoe Bay or Downtown Vancouver be supported? P113</p>	<p>Of the people who responded, more people did want to see enhanced water taxi access to Eastbourne, Gibsons, Horseshoe Bay or Downtown Vancouver. The were suggestions made regarding schedule location and timing (Gibsons 1 –2 time per week and Horseshoe Bay and downtown Vancouver on Monday mornings). Also that the operation be economically viable and on a user pay basis. Concerns were raised regarding not wanting to become a bedroom community , why increase the traffic, noise and pollution, that residents should provide their own transportation, that it is not needed at this time, and that this is a private business issue.</p>
<p>15. Should long term public moorage for private vessels be established? P120</p>	<p>There was not a clear direction from the community comments regarding establishment of long term public moorage for private vessels. Concerns were raised regarding the location (not at marine park or Keats Landing), the costs and the social and environmental impacts (noise, pollution). Suggestions for location were as follows: Plumper Cove, west side of island, expand Keats Landing, and Eastbourne. Environmental impacts studies should be required, community consultation and a suggestion that it be only privately owned long term public moorage or community based cooperative solutions.</p>
<p>16. Should an additional public barge ramp site be established in Eastbourne? P125</p>	<p>There was not a clear direction from the community comments regarding establishment of an additional public barge ramp site in Eastbourne. Reasons for establishing a site in Eastbourne were given such as: would decrease cross island traffic, decrease barging needs from Vancouver, it would eliminate the Keats Landing problems, that it would be convenient and that it is needed. One comment suggested the possibility of a private barge ramp in Eastbourne. Comments were also made regarding the affect on neighbouring cottagers (increased traffic) and to ensure that it is a user pay operation. Concerns were expressed for the negative impacts on foreshore, safety and beach access and that it may increase development.</p>
<p>17. Should tax based Local Service Area (s) be established (for all or part of the island) to address 1. Eastbourne water 2.Garbage Services 3.Fire Depart</p>	<p>Of the people who responded, more people did want to see a tax based Local Service Area (s) be established (for all or part of the island) to address Eastbourne water, garbage and fire department services. Concerns were raised regarding that it is adequate now and who pays for the services. A suggestion for additional policing services was made (one day per month).</p>
<p>18. Are you a part time resident, full-time resident, or have a different sort of association</p>	<p>Of the people who responded, more people were part time residents, rather than full time.</p>

S:\LTC\GAMBIER\Keats\draft RLUB Staff Comments Response TableFeb 2002.doc