<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORRESPONDENCE</th>
<th>RECEIVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Email dated January 29, 2015 from Paul Wright regarding the SDBA parcel tax</td>
<td>January 29, 2015 Pg 3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Letter dated January 29, 2015 from Terry Webster regarding the Site C Project - Moratorium</td>
<td>February 5, 2015 Pg 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Letter dated January 30, 2015 from Pam Jackson regarding dark skies – Vancouver newspaper article</td>
<td>January 30, 2015 Pg 7-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Email dated January 30, 2015 from Doug Spani regarding support for retirement community</td>
<td>January 30, 2015 Pg 9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Email dated January 31, 2015 from Ross Muirhead regarding Elphinstone Logging</td>
<td>January 31, 2015 Pg 14-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Email dated February 2, 2015 from Barry Pruden regarding Sechelt Water Resource Centre</td>
<td>February 2, 2015 Pg 22-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Email dated February 2, 2015 from Linda Williams regarding additional comments on Amendment Byaw 25-265, amended</td>
<td>February 2, 2015 Pg 24-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Letter dated February 2, 2015 from Richard Crawshay regarding Baillie Road storage van</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Email dated February 3, 2015 from Adam Major regarding the SDBA parcel tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Email dated February 3, 2015 from Mike Anderchek regarding Medma Permit and Lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Email dated February 4, 2015 from Thomas Holmes regarding the SDBA parcel tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Email dated February 5, 2015 from Linda Williams regarding BL 25-265, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Email dated February 5, 2015 from Peter Gordon regarding the SDBA parcel tax</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Mayor Milne and Council,

My name is Paul Wright. As a registered Physical Therapist, I have owned and operated a small business in the downtown core of Sechelt for the past 15 years. I am also the owner of the commercial building I work from located at 5691 Mermaid Street. I understand that the Sechelt Downtown Business Association (SDBA) will be applying for renewal of their parcel tax which is applied to commercial land owners in the downtown core.

I am writing you this letter to request that you review this bylaw, and either remove my business from its catchment area, or ultimately eliminate it entirely.

As a healthcare professional, I run a “referral based” business and do not see any benefit from being an unwilling member of this association. As a business owner in the downtown core, I see absolutely no tangible benefit from the SDBA to my business. Thus, I am opposed to being forced to pay an additional $525 annually to the SDBA. I see this as a clear case of taxation without representation!

Furthermore, if you assess this bylaw you will see that it is a tax which is applied to each parcel of land in the SDBA catchment area, and not to specific businesses. I run a single small business on a single land parcel, therefore I am obligated to pay the entire $525 tax myself. If you now consider the Trail Bay Mall, you will note that it is also occupies a single parcel of land, thus, the $525 tax is distributed between all the businesses within it! How can this possibly be considered fair and equitable taxation! A more reasonable method for the SDBA to receive their funding would be to add a small fee to each business license issued in the district of Sechelt, instead of adding to the ever growing tax burden faced by commercial land owners.

I would gladly meet with you as a group to further discuss my situation and concerns.

Concerned business/commercial land owner for fair and equitable taxation and business retention in the District of Sechelt

W. Paul Wright RPT
BSc. Kinesiology
BHSc. Physical Therapy
January 29, 2015

Dear Mayor Milne and Council,

My name is Paul Wright. As a registered Physical Therapist, I have owned and operated a small business in the downtown core of Sechelt for the past 15 years. I am also the owner of the commercial building I work from located at 5691 Mermaid Street. I understand that the Sechelt Downtown Business Association (SDBA) will be applying for renewal of their parcel tax which is applied to commercial land owners in the downtown core.

I am writing you this letter to request that you review this bylaw, and either remove my business from its catchment area, or ultimately eliminate it entirely.

As a healthcare professional, I run a “referral based” business and do not see any benefit from being an unwilling member of this association. As a business owner in the downtown core, I see absolutely no tangible benefit from the SDBA to my business. Thus, I am opposed to being forced to pay an additional $525 annually to the SDBA. I see this as a clear case of taxation without representation!

Furthermore, if you assess this bylaw you will see that it is a tax which is applied to each parcel of land in the SDBA catchment area, and not to specific businesses. I run a single small business on a single land parcel, therefore I am obligated to pay the entire $525 tax myself. If you now consider the Trail Bay Mall, you will note that it is also occupies a single parcel of land, thus, the $525 tax is distributed between all the businesses within it! How can this possibly be considered fair and equitable taxation! A more reasonable method for the SDBA to receive their funding would be to add a small fee to each business license issued in the district of Sechelt, instead of adding to the ever growing tax burden faced by commercial land owners.

I would gladly meet with you as a group to further discuss my situation and concerns.

Concerned business/commercial land owner for fair and equitable taxation and business retention in the District of Sechelt

W. Paul Wright RPT
BSc. Kinesiology
BHSc. Physical Therapy
January 29, 2015

Dear Mayor and Council

RE: MORATORIUM TO ALLOW BCUC TO REVIEW PROPOSED SITE C PROJECT

In response to a report in our local paper, I recently attended the Powell River council meeting and made a presentation. As a result there was a unanimous decision to send a letter to Bill Bennett, Minister of Energy and Mines asking that there be a one-year moratorium on the building of Site C to allow the BC Utilities Commission (BCUC) to rule on the project.

I am aware that the District of Hudson’s Hope sent a letter in December asking for support from municipalities regarding this issue. Unfortunately, the Province announced their approval of the project at the same time so many municipalities may have felt that it was too late to become involved. Although the Site C project has received approval, I believe that the BC Government should follow the recommendation of their Joint Review Committee and refer the issue to the BCUC before beginning construction.

Why is this a municipal issue? Almost everyone in BC uses electricity in their homes and their workplaces. Already ratepayers are bracing for 28% hikes over the next six years - and that is before the $8.8 billion dollar costs for Site C are added. To date the provincial government has not acted on the advice of the Joint Review Commission* so it is the responsibility of local government to act on behalf of its citizens. Raise your voices, write a letter to Bill Bennett and your local MLA to let the BC government know that it is their duty to allow BCUC to analyze the Site C project, thus ensuring that we all have affordable power in the future. Site C is reported to be the most expensive power project that British Columbia has ever embarked on so it is essential that the BCUC reviews the project before construction begins.

Sincerely,

Terry Webster

* Among other findings, the Joint Review Panel concluded that:

- it was unable to assess the accuracy of Site C project cost estimates, and recommended that such costs, including unit energy costs and revenue requirements, be referred to the BC Utilities Commission for detailed examination if Site C proceeds;

basing Site C on a 20-year demand forecast without an explicit 20-year forecast for electricity prices is not good practice given the potential reduction to electricity demand caused by future real rate increases, and recommended that (i) BC Hydro construct a reasonable long-term pricing model and update the associated load forecast and (ii) such forecasts be subject to a BCUC hearing before beginning construction of Site C.
January 28th, 2015

Bruce Milne, Mayor
Sunshine coast regional district
5797 Cowrie Street
PO Box 129
Sechelt, BC
V0N 3A0

Dear Sir,

L’école du Pacifique, your local public francophone school, in collaboration with it’s parent advisory comity, the French pre-school and La société Francophone de la Côte du Soleil, is organising an annual ‘cabane à sucre’: the sugar shack. This cultural event takes place every year at the beginning of spring in many French Canadian communities around the Country. It is a festival of traditional food revolving around maple products, family time, music and outdoor fun.

The assistance of your organisation would help ensure that the event becomes an annual event on the coast at a low cost for. A similar event was already happening in the past as an unofficial community event, potluck style organised by a handful of parents and community members. It has grown tremendously in popularity and we are now in need of securing a bigger space, with tables, chair and would like to bring it to a different level with a proper stage for entertainment and a catered traditional meal. We are also looking at expending it to the larger community and creating a francophone festival accessible to everyone on the coast at a reasonable cost. We are anticipating a crowd of 250 people. The four groups collaborating in the organisation are putting a lot of time and efforts to prepare this event.

We need your support

We are planning la cabane à sucre for March 7th, 2015. We are asking for your support in the form of donation of $500 to $1000 to help support this event at a low cost for families of the sunshine coast. You could be a proud sponsor for this fun and popular event.

Please contact me to discuss possibilities.

Thank you very much for your attention, and we hope to hear from you shortly,

Cécile Desgagné
Directrice / Principal
École du Pacifique (yûm-ach)
École secondaire Chatelech francophone
Tél. 604 885-4743
Cellulaire 604 741-4149
cecile.desgagne@csf.bc.ca
pacifique@csf.bc.ca
Let there be a little less light, councillor says

Elizabeth Ball backs calls to reduce nighttime illumination in Vancouver

If Coun. Elizabeth Ball has her way, the bright lights of Vancouver's skyline and streets will become a little bit dimmer.

In an effort to get a grip on the growing problem of worldwide light pollution, Ball wants the city to bring in a strategy for shielding lights, reducing unnecessary glare and switching to more ecologically friendly sources of illumination.

That includes encouraging homeowners and private building owners to turn out, shield or direct lights to specific tasks, rather than letting them beam out into the universe.

"We're trying to come up with a strategy for what we should be doing to reduce our use of light at night. They don't have to be all lit up at night. They can be taken down a bit, or reduced to a glow," said Ball.

Ball has support for her proposal from the city's chief engineer, the director of planning and the International Dark-Sky Association, who say that cities like Vancouver need to literally tone things down a bit.

CONTINUED ON A8
"We are now saying turn out the lights," said John Barentine, the program director for the Tuscon-based Dark-Sky Association. "When it comes to public safety, lighting is necessary. We are asking, however, 'Is this light necessary?' and if it is not, turn it off or turn it down. In many cases we tend to overlight places."

Light pollution is a serious problem in much of the developed world, with long-term implications for both human and animal health, Barentine said.

Ball has sponsored a motion going to city council Tuesday asking for public input into a new outdoor lighting strategy. She wants the city to develop policies and eventually a bylaw that limit "light trespass" and help reduce sky glow, the light reflected into the atmosphere.

"I am talking about all light. The lights stuck on the backs of buildings that go directly up into the sky, the floodlights on so many of our buildings downtown that aren't aimed correctly, and other unnecessary lights," she said. "I am not talking about taking away the creative use of light or reducing public safety."

Brian Jackson, Vancouver's director of planning, said he appreciates Ball's proposal.

"We welcome the motion because it will be an important strategy that will address several issues. But we will have to look at it in the context of balancing off safety issues because we have to have an acceptable level of light at the ground level, for pedestrians and vehicles," he said.

The impact of light pollution ranges from wasted energy to the more serious effect of disruption of the circadian rhythms of animals and humans.

"Animals are not equipped to handle light during parts of the night when their biology doesn't expect it. So we have seen declines in populations of insects and birds, especially in cities," said Barentine. "We are an animal no different than any other organism, and we also are not evolutionarily adapted to having all this artificial light. It is kind of like putting the body in a permanent state of jet lag. The body is trying to match this diurnal cycle that is governed by sunlight and we keep throwing into the system when it is not expected."

Last week Vancouver adopted a new bird strategy aimed at mitigating the impacts of the city on its avian population. Included in that was a resolution to reduce light pollution to prevent bird strikes on buildings.

For largely economic reasons the city was already heading in that direction, according to Peter Judd, Vancouver's general manager of engineering. More than 55,000 high-pressure sodium street lights are slowly being converted to energy-saving LED lamps (on the right),

Councillor Elizabeth Ball is backing calls to reduce nighttime illumination in Vancouver. Above left is an example of the old high-pressure sodium street lights that are being converted to the energy-saving LED lamps (on the right).

jefflee@vancouversun.com Twitter.com/sunciviclee
From: Spani Developments Ltd [mailto:spanidev@gmail.com]
Sent: January-30-15 3:05 PM
To: Angela Letman
Subject: SENIOR LIVING

Kelly Huish for
Doug Spani
January 30, 2015

District of Sechelt
Box 129
Sechelt B.C.
VON 3A0

Attention: Mayor and Council

We respectfully request that council and staff consider supporting the concept to build and develop a retirement community within the District of Sechelt. Our community is strategically located for growth and opportunity to provide a needed service for an aging population.

Doug Spani
Spani Developments Ltd.
Dear Mayor and Council:

Please consider the attached letter with regard to the District's OCP and Parks plans.

Thank you in advance,

Licia and Mike Paddison
January 31, 2015

Mayor and Council
District of Sechelt
P.O. Box 129
Sechelt, B.C. V0N 3A0

Dear Mayor and Council:

We are writing to request your consideration of a capital works project to build a trail and park system in the Seawatch at the Shores subdivision in West Porpoise Bay, Sechelt.

A trail and park system was part of the development scheme for Seawatch when it was approved in 2005, and indeed one of the reasons in favour of our purchasing our home in this subdivision. The subdivision hugs the shores of Snake Bay on Sechelt Inlet. Actions by the developer (Concordia Seawatch Ltd.), however, negated the building of the ‘promised’ trail and park. It is our understanding that the clearing of the foreshore area by the developer led to a ‘stop-work’ order by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans in April 2009. A subsequent Community Restorative Justice Program directive resulted in the developer not being allowed to perform work within the 15m foreshore area allowed for trail/park purposes. However, it is also our understanding that a properly constructed trail system could proceed under a qualified approval.

The District of Sechelt’s OCP states that “Snake Bay is considered a highly sensitive foreshore area, and restoration of this waterfront site after recent development activity is a priority” (p. 122). The Parks and Open Spaces Master Plan (2006, p. 3) also confirms, “The Concordia Homes development at the north end of Gale Avenue dedicates a 1.8 ha natural park above Snake Bay as well as a 240 meter waterfront trail along Snake Bay.”

There are currently two beach access trails at each end of the subdivision that are maintained by the District. The original approved trails were to connect those beach accesses along a statutory right-of-way, pass up through Snake Creek and continue around the subdivision.

Unfortunately, with the ownership of the first three waterfront houses (out of a possible 12), property owners are beginning to take it upon themselves to ‘manage’ the protected public property 15m foreshore and the 3m right-of-way as each pleases. There is a covenant on each of the waterfront properties in Seawatch banning such activity, but without a clear demarcation that a properly maintained trail system might provide,
activities to privately control the waterfront on Snake Bay will continue. This is clearly against the OCP which also states as one of its goals (p. 123), “to protect the waterfront through improved beach access points, and preventing intrusions from upland properties into the foreshore.”

We and others in the subdivision have been pursuing answers to the building of the trail system for at least four years now with dismissive response from the District. It is hoped that the trail system originally approved as part of this subdivision, which is no longer the purview of Concordia Seawatch Ltd., will be seriously considered as part of the District’s OCP and Parks plans in the near future.

Sincerely,

Licia and Mike Paddison
From: Elphinstone Logging Focus <loggingfocus@gmail.com>
Date: January 31, 2015 at 12:51:43 PM PST
To: <ccraig@secheltnation.net>, <milne@sechelt.ca>
Cc: "info@sechelt.ca" <info@sechelt.ca>, John Gleeson <john@coastreporter.net>
Subject: Cancel EW28 logging and promote Big Tree Tourism

Dear Chief Craigman & Mayor Milne,

As you may know, 'Community Forests' logging company is targeting an older forest in the Wilson Creek Watershed to clearcut log sometime soon. Its been recently surveyed and flagged. We conducted a field visit here on January 30th, and documented many old-growth features, including up to 20 Douglas-fir trees towering into the sky, with an age estimate of 250-400 years old.

Its labeled as 'EW28'. EW is East Wilson, and its an amazing forest that would be a crime to have cut down and shipped off coast leaving residents with another clearcut, with subsequent loss of biodiversity. Access to this forest, is just a quick 10 min. drive up Field Rd, past SCRD offices, a turn onto an old logging road and there it appears as a Temple out of Time.

Please visit this forest before deciding to support the logging of it. Open your eyes & heart and you'll feel the power of this old forest - never touched by the hand of man.

Should you like a tour of the area, we'd be delighted to walk you through this Stanley Park like area.

The Town of Port Renfrew on Vancouver island is embracing this idea of 'Big Tree Tourism' and is seeing a dramatic increase in visitors coming to their remote community. The Sechelt community, with your combined leadership, could also benefit from this kind of emerging sustainable tourism. Would you prefer to see compassionate and intelligent tourists from Europe coming with their dollars to spend in your communities, or another scar on the local hillsides?

Thank you for your concern for this Wilson Creek natural forest. In this day and age of climate change, we need to ensure that the environmental services that old forests provide for free, will continue to thrive for many generations to come.

Best Regards,

Ross Muirhead
Elphinstone Logging Focus
Dear Mr Mayor and Council;

I listened with interest to Mr Nash's presentation at Council on January 21. I am concerned with what was missing from this presentation, particularly about biosolids and their handling and disposal.

Biosolids will originate from two sources, the Dusty Road dumping site, and the Ebbtide site. It appears that the Ebbtide biosolids will be dewatered to 15-25% solids, and passed on to Salish Soils, with whom there is a two year contract. These biosolids have been treated but not disinfected, but they will be of somewhat uniform "quality". Thus Salish will not have to cope with them on a load- to load basis and may find a permanent use for them. (At a price to the DoS).

The Dusty Road biosolids arise from homes with holding tanks or septage from tile bed or other treatment systems, as well as from ~20 small scale sewage treatment plants on the Coast. These biosolids will be roughly dewatered to about 1-3% solids, but are not scheduled to be treated or disinfected. Liquid will be piped to Ebbtide, and solids will be put into Geotubes.

The number of homes which are serviced by Dusty Road outnumbers those treated by the new Ebbtide plant. (My best guess is 5600 total DoS homes of which 2200 connect to Ebbtide.) As there is no other facility, then the total will be more than 5600 due to other homes on the coast, with septage from Gibsons, Roberts Creek, etc.

The Dusty Road biosolids will be of variable "quality" with BOD all over the map, and possible undesirables which can come undetected from anywhere. The proposed treatment using Geotubes is unproven, and inconsistent with the steps that should be taken by a mature community. This is a desperate move, and not an engineering solution.

I urge you to hold off on the decommissioning and dismantling of the Dusty Road facility until a proper solution to the Dusty Road biosolids is found. This facility has a 6,000 cu.meter reactor, which could treat the biosolids, and send them to Ebbtide without upsetting this small unit (less than 4000 cu.meter total in reactors). Please can you get any resistance to this in writing?

I further urge you to make Dusty Road a Profit Centre, with an overseer (manager) and a mandate. This site has been poorly run, according to my sources, and a one year trial as a profit centre could improve things, pay for itself, and give you data for your overall manning plans. It brings in about $270,000 per year, I believe, and I have been convinced that this could be significantly increased if all dumpage were recorded and charged.

Respectfully Submitted
Dr. B.B. Pruden, Feb 1, 2015
PS All my numbers are from different sources and may be off a bit. The DofS has a peculiar system of providing information. FOI only!

PS Some questions.
Is there a contract in place with Salish Soils now to treat the Dusty Road biosolids?
What pilot work has been done on DR biosolids in Geotubes- any reports?
Has any analysis been done on DR biosolids?
Dear Mayor Milne and Councillors:

Please find attached additional comments regarding Council’s intention to waive Public Hearing with regard to Amendment Bylaw 25-265 amendment to the Rural Residential 1 zone.

Linda Williams, Chair
Bylaw Review Subcommittee
Tuwanek Ratepayers Association

Copies to:
Tuwanek Ratepayers Association
Michael Vance, Acting Director of Development Planning
February 2, 2015

Mayor and Council
District of Sechelt
Sechelt, BC

Dear Mayor Milne and Councillors

Re: Adoption of Amendment Bylaw 25-265

Thank you for trying to address the concerns we have with regard to the above amendment to Zoning Bylaw No. 25, 1987. There are a number of reasons, in addition to the fact that the District is already reviewing the new zoning bylaw, why we continue to oppose it. It is probably best to explain why we continue to oppose this last minute amendment.

Although Mr. Vance has provided reasonable assurances to Council about the technical invalidity of our previous comments, he seems to be unaware of the precedent that reinforces our concern.

Will the Amendment affect other properties as well as the 18 listed in the Waiver?

Yes, if past experience is an indication.

BC’s Bare Land Strata Regulation permits the creation of lots smaller than the minimum sizes specified in municipal and regional district zoning bylaws, subject only to certain land capability constraints and density neutral requirements, i.e., undeveloped RR-1 zoned properties in the District of Sechelt can now be developed as urban subdivisions unimpeded by zoning bylaw restrictions. Unless the Official Community Plan (OCP) provides otherwise (Sechelt’s does) and the Approving Officer adheres to the OCP, urban developments in rural zones can be approved without rezoning.

Further, District of Sechelt Zoning Bylaw 25, 1987 s. 312 (1) provides that District of Sechelt zoning setbacks apply to Bare Land Strata developments, i.e., RR-1 setbacks apply to bare land strata regulation developments, as well as to other undersized properties, within the zone.

Who approves Bare Land Strata Regulation developments?

The District’s Approving Officer approves Bare Land Strata Regulation developments; not Council. Rezoning is not required.

What are the REASONS for our concern?

The Official Community Plan’s Housing Types and Density Policy 5.8 (p. 40) states that: “Rural Residential areas will consist of small acreages ranging from .6 ha to 2.0 ha minimum lot size to support a rural lifestyle”.

As well, Figure 17 (OCP p. 46) reveals that Base Density (Gross Yield) and Maximum Density are neither calculated nor applicable (n/a) in the RR-1 zone. This means that the RR-1 zone is intended for single family dwelling on small acreages. It is not intended for “clustering” of the permitted base density, the so-called “density neutral” option, that exists in other “residential” zones (OCP Figure 17, p. 46). To be clear, the OCP doesn’t contain a “density neutral” option for RR-1 zoned properties. They are to be retained as small acreages.

Bare Land Strata Regulation s. 3 (1) (e) (ii) confirms that an Approving Officer may reject a proposed development “in the public interest”. Further, District of Sechelt Subdivision and Development Control
Bylaw No. 430, 2003 s. 25 (2) (a) provides that a development/subdivision\(^1\) “may” be rejected for inconsistency with the OCP. In other words, authority is given to the Approving Officer to reject an inconsistent development.

One former Sechelt planner took it a step further and interpreted Subdivision and Development Control Bylaw No. 430 s. 25 (2) (a) to mean that he “may”, or may not, reject a bare land strata development when it is inconsistent with the OCP. His interpretation was that the authority to override the OCP, and not just the authority to reject a development because it conflicts with the OCP, was assigned to him by the bare land strata regulation and that he could reject, or not reject, an inconsistent plan. He chose not to reject the inconsistent bare land strata development on the RR-1 zoned northern half of DL 3259 in Tuwanek and (without the inconvenience of having to amend the OCP or rezone the property) gave preliminary approval to an intensive residential development even though it conflicted with the OCP in almost every detail. This same planner eventually instructed his lawyer to argue that an OCP is “pie in the sky” and not the regulatory framework for our bylaws that we believe it to be.

The development has not proceeded because there are many good reasons for the property’s current RR-1 zoning. Yet, for the stated purpose of “creating jobs” and in order to advertise it was “open for business”, a Council (assisted by staff) publicly invalidated bylaws, policies, plans and studies, including:

- OCP Bylaw No. 492 (including growth management policy\(^2\))
- rural residential (RR-1) zoning and setbacks
- steep slopes issues (OCP steep slopes DPA 5)
- significant rockfall hazards for downslope property owners, including within the development (DPA 4)
- significant drainage problems
- community sewer needed for the proposed density but the property is not within the UCB, or an OCP sewer area, and no feasible, environmentally sound way to dispose of the effluent exists, there
- extending utilities and infrastructure to a development outside the UCB
- acceptance of incomplete, insufficient geotechnical hazard studies

Additional encouragement was provided by not applying the OCP (Steep slopes DPA 5, p. 27) and Zoning Bylaw No. 25’s useable lot area calculation to the property. “Useable lot area” is (supposed to be) calculated prior to determining “Gross Yield” by subtracting any land greater than 30% slope before lot density (the number of lots) is determined. When the proponent indicated that 35 lots were needed to ensure profitability, Council overruled the “useable lot area” deduction and approved the resulting “non-applicable” and completely inaccurate RR-1 “base density” calculation of 35 lots. If the “base density” calculation had been applicable in the RR-1 zone, which it wasn’t and isn’t, and the mandated useable lot area deduction had been applied (minus >30% slope), the “density neutral” number would have been ~12 lots (because ~75% of the property is deemed “un-useable”).

---

\(^1\) District of Sechelt Subdivision and Development Control Bylaw No. 430, 2003 s. 3. (2) Where the text refers to the word ‘subdivision’ it shall be deemed that the requirements also apply to ‘developments’, where applicable, which may not involve the subdivision of land.

B.C. Reg. 75/78 O.C. 418/78 Strata Property Act; Bare Land Strata Regulation Definitions: “development” means land that has been, or is intended to be, divided into 2 or more strata lots by the registration of a bare land strata plan in a land title office.


1.5 Areas outside the Urban Containment Boundary designated as Agricultural, Resource or Rural Residential will be retained as small acreages ranging from .6 ha (1.5 acre) to 2. ha (5.0 acre) lot sizes for Rural Residential lands (see OCP policy 5.8) and 4.0 hectares (10 acres) for Resource or Agricultural (ALR) lands. These lands are not intended to develop within the next 15-20 years, and will not be considered for residential development until lands within the Urban Containment Boundary are substantially built out and development is intensified within the Downtown Centre and neighbourhood centres.
Had the proposed 35 properties received final approval from the Approving Officer, they would have qualified for the urban setbacks permitted under Amendment Bylaw No. 25-265. Not surprising to us, the setbacks that were proposed for the bare land strata development are the same as those given 3rd Reading in Amendment Bylaw No. 25-265.

Is an RR-1 zone amendment necessary or advisable for the 18 properties?

With regard to the initial impetus for the Zoning Bylaw No. 25 amendment, if the 18 properties “should never have been zoned RR-1” (per Angela Letman) - rezoning is the obvious solution.

All of the 18 undersized RR-1 properties listed in the Waiver are within Sechelt’s Urban Containment Boundaries. Eleven of the 18 properties (those with individual addresses) have already been developed, many for decades. Of those a few may benefit if/when redeveloped. Of the 18 properties listed only the seven recently sold lots on Peregrine Road will actually be substantially “affected” by less restrictive setbacks.

The Future Land Use Designation for the seven lot Peregrine Road cluster is Special Infill Area No. 1 and properly rezoning the seven parcels to “residential” is fully supported by the OCP. Since they are not the RR-1 zone minimum size (RR-1 lands are intended to be 2 ha or greater) and the lots are located inside the UCB, rezoning to Residential is the appropriate zoning “correction”.

The cluster of lots at Norwest Bay and Mason Roads, which are also less than the RR-1 minimum size and are also located within the UCB, are designated as Future Neighbourhood Centre (OCP Schedule C1). Rezoning from RR-1 to a residential use intermediate to, or in keeping with, the projected Future Land Use as a Community Centre makes more sense than “grandfathering” undersized RR-1 parcels that are located within the UCB.

Could there be unintended consequences?

Once adopted, Zoning Bylaw 25, s. 906 (1) provisions (e) and (f) could be carried over into Zoning Bylaw No. 530. The setback reductions apply to all RR-1 properties less than 2000 sq. m. in size, and where a bare land strata regulation development is approved, could result in residential subdivision standards replacing rural zone specifications if the Approving Officer chooses (or is directed) to overrule the OCP and is not successfully challenged.

Having had a former Council direct staff to ignore a new OCP, our Neighbourhood Plans and the Zoning Bylaw to “encourage” specific developments, residents are very reluctant to support ad hoc bylaw amendments that fit a pattern of subverting the OCP and zoning requirements rather than undertaking the necessary public review processes required to legally amend them.

Thank you, again, for your attention to this matter.

Linda Williams, Chair
Bylaw Review Subcommittee
Tuwanek Ratepayers Association

Cc: Michael Vance, Acting Director of Development Planning
Dear Mayor and Council

The enclosed photo was taken from our driveway on Baillie Road. We have had this view for many months.

The "storage" van does not belong to our P1 area.

We would appreciate receiving an acknowledgment of this letter.

Yours truly,

Richard & Patricia Crowshay
Dear Sir  

re: Revamped SCRD Recreation Membership Fee Structure

On Sunday, January 18, you asked me if I had received acknowledgement for the notes I delivered to your offices regarding the above. At that time, I also clarified that it was not a copy you were provided with, but a request, directed to you, in order that you might provide some action or clarity.

As of the date of this letter, no acknowledgement has been received, but that is not an issue for me because I know you are in possession of my notes.

What I am looking for, with regard to those notes, is:

- a political solution resulting from the SCRD recognizing that their new recreation fee structure is too rigid and too controlling, or;
- clarification on the political/bureaucratic structure that created this scheme, so that I may pursue a legal confrontation with some knowledge as where to focus my efforts.

In the meantime, I remain a second-tier member of the Sechelt Aquatic Centre; paying a greater fare, provided a lesser service. And all because I will not agree to a Pre-Authorized Debit Agreement providing the SCRD direct access to my bank account.

Thank you, and respectfully yours,

H Hicken

whoie2H@gmail.com
-----Original Message-----
From: Adam Major | Holywell Properties [mailto:adam@Holywell.ca]
Sent: February-03-15 9:22 AM
To: Council
Subject: Sechelt Downtown Business Association Parcel Tax

Please see attached a letter to the Mayor and Council regarding the SDBA Parcel Tax. Thank you.

Best regards,
Adam Major
Managing Broker

Holywell Properties
www.holywell.ca
adam@holywell.ca

office: 604-885-3460 ext. 104
fax: 604-740-0248
toll free: 1-800-905-3230

PO Box 187
103 - 5711 Mermaid St.
Sechelt, BC V0N 3A0

Confidentiality Warning: This message and any attachments are intended only for the use of the intended recipient(s), are confidential, and may be privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, retransmission, conversion to hard copy, copying, circulation or other use of this message and any attachments is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail, and delete this message and any attachments from your system. This email address is not the official email address of any strata corporation, and cannot be used for notification purposes. This email is not intended to solicit business from anyone already under contract with another REALTOR®. Thank you.

-----Original Message-----
From: info@holywell.ca [mailto:info@holywell.ca]
Sent: Tuesday, February 03, 2015 9:13 AM
To: Adam Major | Holywell Properties
Subject:

This E-mail was sent from "Ricoh4500" (Aficio MP C4500).

Scan Date: 02.03.2015 09:13:11 (-0800)
Queries to: info@holywell.ca
Feb. 3rd, 2015

Dear Mayor Milne and Council,

I understand that the Sechelt Downtown Business Association (SDBA) will be applying for renewal of their parcel tax which is applied to commercial land owners in the downtown core.

I am writing you this letter to request that you review this bylaw or eliminate this tax entirely.

As a business in the downtown core of Sechelt, I see limited benefit from the SDBA to my business.

If you assess this bylaw you will see that it is a tax which is applied to each parcel of land in the SDBA catchment area, and not to specific businesses. If you now consider the Trail Bay Mall, you will note that it is also occupies a single parcel of land, thus, the $525 tax is distributed between all the businesses within it! How can this possibly be considered fair and equitable taxation! A more reasonable method for the SDBA to receive their funding would be to add a small fee to each business license issued in the district of Sechelt, instead of adding to the ever growing tax burden faced by commercial land owners.

Concerned businesses for fair and equitable taxation and business retention in the District of Sechelt.

Yours truly,

Adam Major
From: Mike Anderchek | Deluxe Landscaping  
mailto:mike@deluxelandscaping.com
Sent: February-03-15 9:28 AM
To: Bruce Milne
Cc: Council; Sean B. Donovan; MLA Nicholas Simons
Subject: Medma permit

Good Morning,
I just wanted to let current council know that I oppose the construction going on behind my new store site. I have also enclosed correspondence from last July when members of the area were voicing their concerns before the development permit was issued.
I look forward to hearing from council on the subject.
Regards, Mike Anderchek

Mike Anderchek
Deluxe Landscape and Garden Supply
P. 604-885-9070 C. 604-885-8422
RE: Lot L

Jan 28, 2015

Dear Mayor Milne and Council,

I wish to re-iterate my desire to be able to re-purchase or re-lease the redundant portion of Lot L. It has always been an integral part of my business operations. It is time for the District of Sechelt to send a sign that it supports on-going local business. As you are aware, the lease expires on June 31, and my inability to make long term decisions on behalf of my company have, and are continuing to, negatively affect my operations.

I would appreciate the opportunity to discuss this with you.

Regards, Mike Anderchek

Deluxe Landscaping
Mr John Henderson,

Mayor, District of Sechelt

Cc: Mr Tom Lamb; Councillor, Ms Darnelda Seigers; Councillor, Mr Mike Shanks; Councillor, Mr Chris Moore; Councillor, Mr Doug Hockley; Councillor, Ms Alice Lutes; Councillor

RE: Medma Pharmaceuticals

July 10, 2014

Dear Elected Mayor and Council,

I was in attended the the Committee of the Whole Meeting on July 9th during the reading of Items 4.1 and 4.2 on the Agenda. I have several concerns relating to the Medma Pharmaceutical Ltd.

I own the property in the industrial park immediately adjacent to the proposed legal marijuana growing operation. I am currently investing 1 million dollars into a new commercial building, that has been lauded by all of Sechelt for its design and environmental sensitivity. As a tax payer in the District of Sechelt for 27 consecutive years, and as the operator of one of the few established businesses that is actively re-investing in the District of Sechelt, I have some serious concerns about the Medma application and about the potential for another Legal grow op on Lot L.

My business has been operating in the District of Sechelt for 20 years. We routinely employ between 15 and 20 people in the community, and re-invest in the public sector continuously.

In fact ... In the last year we paid out over $130,000.00 to local vendors just within 1 Km of our current office site. The list of non-profit organizations that we have supported in 2014 alone is now at over 40 organizations. We are good for the Community, and money we take in, finds its way back to the community.

My first concern is about the process. Medma representatives and the agenda said ‘all concerned parties were contacted’. I am both a commercial and a residential neighbor yet I was not contacted. In fact ... not one business in the industrial park received any notification. Not an e-mail, not a letter, and certainly not in person. Same holds true for the large re-zoning notification sign outside MY gate on the 3 acre parcel I lease from the District. The sign says interested parties should contact the ‘Director of Planning’. Well three attempts this week alone have not led to a response from the District, and my assistant was again informed by DoS staff that all ‘interested’ parties were already contacted. Same for the Public Works Superintendant ( that I share Lot ‘L’ with) not returning my call. Apparently the only interested parties in the eyes of the District were 3 members of the local rate payers association.

That’ not diligence, that’s deception. Period.
Now to my concerns

Re: Medma

A. How is odour defined and policed. I have a business that is open to the public. ANY ODOUR WHATSOEVER WILL NEGATIVELY IMPACT MY BUSINESS. I can’t have the public thinking any illegal activity is going happening on my premises. How is it defined and how is it policed?

B. Have the police been contacted? Are they not an interested party? The other operation in the subdivision has been broken into already. Clearly we are inviting the opportunity for an increased crime presence in our town.

C. What happens if somebody witness a theft or other illegal activity. Is that person’s safety not at risk as well. Both the closest neighbors in the industrial park have residential suites above them looking directly onto the Medma Site.

D. What about the character and integrity of the neighborhood. The two recently built streetside buildings have established a level of quality, workmanship and investment that should enhance the prospect of getting companies that re-invest in the community and do not affect crime rates or insurance premiums for neighbors.

E. Disposal of effluent. All the properties in the subdivision absorb water quickly. As the owner of a business with a significant investment in live plant stock immediately below the Medma application, what assurance will I have that disposal of their effluent (yes ... it is industrial effluent) will not negatively affect my inventory.

These Grow-ops are completely in contravention to the vision for our area. It has been so refreshing to see the positive developments on Sechelt Inlet road, including Prime Rentals building, Deluxe Landscape building, the Onni Group development, the future hotel development. Adding the grow ups simply does not fit with this future positive growth.

I am asking you to consider the ramifications on the neighbouring businesses who have persevered in our community through difficult economic times, yet continued to supply employment and economic flow to the community. I understand the need and desire for a larger commercial tax base, but please don’t act desperately in an attempt to achieve this goal.

Re: Lot ‘L’

As the past owner and current tenant of Lot ‘L’ I have a direct interest in what goes on there. I have asked the District of Sechelt numerous times for the option to continue ongoing business there. That includes a letter (enclosed) that was sent to all councillors in December of 2013. In this letter I outlined the history of communication between the District and myself, and the fact that I have asked at least every year for an option to continue business there. It was and continues to be an integral part of my on-going business operations.
That option could take one of the following forms:

A. Lease renewal. This would generate revenue for the District and allow them to continue owning the property for future, long term considerations.

B. Right of First Refusal. I granted the District that in 2007. I have always treated dealing with the District fairly and have asked for nothing more than that in return. I have never asked for anything outside of fair market value.

Note: I have asked the mayor this every year since he has been elected and I asked past administrators as well.

C. Negotiate a sale of the property directly back to me. Issue a statement saying that it was taken under duress and that as it is not being used for the purpose it was required, sell it back to me. Show the community that the District of Sechelt supports existing local business and that only attracting outside business is not the only focus of increasing the general industrial health of the community.

Note: Letter dated Feb 7, 2010 to Sechelt administration from Deluxe Landscaping asking for a right of first refusal, and exercising my lease option. You will see that not only was I told that there would be no option on the grounds that they were putting a sewage treatment plant on the site, but in fact, they were kicking me off the property, all because they misread one sentence in the license of occupation.

The sad reality is ... the District believes that the only way to improve the industrial tax base is to attract new business, often at the detriment of existing. How does the District know that I would not develop the property in a manner that would increase value (and taxes), employment, and foster partnerships? (page 2 agenda, July 9th meeting). I have not had the opportunity.

The fact that the District has already ‘received and offer’ on a lot that doesn’t yet exist from apparently another medicinal marijuana operation at this site shows they are not even considering the concept of fostering partnerships or enhancing existing local businesses to be successful.

I have never asked for anything but to be treated fair.

Vote no to the development of The Medma Pharmaceutical application and to the re-zoning of ‘Lot L’, pending further public discussion

If you would like to contact me for further discussion, please feel free to call or email me.

Sincerely, Mike Anderchek,
President, Deluxe Landscaping
Dear Mr. Mayor and Councilors,

Congratulations on your recent confirmation to serve the Sechelt community...all the very best to you going forward.

Last year we submitted the enclosed letter to the previous Mayor and Council. It was forwarded to Tracy at Sechelt Innovations. In speaking with Tracy on January 30th it was determined that a new letter should be re-submitted for the new Mayor and council.

For your consideration:

We would like to provide a variety of yacht charter services for the Sechelt area. We see that no similar services are currently available in the Salish Sea or Inlet area and would be happy to provide this service to include:

- Reception or, after wedding reception Trail and Thormanby Island Tours
- Dinner / Gourmet Appetizer and Beverage Tour / Trail islands / Smugglers Cove
- Select Water Taxi Service / Private and Public Yacht Service Tours

Our 62 foot Vessel, “Tranquility”, is a “Pacemaker” twin diesel motor yacht. It incorporates seating for 20+ in all glass Salons, as well as bow seating, fly-bridge seating and pilot house seating.

Tranquility is in the completion stages of a 100K interior redesign specifically for Tour Service, to include two granite bars, Jenn Air stainless steel grills and appliances and leather couch seating with surround sound and theater viewing.

To accommodate this service we are requesting consideration the following:

- Licensing / Use of the Trail Bay Pier and Day Float for Moorage May – October so that Tranquility would have a “6-7 month home base” for dockside dinner and Salish Sea Charter Operations.
NOTE: Tranquility would be outfitted similarly to a restaurant and be licensed accordingly by Local Health and LCB as a “Food Primary” Licensee.

It should be noted that even in the summer months of 2014, (based on our observations) the day float was completely unused more days than otherwise…and at no time during the entire summer was the float at capacity for boat moorage for even a single day or portion of a day…it largely sits unused and dormant….as do the 5 Sechelt Mooring buoys…they were more dormant than the float all summer. More commonly, even during peaks summer weekends, it is quite unusual to even see a boat in this area. This was easy for us to monitor as we reside at the Watermark.

About us:

We are “1.5 years new” to Sechelt after 40+ years as BC Residents. Our background is previous ownership of 8 restaurants in the Lower Mainland. Although currently confidential, we are hopeful to use Tranquility in conjunction with a new “Polished” Bistro / Restaurant / Wedding Service operation in the Sechelt area. Tranquility is corporately owned (BC LTD)…the Company is debt free.

We did speak with Angela and Greg preliminarily…they suggested that we submit this letter for your review.

Thank you very kindly for your time in considering the enclosed. We trust that our proposed operation can become a shining example of how to “best see” and enjoy the Sunshine Coast from a perspective that few have the opportunity to see…and ad a unique “tourism draw” to the Sechelt area.

Most Sincerely

Ken Klassen / 604 530 8245
August 26, 2014

Att: Mayor John R. Henderson and Council Members / Doug Hockley, Tom Lamb, Alice Lutes, Chris Moore, Mike Shanks, Darnelda Siegers

RE: Yacht Service / Trail Bay Pier & Day Float

Dear Mayor John R. Henderson

We would like to provide a variety of yacht services for the Sechelt area. We see that no services are currently available in the Salish Sea and would be happy to provide this service to include:

- Reception or, after wedding reception Trail and Thormanby Island Tours
- Dinner / Gourmet Appetizer and Beverage Tour / Smugglers Cove
- Select Water Taxi Service / Private and Public Yacht Service Tours

Our 62 foot Vessel, “Tranquility”, is a “Pacemaker” twin diesel motor yacht. It incorporates seating for 24+ in 2 Salons, as well as bow seating, fly-bridge seating and pilot house seating.

Tranquility is in the midst of a 100K redesign specifically for Tour Service, to include two granite bars, Jenn Air stainless steel grills and appliances and leather couch seating with surround sound and theater viewing.

To accommodate this service we are requesting that Mayor and Council consider one or both of the following:

- Licensing / Use of Trail Bay Pier and Float for Moorage May – October

Tranquility is corporately owned (BC LTD) and, the Company is debt free.

We are 1 year new to Sechelt after 45 years as BC Residents. We reside at The Watermark. Our background is ownership of 8 restaurants in the past. Although currently confidential, we are hopeful to use Tranquility in conjunction with a new “Polished” Bistro / Restaurant / Wedding Service operation in the Sechelt area.

Thank you very kindly for your time in considering the enclosed. We have spoken to Angela and Greg preliminarily…they suggested that we submit this letter for your consideration.

Most Sincerely
Ken Klassen / 604 530 8245
February 4, 2015
Dear District of Sechelt Council and Staff,

We respectfully request the definition of what "play with it to their heart's content" means in terms of sludge processing at the Dusty Road site as was publicly stated (audio clip attached) on January 21, 2015 in the verbal report to Council.

The report of this event is up for receipt in the agenda for the regular meeting on February 4, 2015. We urge the District to immediately define for the public, in no uncertain terms, what kind of experimentation is planned for septage and sludge treatment and or composting on District of Sechelt controlled lands (leased or owned). Will it be with Geotubes, vermiculture or something else experimental?

The Organic Matter Recycling Regulation (OMRR) regulates composting facilities in British Columbia. Qualified professional signoff is required before constructing and operating a composting facility as legislated by the OMRR. We are concerned that the composting facility should require something to prevent leachate and the potential disease from escaping via vectors. What assurances do we have? We respectfully request to inspect the documentation associated with OMRR compliance for the Dusty Road site.

The Dusty Road site(s) appears to be on land that is within the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR). If so, has the Agricultural Land Commission been notified as is required by the regulation?

We understand the land at the Dusty Road site is currently leased by the District of Sechelt. If leachate cannot be adequately contained, could it potentially prove to be a liability to the taxpayers with respect to subsequent aggregate extraction? Has the owner of this site been notified?

More information and links are below.

Sincerely
Marc Nixon
Sechelt

OMRR:


Plans and specifications
(1) A discharger must have a qualified professional prepare plans and specifications for

(a) the construction and operation of a new composting facility, or

(b) any modification of an existing composting facility that results in an increase in the annual production capacity of more than 10 percent or more than 20,000 cubic metres.

(2) The plans and specifications required by subsection (1) must include, but are not limited to, all of the following:

(a) all works to be constructed on the site;

(b) design capacity of the composting facility;

(c) a leachate management plan which stipulates how leachate generated from any and all stages of the composting process will be minimized, managed, treated or disposed;

(d) an odour management plan which stipulates how air contaminants from the composting facility will be discharged in a manner that does not cause pollution;

(e) an operating and closure plan for the composting facility.

(3) The discharger must ensure that

(a) the qualified professional

(i) affixes his or her professional seal or signature, or both, to the plans and specifications for the composting facility, and

(ii) makes a signed statement certifying that the composting facility has been constructed in accordance with the plans and specifications,

(b) a copy of the plans and specifications for the composting facility are kept at the composting facility at all times, and are available for inspection at any time,

(c) the plans and specifications are submitted to a director upon request, and

(d) the composting facility is operated in compliance with the plans and specifications required by subsection (1).

(4) The director may request additional information with respect to the plans and specifications that he or she considers necessary for the protection of human health and the environment, and may specify particular concerns or questions that the plans and specifications must address.

[am. B.C. Reg. 321/2004, s. 19 (g), (k) and (m).]
Notification of operation

25  (1) The discharger must, at least 90 days before beginning the operation of a composting facility, give notice in writing to

(a) a director, and

(b) the Land Reserve Commission if the composting facility is in an agricultural land reserve or forest reserve land.

(2) The notification required by subsection (1) must include

(a) the composting facility location and design capacity, name of a contact person, type of waste received, and intended distribution of compost, and

(b) a copy of a personnel training program plan that addresses the specific training needed to operate the composting facility in compliance with this regulation.

[am. B.C. Reg. 321/2004, s. 19 (g).]

Division 3 — Leachate Management for Composting Facilities

Composting facility requirements

26  (1) In this section, "curing area" means an area where organic matter which has undergone the rapid initial stage of composting is further matured into a humus-like material.

(2) The receiving, storage, processing and curing areas of a composting facility must comply with all of the following:

(a) be located on asphalt, concrete or another similar impermeable surface that is capable of withstanding wear and tear from normal operations and that will prevent the release of leachate into the environment;

(b) have a roof or cover, or a prepared surface, designed to prevent

(i) the surface collection of water around the base of organic matter and compost, and

(ii) run-off water from entering the receiving, storage, processing and curing areas;

(c) have a leachate collection system designed, constructed, maintained and operated to reuse leachate, or to remove leachate, from the receiving, storage, processing and curing areas.

(3) Leachate that is not collected and reused in the composting process must not be discharged into the environment unless authorized under the Act.
(4) Despite subsections (2) and (3), an impermeable surface, roof, cover, prepared surface or leachate collection system is not necessary if a qualified professional can demonstrate through an environmental impact assessment that the environment will be protected and appropriate water quality criteria satisfied through the use of alternative leachate management processes.

(5) A director may request additional information with respect to the environmental impact assessment that he or she considers necessary for the protection of human health and the environment, and may specify particular concerns, questions, standards or monitoring that the assessment must address.

Geotubes:


http://www.bishopwater.ca/case-studies

Selenium. Is anyone else alarmed?

http://www.bishopaquatic.com/pdf/Eganville%20Lab%20Results%20&%20Concept%20Drawing%20Nov%202006.pdf
Dear Sir/Madam,

Please see attached.

Regards,

Thomas Holmes, CPA, CA

OCEAN BREEZE ACCOUNTING INC.
Box 2240
5587 Inlet Avenue
Sechelt, B.C., V0N 3A0

604-885-0366 - Telephone
604-885-0367 - Fax
877-885-0366 - Toll-free

www.oceanbreezeaccounting.com

Privilege and Confidentiality Notice:

This document contains information that is privileged and confidential. It is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. If the reader is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify us immediately and delete this message.
February 4, 2015

Dear Mayor Milne and Sechelt Council,

I understand that the Sechelt Downtown Business Association (SDBA) will be applying for renewal of their parcel tax which is added to commercial land owners in the downtown core.

I am writing you this letter to request that you review this bylaw, and either remove my business property from its catchment area, or ultimately eliminate this tax entirely.

As a business/property owner in the downtown core of Sechelt, I see absolutely no tangible benefit from the SDBA to my business. Thus, I am opposed to being forced to pay an additional $525 annually, to the SDBA. I see this as a clear case of taxation without representation!

Furthermore, if you review this bylaw you will see that it is a tax which is applied to each parcel of land in the SDBA catchment area, and not to specific businesses. I run a single small business on a single land parcel; therefore I am obligated to pay the entire $525 tax myself. If you now consider the Trail Bay Mall, you will note that it is also occupies a single parcel of land, thus, the $525 tax is distributed between all the businesses within it! How can this possibly be considered fair and equitable taxation! A more reasonable method for the SDBA to receive their funding would be to add a small fee to each business license issued in the district of Sechelt, instead of adding to the ever growing tax burden faced by commercial land owners.

I am a concerned business/commercial land owner for fair and equitable taxation in the District of Sechelt and adding to our property ownership costs, when our property taxes are already significant, does not make Sechelt an attractive place for businesses to be located.

Yours truly,

OCEAN BREEZE ACCOUNTING INC./THOMAS N. HOLMES INC.

Thomas Holmes, CPA, CA
February 5, 2015

Dear Mayor Milne and Council:

My final comment regarding the adoption of Amendment Bylaw 25-265 is a quote I find useful:

?...people continually try to misunderstand [legislation]..., therefore, it is not enough to attain a degree of precision which a person reading in good faith can understand, but you must attain, if you can, a degree of precision which a person reading in bad faith cannot misunderstand. It is all the better if he cannot pretend to misunderstand it?

Stephen, J., Re Castioni (1890)

Linda Williams
Dear Mayor & council.

It has come to my attention that Sechelt Downtown Business Association (SDBA) is applying for a renewal of their parcel tax funding to be paid by a $525 tax levied against downtown business properties. As the owner one of these properties I wish to pass onto you my concern that the method of taxation to pay for the ongoing operation of SDBA is unfair, and that funding SDBA should be discontinued because it provides a redundant duplication of the services already provided by the District of Sechelt Chamber of Commerce.

The tax is unfair because it targets individual commercial properties not individual businesses. For example, the businesses in Trail Bay Mall each pay a portion of a $525 tax assessed against the property the mall sits on. So, as owner of 5788 Cowrie Street, I pay $525 per year; if there are 10 businesses in the mall they each pay $52.50. This is simply not fair. I’m certain this same situations affects other properties housing multiple business tenants.

I hereby request you do not fund the further operation of SDBA and instead fund the District of Sechelt Chamber of Commerce via the traditional method of remitting to them a portion or all of the business license fees generated in Sechelt.

Yours truly
Peter Gordon
BC Land Surveyor

Cowrie One Properties Ltd.
PO Box 2329
5788 Cowrie Street
Sechelt BC V0N 3A0

P: 604-885-3286
F: 604-885-2505
C: 604-740-2126
E: gordonsurveys@dccnet.com