Cariboo Regional District File No. ....3900 20 -5239

OCT 2 3 2019

October 22, 2019

Letter to the CRD Board of Directors

Re: Petition for Parking Lot for Emerald and Crown Royal Island Owners

Dear Directors,

Referred To CAO

I am writing on behalf of 9 Island owners representing 9 voters, specifically Emerald Island lot numbers and and Crown Royal lot numbers

We have been informed that you will be voting on Friday on the Petition presented to Crown Royal and Emerald Island owners at your next Board meeting.

It is my understanding that even though this petition has been counted, the Board still has to vote to approve it.

Here are our concerns:

This petition came to several Island owners as a surprise.

- Many Island Property owners were never contacted before the petition
- I was personally contacted by email early last spring by Island lot owner, me if I would be in favor of a parking lot for Island owners. My reply was that I don't require it, wouldn't use it but if it doesn't cost me or affect me in any way then they could try what they want.
- We never heard another word until the petition arrived.

This petition was flawed.

- There was a map attached but it was the wrong map and didn't even show where the parking lot was proposed to be. Instead Eagle Point was squared off and of course totally upset residents near the point.
- More than a week later the correct map was mailed out. I only found out that a new map was being sent after I called to ask about it.
- The petition allowed only for a YES vote. There was not a choice for a NO vote nor was there any space for comments or suggestions. We were told not to respond if we were against. Just ignore it. That is not reasonable. Ignoring the petition sends the message that one can't be bothered, do not care, or simply forgot.
- The petition is a simple 50% where a 50% vote goes to the petitioner. How can this possibly be fair on a vote that is financially binding for everyone. In this case 50% of the people would be paying for parking for the other 50%.

Mr, Richmond was actively working for the petitioners:

• The group writing the petition and working closely with Mr. Richmond, called a meeting at Clancy's with Mr. Richmond and invited only Island owners who were in favor of the petition.

- Mr. Richmond told me there were 20 people in attendance. This is odd as there are only 18 lots and 18 votes and at minimum 9 lot owners were not invited or notified.
- I also read an email from Island owner to Island owner that said and I quote exactly "it is such a breath of fresh air to have someone like Al Richmond in the position he's elected to and have his support" I am under a different impression. I believe our member was elected to represent all of his constituents. A concerted effort to keep any Island owners in the dark was wrong.
- They were told at the meeting it would be good to start an association of Island owners and register the association. A good idea if every Island owner was informed and invited to join. Again, only Island owners in favor of this parking lot petition were invited to join. No other owner was informed or invited 18 lot owners, 9 not informed or invited.

Lakeshore is not appropriate for a parking lot

- The Petitioners have chosen an MOTI lot on the lakeshore next to Easy Go Ranch at the north end. A Parking lot is without a doubt the worst use of prime and pristine lakeshore property I can imagine.
- Why is it necessary to use a lakeshore lot for long term parking? I was told that they "don't need to launch" from there, it is just for parking. Who would ever allow a lakeshore lot to be exclusively for overnight parking and/or launching? Check any parking lot for oil spills, gas spills, trash and other environmental concerns.
- There are other MOTI properties near LLH and closer to the launch at Kokanee bay that could be used. (one on Stevens Road for example.)
- There are private parking lots off the lake, there are resorts willing to "pay/park", there is a storage business across from Kokanee Bay. There are no limits to alternate and acceptable solutions.
- Once an overnight parking lot is dedicated on lakeshore, it becomes a taxpayer's disaster waiting to happen. A precedent is set for other petitions to be written and will follow for more lakeshore parking lots and preferential treatment of small groups of private citizens.
- This pristine property is right on the lakeshore and the highway. We absolutely must preserve our lakeshore for proper use and an overnight parking lot for a few but potentially many is not environmentally or socially responsible.

Mainland neighbours of the parking lot were not given a vote or opportunity to

- Mr. Richmond told me the "neighbors of the MOTI" were notified as to this petition. Only one was spoken to, the other 2 were not. I am one of the other 2 property owners. One agreed only if the property was to be locked and gated. Mr. Richmond told me the overnight parking lot will be ungated, not locked and public. He said this is by insistence of the MOTI. told me (by email) that after the petition passes the property will be locked and gated. I asked Mr. Richmond for the letter in writing from the MOTI clarifying this and he said he doesn't have one.
- I notified 3 of the 4 neighbors of the proposed overnight parking and they are definitely not in favor, but as one said, we don't have a vote or a leg to stand on. I am one of those neighbors.

## Parking lot rules

- What are the rules on this property: If it is locked and gated it is not a public parking lot. If it is not locked, then island property owners are paying for a parking lot that may be full of other parkers. What exactly are the rules?
- Who maintains this parking lot and how will the rules be enforced?
- If you can park there for free for long stays, can you leave your RV there for the winter? If it is a public parking lot and islanders can park there all summer, why can't others leave vehicles there for extended periods as well. Feasibly anyone can park overnight with no restrictions, camping, campers, etc. and all this at the expense of Island owners.
- How will abandoned boat trailers and other trash be removed and at whose expense.
- If this parking lot as presented is open to the public then nobody should have a reserved spot. Will people take to leaving vehicles, trailers, campers, etc. all winter to make sure they have a parking spot in the spring?

## Property with Services vs Property without

- When Island owners purchased these lots, each owner knew that they bought a piece of an Island. They knew there was no access, no parking, no services, just simple tranquility. What will they ask for next, a septic system?
- The price they paid reflected the nature of the property. If this property was on the mainland it would be more than double the price.
- Why should 3 property owners on the mainland now have to live next door to a parking lot because the Island property owners want their own parking. Mainland property owners paid for their services in their property prices and their taxes and now they are going to have a parking lot beside them because other property owners who do not pay for services in their property price or taxes want it. That just makes no sense at all.
- It is every owner's own responsibility to find appropriate parking and boat launching for themselves, and ample launches and parking already exist.

## In summary

- There are other places to park around Lac La Hache
- Lakeshore should not be turned into a parking lot
- Property owners should arrange and pay for their own parking
- Half of the Island owners should not have to pay for the other half to park
- The worst use of property is a parking lot, especially lakeshore property.

I have all the texts and emails regarding any of the comments and facts in this letter. I am happy	to send
anything pertaining to a comment in the letter. Just email me at :	or call
me and I will send the text or email.	

Thank you for reading and considering our letter regarding this extremely important decision.

Sincerely

