



## Compound Bylaw Options Report

This Report aims at providing a summary and a breakdown of options on the 4 key issues raised at the AGM on the proposed Bylaw.

The overarching principle guiding the proposed changes is a fair and equitable access of a mixed-use shared asset. As such, a first come first serve approach with temporary access (i.e., no storage) is the intent of the bylaw as drafted. With the exception of the boat racks which provide a dedicated space in the lot.

### 1- Boat Rack Fee

Initial draft bylaw was using market rates as benchmark to calibrate the price (i.e., between \$50 and \$150 per month). As such \$300/year (i.e., \$25/ month) was seen as being at least 50% under market rates.

It is worth noting that according to Harold Skolrood's book, page 48, "boat racks were constructed in 1977 and made available to individuals needing them for a non-refundable yearly charge of \$25."

The fee has not changed since 1977. If we use a basic inflation calculator, it would be about \$110 today.

**Option 1 – Market rate comparator (\$300/year)**

**Option 2 – CPI adjustment (\$110/year) – Compound Committee Recommendation**

**Option 3 – Do nothing (\$25/year)**

### 2- EV Charging

Initial draft approach was to provide EV charging opportunities without PIID bearing the costs of installation or owning the chargers. This provides the following benefits:

- Opportunity to have EV charging
- No cost to PIID
- No PIID liability related to maintenance, operation or damage.
- No dedicated EV parking spots

The initial draft was unclear as it relates to the possibility for the PIID to request that EV chargers be removed should another solution be found. This can be addressed in the bylaw by adding: "The PIID reserves the right to remove all chargers should another type of EV charging system (e.g., community station) be implemented."

It is worth noting that the survey showed support for adding EV Charging opportunities to the Compound. The capital investment for a community shared and pay per use station is not an option at this time given the current cost (i.e., \$40,000 + for one station).

Future opportunities and access to grant or government programs should be investigated by a dedicated Select Committee.



## Compound Bylaw Options Report

**Option 1 – Proceed with EV charging opportunity for 6 chargers with the caveat that these can be removed at any time**

**Option 2 – Remove the EV Charging from the Bylaw – Compound Committee Recommendation**

### 3- Trailer Long Term Storage vs Short Term

The initial draft bylaw would provide short term boat trailer parking on the west side. Storage or long-term parking would not be allowed. It still provides the benefit to use the compound for launching a boat and parking a boat trailer while on Piers (e.g., seasonal or short term stay on Piers).

It is worth noting that the survey showed support for removing long-term storage and providing either a co-operative system or PIID owned boat trailers. For legitimate reasons, PIID owned trailers are not a viable option (maintenance, damage, management by volunteers). The co-operative approach is added to the draft should Islanders come up with a viable system that allows any owner to be a part of the co-op.

**Option 1 – Proceed with current draft including the co-op wording – Compound Committee Recommendation**

**Option 2 – Do nothing**

### 4- Winter Pass Elimination / One vehicle per property / Fob vs Code

This issue is not a simple black and white approach.

The first topic to confirm is the one car per property vs two today (with winter pass from September 15 to June 15). The bottom line is that we now have well over 50 permanently occupied homes on the Island, well above the long term past average of 40. With a maximum of 50 spots (depending on trailer storage solution above), it seems clear that the lot is going to become a "choke point" on convenient use of one's property, especially if owners find that they can no longer afford marina rates or if marina spaces are not available.

During the winter, the Compound can be half empty without any issue for a few weeks until it suddenly is at capacity. An experiment with new rules aimed at limiting the second car privilege during times when greater pressure on the lot is expected can be considered, but there is concern that this will put unfair and undeserved pressure on the person charged with enforcing the bylaw.

The initial draft bylaw limits access to the Compound to one car per property all year round. This has the benefit to be easier to enforce especially with the fob only access. If two cars are allowed parts of the year this means that we rely on good faith and volunteer hours to check and enforce the bylaw when parking is scarce.

An alternative would be to keep the Winter Pass but reduce the period it is valid. This could include all statutory holidays, long weekends, and school breaks.



## Compound Bylaw Options Report

Finally, a fee option could be introduced for a second vehicle. The fee could be set to put the emphasis on high usage (daily commuters and users) e.g., \$750/year. This would be in line with charging for dedicated space or additional “service” when compared to boat racks or EV charging.

**Option 1 – Proceed with current draft with one vehicle per property. – Compound Committee Recommendation**

**Option 2 – Maintain the Winter Pass. Limit it to September 15 to April 15 and not valid on statutory holidays, long weekends and school break including Christmas Break and Spring Break.**

**Option 3 – Limit to one vehicle per property. A second vehicle pass may be allowed for a fee.**

**Option 4 – Do nothing**

Providing access to vehicles is the next steps.

The initial draft bylaw had one fob per property to match the one vehicle policy. While the code is convenient, it is also easy to give it away and it does not provide a high level of security with third parties having access to the Compound. As such the recommendation was to keep the code for PIID purposes only with temporary codes created for emergency or service purposes. Only those with a fob would be able to open the vehicle gate. If two vehicles are allowed, then two fobs should be provided or a temporary access code for the second vehicle could be provided.

The alternative is to provide a fob to those who wish to have one for convenience and still have the code for everyone else. The problem remains with enforcing vehicle counts, access to third parties, and security concerns, etc.

**Option 1 – Fob only access – Compound Committee Recommendation**

**Option 2 – Fob and code access**