

From: Executive Admin
Sent: Thursday, June 24, 2021 3:56 PM
To: Islands2050
Subject: FW: Comments on TPS Process
Attachments: Trust Council - Re TPS.docx

Dear Chair Luckham:

Please accept the following letter for the agenda package of the next Trust Policy Council meeting.

Jennifer Margison

[REDACTED]
Galiano Island, BC

June 22, 2021

Peter Luckham, Chair, Islands Trust Council
Local Trustees

To Chair Luckham and Trustees:

I would like to say that I am quite concerned about the impending first reading of the Trust Policy Statement 2.0. This draft was only released June 11, with only a few days for the Trustees and the public (those who are even aware of it) to digest it and with very limited public input at the June 15 Trust Program Committee meeting.

I am also concerned that first reading would be considered prior to the Governance Review. I believe these two reviews are so interconnected that moving to first reading of the TPS prior to any public consultation on governance would be counter-productive to ensuring effective implementation of the TPS now and for the future.

In spite of many words and phrases in the draft, there does not seem to be a critical, clear definition of environment. It seems to me that clear distinctions need to be made in this draft between the rural "built" environment, a more dense and urban "built" environment and the natural environment. The concern in 1974 and the concern now, is the ever-increasing built environment overtaking the fragile and limited natural environment. I am concerned that "carrying capacity" was removed as a phrase from this draft as that seems to me to be a vital concept that requires further definition but not deletion if the Trust area is to be protected.

The protection of groundwater also needs far more attention than the section on Freshwater Stewardship Policies contain. The sustainability of our potable water resources is essential and once again where "carrying capacity" is so important.

I have had firsthand experience on Galiano in seeing how little real groundwater protection exists when new developments are proposed. The applicant hires the hydrogeologist who provides a report that may be technically correct but has very limited scope; the already zoned-for development density in an area is not considered at all (what then does "inadequate or unsustainable" really mean in this draft? Or "existing, anticipated, and seasonal water demand and supply projections are considered and allowed for"?); water problems already occurring in an area are ignored; water usage estimations are set unrealistically low, planning for the minimum not the

maximum; and rainwater catchment is set unrealistically high (will never sustain gardens through the dry season).

Then when it comes to applications for a Commercial Water Licences in the case of high-density developments, again in my experience, the original applicant-commissioned, limited scope hydrogeologist's report merely gets rubberstamped by the Regional Hydrogeologist and the Water Authorization staff with no investigation or attention to empirical on-the-ground evidence of water problems. Though outside the Trust's authority, but offered by the Planner and LTC as some sort of reassurance, the Water Sustainability Act of BC and the "First in Time, First in Right" provision in the Act will offer no protection or recourse if water problems are from a new development; it is virtually unenforceable.

Further, I have no confidence that the Draft TPS 2.0 will actually be effective in its implementation. These policies should **implement** "preservation and protection." Why is the now separate 1994 Implementation Policy 1.3.1 not part of this review and the TPS and therefore not subject to Ministerial oversight? And why is the staff person responsible for the TPS not the Director of Trust Area Services, rather than the Director of Local Planning Services? Since in my experience of informing myself about the Trust over the past 3 years, planning seems to merely be about facilitating development applications and planners' job description contain little or no emphasis on environmental education or accountability requirements, this seems inappropriately skewed. I have been shocked on Galiano to see in LTC meetings, how little reference is made to TPS Directives or even OCP bylaws and certainly how little adherence there is to either in consideration of rezoning applications.

I believe Housing Policies have no place in the TPS. Including these Directive Policies will only serve to further confuse the primary intent to protect the "natural environment". Addressing larger social issues, as important as they may be, is not the responsibility of the Trust. As can be seen on many of our islands, the lobby to build high-density, urban-model affordable housing is creating great conflict among islanders, when more rural, small scale options should be explored.

Something appears to be very wrong with the "preserve and protect" implementation of the mandate of the Islands Trust. I do not believe the current approach to the review of the TPS and the timeline will serve us well in the future and I ask all Trustees to not approve first reading of the current TPS draft.

Sincerely,

jennifer Margison