

On Jul 26, 2026, at 11:40 AM, Gary Mccollum [REDACTED] wrote:

Hi Susan,

Thanks for forwarding this. I couldn't attend as our son John got married in a small family service on the 16th in the afternoon, so no doubt where I would be.

I am curious to hear what the participants had to say. I am troubled that the material presented seems single minded and suggests that mandatory cistern requirement will benefit all properties and water sources. Cisterns are, in many cases, the only viable solution to water supply, and often of great benefit to limited or poor quality water well supply. But please keep in mind that cisterns are not a panacea to water problems. In all cases, water wells and cisterns are compromises for water supply and each home owner has to find a solution best for them.

I am not sure why this topic is under my skin, I have no plans to build, John does, and has a well, but I am going to suggest a cistern as part of a filtering system to remove a very fine glacial till anyway. I guess my frustration lies with the constant talk of "housing crisis" and "affordable housing" and then requiring cisterns for all residential construction. Requiring the extra expense does not require the homeowner to ever use it. I do find the action versus the rhetoric as hypocritical.

I also do not see the argument that installing a cistern on construction is somehow cheaper than to install at a later date. The cistern itself is the same price, the extra plumbing would be the same cost. What am I missing?

And by the way what is "adequately sized freshwater storage"? Depending on how that definition is interpreted, it could add an extraordinary cost to construction.

I very much feel the OCP should remain silent on the question of installation of cisterns for residential construction.

The other issue I feel is important is the question of mandating enforcement of bylaws. Your planners assertion that it restrict the decision making of future LTCs is precisely the point. The current suspension (not a referral) sets a precedent that any future LTC can lean on to support any sort of enforcement suspension they may choose. After all, future LTCs are bound by the provisions of bylaws on the books, and if they find need for change, there is a process to amend any bylaw. Including removing a clause to enforce. But that becomes a discussion and a process rather than a whim. I am not a backyard lawyer, but if there is a question of legality then I feel you should seek legal opinion rather than a planners understanding.

Surely, by now, we can all see that any kind of fool can get elected and cause any kind of havoc without some sort of checks and balances.

Susan, finally I feel the entire process has lacked an open discussion of cost versus benefit. The benefit presented is the possibility that increased density will somehow provide affordable housing. When I talk

to people they easily agree that housing is a problem for many here, and we need young people and workers in all fields. But if you ask whether they support the costs, that is, more cars on the roads and ferry, more people on the beaches and parks, more sewage, more water trucked from Nanaimo, more development in their neighbourhoods, and greater urbanization to support increased population, then layer on top of that the unknown possible development of the near 1,000 acres outside of Trust jurisdiction, the discussion really begins.

David Suzuki has said that too many of our political decisions lack a cost/benefit analysis. I see what he meant.

I hope I'm not being too negative here, and I am not criticizing the tremendous effort you and Tobi have put in, I truly respect your commitment to our community, and appreciate your work.

Gary

> On Jul 26, 2026, at 8:31 AM, Susan Yates <syates@islandstrust.bc.ca> wrote:

>

> Hi Gary,

>

> I thought you might be interested in the document that was used for last Thursday evening's session - lots of talk about water storage and rainwater catchment. I have not seen the results of the table discussions yet but will forward them to you if you are interested, and if I receive a copy. There were 44 participants at this session, but I did not join any of the tables.

>

> Best regards,

> Susan