

From: Robert Adria <[REDACTED]>
Date: March 11, 2025 at 7:04:29 PM PDT
To: David Maude <dmaude@islandstrust.bc.ca>
Subject: Proposed Bylaw 235, Raptor DPA's

I am a land and home owner on North Pender Island. I own land that is impacted by protected wetland, protected intertidal zones, protected windswept forest, Arbutus and Gary Oak tree protections, as well as Raptor and Eagle nesting areas. I understand the need to be aware of and work around/create solutions that protect natural/sensitive ecosystems and areas.

However, I am opposed to the proposed Bylaw 235, raptor DPAs, and believe that it should not be adopted. I believe it unfairly impacts the enjoyment and use of one's land without the scientific support that extended protection is required. It borders on the expropriation of land rights without the process of law which should only be done with the most compelling of reasons.

The proposed changes would blanket nearly the entire end of our peninsula with restrictions. The fact that these regulations are not needed is borne out by the fact that the species intended to be protected are apparently thriving here without these regulations. Compared to the 2020 map on the Island Trust website, the nesting grounds, as shown in a recent brochure, are flourishing.

In our end of the island (south end of Pender Island opposite Poets Cove Resort) where we have for years had heron nests, and during that time we have had homes built, new power lines put in, and roads excavated and built (in addition to the ongoing lawn cutting, tree cutting and home maintenance of the existing housing stock), and all these areas were cleared in advance to accommodate these new roads, homes and powerlines - and yet the nests have flourished and expanded. They do not appear to need the nearly year-round "quiet times" and severe and extensive limits on human dwelling/living that the bylaw proposes.

A neighbour told me of the storks in Netherlands which nest atop chimneys.

The complex scheme of calendar periods, exemptions, and exceptions proposed, would make both compliance and enforcement problematic.

It is hard to determine what the status of the Proposed Bylaw 235 is, however it comes before you, I trust you will not vote in favour of it, as the proposed bylaw is not supported by any valid evidence, is excessive, and is unnecessary.

Sincerely,

Robert S. Adria