

From: Julia Wagner [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, August 11, 2026 9:39 AM
To: SSInfo
Subject: Support for PLDP20250452 and PLDVP20250460, 434 Baker Road, August 27 LTC

Dear Chair and Trustees,

My name is Julia Wagner. I have lived on Salt Spring Island for close to a decade and serve as Assistant Director at the Public Library. Over the course of my time here, I have come to know Ethan and Bahareh Wilding and to follow the shoreline erosion issues they and their neighbours have faced — including the Islands Trust process, their legal case, and now their amended application.

I am writing to express my support for the applications at 434 Baker Road (PLDP20250452 and PLDVP20250460), and to ask that a decision in their favour be made without further delay. The amended hybrid naturalized revetment plan reflects careful, expert-backed rethinking that still serves the original goal: environmental protection, property stability, and neighbourliness. It addresses legitimate Indigenous concerns around clam bed access and beach longevity, and does so in a way that is minimally disruptive to the shoreline and neighbouring properties, if all project components (indigenous plantings, etc.) are properly implemented.

I want to be clear that I respect the Trust's mandate and the diligence with which it carries that out. Preserving a fragile, changing ecosystem while remaining fair to applicants is not easy, and the Trust is not always going to be popular for doing it well. But I have seen cases where certain public pressure — rather than the policies and bylaws themselves — appears to have swayed an outcome. The rezoning denial for the Salt Spring Coffee Roastery is one past example recently in the media; the signatures gathered by "Friends of Baker Beach," and some questionable social media smear campaigns around that looks to me like a current one.

I recognize that public input is actually part of the process - which is why I'm writing today - but I also think we should be referring to the what has actually transpired, facts and science presented, and not hearsay, false assertions, polarizing characterizations or personal attacks. Some of the things I've read make me feel like the process is damaging and flawed.

In the case of the applications put forward by 434 Baker Road – the applicants proceeded in good faith, at real expense, expecting that a fair and understandable

process would be honoured. My feeling is there were discrepancies, perhaps even influenced by the type of public input mentioned above. I think going forward we can and should do better – and that the Wilding's current applications show that they too are listening, responding, and trying to do better.

The Wildings have engaged with this process in good faith. They have submitted professional engineering and environmental evidence, and they have amended their proposal in direct response to community concerns. PLDP20250452 and PLDVP20250460 are well-developed applications that deserve to be evaluated on their merits. If specific conditions are needed for the permits to proceed, those should be clearly identified and attached. But the applications themselves, and the permits they request, should be able to move forward.

Thank you for your time and for considering my perspective.

Sincerely,
Julia Wagner

