

From: Stephen MacLean

Subject: Re: Delegation Sept 21

Here is the finished delegation:

"There seems to be some conflicting information circulating around the Islands Trust Policy Statement Revision. Most recently, I attended a Q&A with my trustee, Kees Langereis. If I understood Kees correctly, there is no requirement for LTCs to implement PS directives into their island's OCP. Yet, when your CAO received the petition to delay the first reading, he stated that trustees would need to rewrite their OCPs in response to PS revisions.

What is the actual requirement and where is the language that legislates this, and is there currently an intention to change or advocate for changing this requirement?

There also seem to be contradictions in the details of what is written and the verbal messages of trustees. One example is tree cutting. The PS states that the IT shall advocate for authority to regulate All tree cutting. Yet multiple trustees have stated that the intention is to regulate clear-cutting only or to regulate 'forests not trees.' Why does the PS revision ask for more authority than trustees seem to feel is needed. It seems like an excessive expansion of bureaucracy to regulate more than that which is perceived to be necessary. Tree cutting is regulated in urban areas for altogether different reasons: namely safety, such as closing a road during removals.

There also seems to be some vague directives, which could be exploited for unintended uses. One example is the emissions directives for housing. What is the intention? New housing only? If applied to existing housing, only new installations?

If policy is to be based on the 'precautionary principle,' the primary if not exclusive focus should be on industry. Residents and home owners cannot afford to be overburdened by excess regulation and restriction.

These are just a few examples as I don't have the time to reread the entire unwieldy document, especially with such a short timeline. Perhaps you should start over with a document that specifically and clearly states what you intend to change and why.

That might help restore some of my faith in a bureaucracy that I only recently learned to be so top heavy and unrepresentative of its electors and sources of funding. I am also wondering why the amendments planned for the draft haven't yet been brought forward. It seems like we will be engaging with a draft doesn't represent the final intentions of Trust Council."