

From: Robert Barlow
Sent: Friday, September 17, 2021 8:26 AM
To: Islands2050
Subject: FW: Islands Trust 2050
Attachments: 2050 thoughts.pages; ATT00001.htm; 2050 thoughts.docx; ATT00002.htm

From: Al Maxwell [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 27, 2021 7:01 AM
To: Dionne LoForte <dloforte@islandstrust.bc.ca>
Subject: Re: Islands Trust 2050

And here are my thoughts, for the record.

No problem with Sections 1, 2, and 3. Understood that with addition of respect for indigenous rights come responsibilities, and that there needs to be serious hard lines set regarding limits on development.

Section 4.1 Ecosystem Preservation and Protection

4.1.11

If this means giving high-end DFO officials shock treatments on enforcement, I'm all for it. Filth and disease from net pens for farmed salmon have killed off the salmon abundance we once had. Responsibility lies directly with this politically corrupt organization. Further, calls to protect Rockfish Conservation habitat from local citizenry seem never to be answered. Or answered too late. A rule needs consistent reinforcement to make it stick.

4.1.13

On a personal level I worry that proclaiming standards may move to enforcement of restrictive and expensive policies regarding home heat. I burn wood. I will continue to do so and I will defend my right to do so. To be forced to adopt what others see as acceptable is not in my opinion a reasonable way to go without recompense. If full cost grants were afforded to re-tool or retrofit, my obdurate refusal would be undermined substantially.

4.2 Freshwater Stewardship Policies

4.2.5

I reject this. It is in conflict with 4.2.4 “...self-sufficient...”. Individual island councils should make those decisions. Ideology from on high does not work in the granularity of ALL islands. This is far too high handed, and all science is not in on it. Small works are already evident on at least one of our islands, and not damaging in any way, power or environmental effect included. Who made this recommendation, and upon what basis did they do that?

4.2.7

Full concurrence. Support in these endeavours might include a loosening (with appropriate safeguards) of the restrictions on rainwater harvesting as a natural and plentiful means of maintaining adequate self-sufficient supply.

4.2.9

No! See 4.2.5 above. Each to his own when it comes to self-sufficiency.

4.2.12

Absolutely concur! Our water district leads with frequent letters to authorities.

4.3 Forest Stewardship Policies

4.3.9

In general, I see the need for such policy (I share the ideology behind it), but I am not at all convinced that adding another level of bureaucracy in determining the likelihood of tree removal for safety or for public works is a good idea. Its already hard enough to come to agreement without taking it to council too, when a water district for example needs to take out some trees to preserve the integrity of their works or the safety of homeowners.

4.6 Coastal and Marine Stewardship Policies

4.6.7

As a mariner, some of the restrictions suggested here alarm me. Definitions need to be upfront. For example, I moor my sailboat on a mooring ball most of the year. It is in an eelgrass habitat. Its been there for 16 years. It prevents me mucking up the sea floor every time I want to anchor. In terms of saving habitat, I thought that through 20 years ago. Because of my boat's size, I am not welcome at the new Anson Road dock, I hear. At the old Horton Bay dock, even if I wanted to dock I couldn't because there is no space. So, are old tars like myself being told to take their boats elsewhere? Not in favour, if that's the case.

Also, seems unfair to limit docks to the old owners. What of dock rebuilds? In the name of habitat protection, I see the point, but to preserve and protect goes to the expectations of islanders when they buy on the water. That is one of the attractants. I can suggest some stipulations about sharing, perhaps. Might be more acceptable than a straight out ban. There's not enough dock space at present, and the new dock won't completely alleviate that problem.

6.1 Rural Planning

6.1.15 Or the next

A pet peeve. My neighbourhood has seen industrial level house construction for several years now. While on the one end of the street, the extensive resources of the owner has created a magnificent pair of homes for the extended family, I am nervous that when that owner sells, the prospect of a destination resort MAY enter into the sale. Please beef up those restrictions, in order to preserve the neighbourhood character.

On the other end of the street, again extensive resources have poured into an interesting home for two. I can't believe that that is all that was intended when the home was built, and I forewarn again about a hidden agenda involving self-help and therapies in this residential area. Big Brother is not a Canadian ideal, but enough is enough, eh? Rezoning should be so excruciatingly difficult that only the fully out-to-lunch should even consider it. And what bylaw enforcement can we arrive at collectively to make a home for profit not on the menu here?

In general, I applaud the prodigious efforts put forward by Peter Luckham and crew. Public service is a frigging meat grinder. Your inclusion strategy will win out, and more power to you for sticking to it.

Cheers,
Al Maxwell
Crotchety Old Timer