

From: Islands2050
Sent: Friday, November 19, 2021 8:11 AM
To: Islands2050
Subject: FW: 438 reached

On Oct 30, 2021, at 8:24 AM, AP D [REDACTED] wrote:

Laura / Peter / Peter

I don't know if you have seen the 2050 comments below.

I want to sincerely express that many Salt Spring residents (and SSI workers who can't afford to be residents) feel in a way that is expressed by these comments. In the past, Salt Spring Trust often implemented policy change and interpreted policy in such a manner without due consideration of the long term consequences on people.

We only need to look at the existing residential zoning policy as one example of policy creating major problems such as affordable housing, labour shortages, and others which affect, or will affect, the livelihood of all of us.

Another example is the policy of eliminating short-term vacation rentals which are an integral part of our community and its economic balance.

Many of these problems could have been foreseen and would not be as acute as they are today.

The evidence of such increasing problems was ignored or not considered as we carried on creating an economic and social imbalance through policy and its implementation. Many of the problems that now need fixing are years in the making. Many of the so-called problems do not need fixing at all, or certainly not fixing as identified.

Identifying each problem and its alternatives as opposed to a broad brush approach will avoid or lessen the negative effect on change, otherwise we may create a problem which is greater than the problem that we were trying to fix.

Let's hope that we can foresee the problems that 2050 is likely to create this time around.

Policy change is too important a matter to put into effect without obtaining professional models of all of the long term consequences.

The residents of SSI also need to understand these models and how each change may affect them in the future. Otherwise, we will create a dissent in our community that will need to be fixed which is much like the problems that we previously created that now need to be fixed.

The old adage "be careful what we wish for" is likely to apply here.

The 2050 policy approach should start over again until we understand what we are asking for and why and consent to making any changes.

Thank you for listening.

A. Peter Dorazio
[REDACTED]

██████████ cell

----- Forwarded message -----

Worth reading.....

Begin forwarded message:

Just wanted to share with you all the Pender group's newsletter is getting a lot of traction

Message from Pender Island

...."What should be of concern to you is the fact that of the four dozen bylaw notions not one is supported by science or multiple ways of knowing. And why? The Trust reserved the right to ignore the science with the proviso..... " read more below

An Important Message to all Residents and Property Owners in the Areas Governed by the Islands Trust

Revision of the Islands Trust Policy Statement

Hello.

We previously wrote to you informing that the Islands Trust, which manages our islands, is re-writing their Trust Policy Statement as Bylaw No. 183. This proposal pursues significant changes in how you can live on the islands. Why? They believe our islands are "complicated by new social, economic and environmental dynamics" which is obvious. However, the re-write runs to an astonishing 35 pages of "woo woo" language and unrealistic aspirations that open the door for the Trust to advance all sorts of social agendas that are, frankly, outside their jurisdiction.

If you have read the draft Bylaw, you already know that the proposed changes may diminish you, your livelihood, your property, and your community. The document by its introduction, and certainly by its contents, is deeply flawed – and must be rejected.

Why?

- despite the Trust's claims, preparation of the document drew on

little to no consultation with resident islanders;

- the Trust defines “unique amenities” in entirely environmental terms, and disdains that people actually live on the islands;
- the Trust claimed consultation with indigenous peoples, but those consultations are unavailable, classed as “confidential”;
- the Bylaw, introduced during the height of the Covid-19 pandemic, was readied for First Reading, a legal process, not a draft for discussion to solicit community input;
- the basis of their law-making gives primacy to “environmental protection” based on climate change and indigenous reconciliation; thus the new Trust Policy becomes a tool to advance important social matters which may or may not be appropriate for the Trust - except that they failed to ask you as a resident about your thoughts;
- to meet their objectives they state, "the rate and scale of growth and development in the Trust Area must be carefully managed and requires limitations" and to that end they have already endorsed a moratorium on the building of docks;
- they also propose a "need to shift towards a less human-centric and less settler-centric planning paradigm"; in consequence, their notional bylaw directives governing you in the draft exceed 50 in number.

The Trustees plan to concoct bylaws on the basis of "multiple ways of knowing, using the best available area-based mapping, science, social science, local knowledge and indigenous ways of knowing". Here is a short and very incomplete list of things to be contemplated for governance or prohibition:

- desalination plants
- reefs
- private docks
- tree cutting
- roads
- shore armouring
- agricultural practices
- finfish farms
- burning of fossil fuels
- extraction of minerals
- private automobiles
- short term rentals

There are many, many more. What should be of concern to you is the fact that of the four dozen bylaw notions not one is supported by science or multiple ways of knowing. And why? The Trust reserved the right to ignore the science with the proviso, "the lack of full scientific certainty should not be used as a reason for

postponing measures to prevent environmental damage". In other words, the Trust allows itself the right to create a bylaw despite the science possibly showing no environmental damage. The Trust may assume to do whatever it wants, and property owners will pay the bill.

Page 2 of 2

Head Office Direction, and No Local Freedom of Action

The Trust claims that the proposed Bylaw does not confer an executive role to the Head Office in Victoria.

For a start, the Bylaw contains 12 "Directive Policies for Local Trust Committees and Island Municipalities". Within those Directive Policies the clauses using the word "shall" number over 60. Shall as defined is a command, promise or a determination. It is legally binding.

Your Local Trust Committee must obey the dictates of the Trust Policy for if the Local Trust Committee creates bylaws they will have "no effect unless approved by the Executive Committee and the committee cannot approve such a bylaw if it is contrary to or at variance with the Policy Statement." This may not be a change from the present status...but it further restricts island residents in making their own Official Community Plans which, if Bylaw 183 is enacted, will all have to be rewritten.

The Trust Marches On

Despite many articulate letters to the Trust and despite many submissions from experts in their field and wise political counsellors, the Trust has engaged at your expense, two consulting firms to promote their Revised Policy Statement. Despite their words to the contrary, they refuse to listen. They refuse to collaborate, listen and engage residents in the new Policy Statement. Rather, they intend to educate and inform us.

A Call to Conscience

As Islanders, we all need and depend on one another. The Trust is disrespectful of the Islanders who financially support it. If one party is ignored or diminished in the act of reconciliation, only division will remain. That's why the Trustees need to terminate the rewrite of Trust Policy Statement.

If the property and businesses of those who sustain the residents are diminished by oppressive and inconsiderate bylaws, we all

suffer.

The Trust needs to stop and listen. The Trust should have direct individual contact and support their proposed bylaws with sound research or a validating plebiscite.

We all realize the Islands are "settled" by and served by responsible people who respect indigenous peoples and our green environment, no less than the Trust. Maybe we care more since, unlike Trust staff, we live here.

We ask you to immediately:

1. Contact your local Island Trustee by email, phone, in person and on social media – to register your strong opposition to proceeding with this re-write of the Trust Policy Statement, Bylaw No. 183 without appropriate consultation and consent.
2. And Contact your B.C. Member of the Legislature and your Member of Parliament as well – time is of the essence, as the Trust wants to get this enacted before the next local elections in October 2022.

<https://concernedislandresidents.ca/email-list-of-mlas-and-ministers/>

Sent from my iPhone