

From: Peter Luckham <pluckham@islandstrust.bc.ca>
Sent: Thursday, July 15, 2021 9:57 AM
To: Dan
Cc: Islands2050
Subject: Re: ITPS revision

Thank you Dan for your email. I am forwarding it to staff for inclusion in the materials we are considering as we move forward with this project. Thank you for your expressing your concerns and constructive, thoughtful contribution.

Peter Luckham, Chair Trust Council
Trustee, Thetis Island
Islands Trust
#200 1627 Fort Street
Victoria, B.C. V8R 1H8
Home Phone: (250) 210-2553
Office Fax: (250) 405-5155
www.islandstrust.bc.ca

Preserving and protecting over 450 islands and surrounding waters in the Salish Sea

On 7/13/2021 8:32 AM, Dan wrote:

> Dear Chair Luckham,

>

> As an island trust (Gabriola) resident, and landowner, perhaps I can explain my opposition to the revision to the islands trust policy statement that is proposed.

>

> I have studied urban planning, and have a degree in politics, and have no problem understanding the challenges faced by planners, nor do I find their desire for a broader mandate hard to understand.

>

> However, I do not agree with your revision of this statement for several reasons.

>

> First of all, any laws that you pass regarding indigenous title are likely to run afoul of superior jurisdictions, because your lawmaking powers are subordinate to the Province and the Feds. Fundamentally, your power is very limited.

>

> Secondly, and more troubling, is that I believe that giving affordable housing equal primacy as the environment will be counterproductive to your rationale that this update to the policy will help us fight climate change.

>

> More people means more emissions, more consumption, more waste, and less nature. These are not in anyway mutually compatible goals, and giving them equal primacy means that in finding a 'balance' we will be a constant downward environmental spiral. It's not like the numbers of people that want to live on the islands are dwindling, so the more people that move here that cannot find sustainable, affordable housing, the more that there will have to be built.

>

> There is no logical limit to this in what is proposed.

>

> I bought land here on the premise of the idea that this was to be largely a protected natural space, not that we were going to turn it into a social housing experiment.

>

> And the changes proposed are hugely disproportionate, as well. I know how they will affect Gabriola, but what are the ramifications of affordable housing being an Island's Trust priority on islands like James or Sidney? Are they also going to have affordable housing densities allocated simply because people cannot afford to live there?

>

> Please look at the experience of Portland Oregon, when the urban growth boundary there was introduced. Land prices skyrocketed, gentrification was rife, and many people were displaced.

>

> That barrier was artificial, so unless you intend to introduce bridges, we have to deal with the fact that there are natural growth boundaries on these islands, and behave logically within that framework.

>

> Current physical geography, coupled with human geography, built infrastructure, and climate patterns will lead any sensible person to the conclusion that the Gulf Islands have largely been historically undervalued and that we are in the midst of a market correction that is being exacerbated by the pandemic as well as attendant technological/Human Resource advances.

>

> I firmly oppose the revision of the islands trust policy statement, and I fully understand the reasons for which I oppose it. I do not agree with your mandate being broadened to include affordable housing, and I do not believe that you have the power to undertake the kind of lawmaking required for meaningful reconciliation.

>

> I do believe that issuing a statement in the form of an MOU that the Trust is in favour of, and committed to, the principles enshrined in UNDRIP, and to undertaking as many of the 94 Calls To Action in the TRC as possible, would be a very positive step, but beyond that the specifics should be left to higher powers than you.

>

> Sincerely,

> Daniel Backé

>

> PS- It's more than a bit condescending to assume that those who disagree with you, simply do not understand.

>

>

>

>