
From: Gary Mccollum <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, September 12, 2025 4:57 PM
To: Susan Yates
Cc: Tobi Elliott; Gabriola2050; Laura Patrick; Narissa Chadwick; Stephen Baugh
Subject: Re: OCP review workshop and survey

Hello Tobi,

I apologize if I haven't made myself clear. I am not implying that the shift in population in the last 5 years is responsible for negative growth trends. But I find that since Covid there are some people to whom I have spoken to that feel that there is room for increased population and would like to be able to build suites and carriage houses on smaller properties.

So, my point is that you will hear from people who feel that there is lots of room for greater population, that's normal where they come from, and people who are very much in, some cases desperate, need of housing and hope to see affordable housing. My concern is the discussion may turn into an echo chamber without engaging the larger population.

Please understand I fully support cluster development, as proven by our 2019 project. Through clustering Jane and I managed to create 6 one and one half acre lots (1/2 hectare), and through restrictive covenant, in favour of the Trust, protect 30 acres (12 hectare) of mature forest from further subdivision. The protected forest abuts both the 707 and the Kensington Lands.

I also support concentrated density in the way of multifamily residential, or trailer/tiny home parks which should be within walking distance of the village and ferry. My concern is there seems to be no discussion of limiting developments that will increase the potential population.

Further, if you read the treaty signed in 1854 with the Snuneymuxw Band it becomes obvious just how abusive the agreement and the indigenous people here have been treated. We all have a moral and social responsibility to support the Snuneymuxw in the acquisition and governance of the Kensington lands here. This dynamic band has indicated they haven't decided what they wish to do with those lands, therefore any sort of development is possible. When considering future expansion of population in the trust governance area are you considering the possible development of nearly 1,000 acres of treaty reparation lands?

So Tobi, considering these factors do you support the notion that our OCP should limit development options in order to limit the potential total population of Gabriola? And Tobi, when you were part of the housing survey group you rejected discussion of the potential development of the Kensington lands as out of our jurisdiction. As trustee do you still support that view? Finally, do you have an ideal whether there should be a maximum population here? If so, how many?

Gary

On Sep 12, 2025, at 5:29 AM, Susan Yates <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Thanks Tobi for your thoughtful reply too!

We need to find creative ways to preserve as much carbon-capture area as we possibly can, and live in a community that supports young and old and everything in between, otherwise we are doomed to paradise lost and much worse.

Just thinking about how hard it was for teachers this week, praying for just one more student so that the Ks and Ones did not have to be in a split class. That magical one child arrived at the last minute and saved the day, but who knows how long their family can afford to stay here.

♥ to everyone who works to support a healthy demography and environment (the green kind)!

Susan

On Sep 11, 2025, at 3:33 PM, Tobi Elliott <telliott@islandstrust.bc.ca> wrote:

Hi Gary,

Thank you for your input. I've included the planners working on the OCP, as well as the Gabriola 2050 email where all comments about the OCP can go so we can capture all the views on this project. I'm sorry you can't be there on Sunday.

Your points are well taken. Thanks for speaking your mind and what you see.

I disagree with your premise that there is any desire or drive to "opening up development and the resulting need for the further urbanization of the island," from either your trustees or the planners.

I agree with you there are some very harmful and negative impacts of population pressure and growth that are ALREADY happening, and which is currently negatively impacting the environment, people, and the values of Gabriola residents and visitors. The reason staff were requested to hold a community workshop on density and growth patterns was so that we all could have the conversation about these trends that you're seeing, and ask what might be done to curb them.

I disagree with your statement implying somehow that these negative trends are impacts from the last 5 years of a shift in population. I believe the effects we agree we're seeing are due to the settlement pattern of the current OCP. The density pattern latent in the choices that were made over the last 50 years, is now obvious for all to see.

Now is the time to look at those patterns, evaluate whether we want the status quo to continue, or if there is something that could be done to ratchet back the harmful impacts of this kind of growth, and support better outcomes for the environment, for our community as a whole, and for the future. Whether this community can rally behind a collective set of the values and a vision for how we'll live out those values, is up to the community itself. I hope that doesn't sound patronizing, because I really do believe that community is the driver of change. We are just here to support a process that everyone has an equal chance to engage in.

Your thoughts and input will be taken in and collated along with everyone else's input. We'll see what comes out of the dialogue.

Cheers, Tobi

On Sep 11, 2025, at 8:00 AM, Gary Mccollum

<[REDACTED]> wrote:

Hello LTC

I will be out of the country and unable to attend the September 14 workshop. I have filled in the survey, but I find it to be directed to an outcome promoting residential growth.

I realize that I have a singular experience and perspective on the Gabriola Community and the role of the Islands Trust. As a result I have taken to seeking opinions from people I don't know, whether on the trails, or in the dentist's waiting room, or the coffee shop, or on the ferry etc. I have been talking to people who have been here for 2 to 40 years, with various reasons for coming and settling on the island.

I have heard a lot of interesting things I hadn't thought of, and opinions as to the extent of what future development should look like. What I have universally heard was that there has been no discussion of the price the Gabriola community will pay for opening up development and the resulting need for the further urbanization of the island.

I heard the usual comments on expansion cost, how will more people affect water, sewer, environment, loss of habitat, ferry traffic, road infrastructure, electric infrastructure? Will we need more water trucked from Nanaimo? I also heard issues I have never considered. From a retired law enforcement person: increased population will lead to increased petty crime. From a member of GROWLS: more people means more domestic cats and dogs leading to greater stress on wildlife. On top of that no one I have spoken to can predict what may happen with potential development of the almost 1,000 acres of treaty reparation lands.

Now, I will be the first to admit I am a privileged dinosaur, and to continue to limit growth has many negative impacts as well. I also understand the nature of Gabriola society

has changed dramatically in the last five years, and that many people may happily embrace greater growth and be willing to accept the consequences. If that is true I am willing to accept that view.

I do not intend to stymie the process, but to point out that I do not see any discussion around the cost/benefit analysis of some very substantial changes to our OCP. I have taken all the surveys and none provide any context or consequence for any of the issues. More along the lines of: Which would you rather lose? An ear? A toe? or A finger ? Or none of the above?

Please, let's step out of the echo chamber and get to the core of democracy. On the table are some rather dramatic changes to the nature of our OCP and the meaning of "Preserve and Protect". Changes that deserve deep, open debate, not patronising, single minded determinism.

Please include this note in the LTC agenda.

With Respect,

Gary McCollum