

From: Frants Attorp [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, October 9, 2025 3:05 PM
To: Chris Hutton
Cc: Stefan Cermak; SSInfo; Bill Henderson
Subject: Re: We need a full community discussion about your plans

Mr. Hutton, I find your answers rather disturbing.

a) You give no assurance that the Gaps Analysis will not do exactly as I described, but promise, rather, to “include” my email “with correspondence received during the community visioning engagement.” This is very puzzling given that you are the one who set the terms of reference for the gaps analysis and included it in the consultant’s contract. I would like my concerns addressed by the independent planner responsible, not just flagged as correspondence for the LTC.

b) I do not feel it is fair to exclude all comments received outside the public engagement period. The (latest) OCP-LUB amendment project was officially announced by Trustee Patrick in May 2024, but the Housing Action Program was actually launched in 2021 with the intended goal of a major OCP-LUB amendment. Along the way there have been several events including aborted Bylaw 530 whose basic concept still forms part of the recommendations in two guiding documents. Excluding all input from those who took time to write previously shows disrespect for their efforts, and seems like an attempt to wear down a public already suffering from planning fatigue.

c) I and many others do not want to participate in the consultant’s survey as it is clearly skewed to sideline the Islands Trust. One of many examples is that it does not even start with basic information about the Islands Trust’s purpose and vision. As a consequence, all the questions that follow are not presented in the context of a protected area. I note this is not the first time you have cut the Islands Trust out of the picture: it also happened with the Complete Communities Assessment. Imagine the Town of Banff planning for the future without first framing the whole exercise in the Parks Canada context.

d) The skewed OCP survey would not have been possible if you and other Trust planners did not buy into the whole idea of a “targeted housing update” that is actually a full review in disguise. (See my September 9th “Flawed Process” article on the Salt

Re: We need a full community discussion about your plans

Spring Exchange.) Why else would you use words like “major amendment” and “will guide residential growth and change on Salt Spring Island over the next decade or more.” This is about much more than housing! All your planning documents show a clear intent to restrict and control public input on matters that should be wide open for discussion—topics such as growth, sustainability, climate change and preservation of rural character (i.e. the main focus of the Islands Trust Act). Your own words belie the true nature of this whole process, and I’m wondering how you and other professional planners can justify your involvement. It all seems so very wrong.

I look forward to your response to my questions and concerns.

Frants Attorp

On Thu, 9 Oct 2025 at 14:06, Chris Hutton <chutton@islandstrust.bc.ca> wrote:

Comments received outside of a public engagement period are not considered when we share what we heard in a specific engagement. If Mr. Henderson feels that his input is relevant, he should resend it to ssiinfo@islandstrust.bc.ca.

We do, however, file all correspondence received during the project in a general correspondence file.

Sincerely,

Chris Hutton, MPA, MCIP, RPP

Regional Planning Manager

Islands Trust | 250-538-5608

Re: We need a full community discussion about your plans

The Salt Spring Island Islands Trust office at 500 lower Ganges Rd is now closed to in-person service. Islands Trust staff will continue to provide services by phone and e-mail until the new office space at 121 McPhillips Avenue opens. During the in-person office closure period, enquiries can be submitted by email at ssiinfo@islandstrust.bc.ca, or call 250.537.9144.

From: Frants Attorp [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, October 8, 2025 7:31 AM
To: Chris Hutton <chutton@islandstrust.bc.ca>
Cc: Stefan Cermak <scermak@islandstrust.bc.ca>; SSIInfo <ssiinfo@islandstrust.bc.ca>; Bill Henderson <bill@gonegonegone.com>
Subject: Fwd: We need a full community discussion about your plans

Good morning, Mr. Hutton. I know that many messages regarding the OCP-LUB amendment project were sent to the Local Trust Committee before the official consultant-led public engagement period began. Here is one such message from island resident Bill Henderson. Have those comments been saved in a separate file and will they be shared with the project consultant and incorporated into his report summarizing public input for Phase 1?

I am copying this message to Bill Henderson so he can stay informed about the handling of his important input regarding the future of this island.

Regards,

Frants Attorp

Salt Spring

Re: We need a full community discussion about your plans

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

From: [REDACTED]
Date: Thu, 12 Dec 2024 at 17:40
Subject: We need a full community discussion about your plans
To: ssiinfo@islandstrust.bc.ca <ssiinfo@islandstrust.bc.ca>
Cc: Frants Attorp [REDACTED]

Ladies and gentlemen of the Islands Trust,

I am writing to urgently request that a full community discussion take place about:

- 1) growth on Salt Spring Island,
- 2) sustainability on Salt Spring Island and,
- 3) the mistaken belief that an unregulated market can somehow solve Salt Spring Island's housing problem.

This full community discussion, should be convened by the Islands Trust and take place before you/we go another step towards making changes to our Official Community Plan.

Thank you

Re: We need a full community discussion about your plans

Yours truly,

Bill Henderson C.M.



Re: We need a full community discussion about your plans