

RE: Bylaws 228 + 229

While developing low-impact bylaws that improve the capability of farmers and residents to produce food for our community is an excellent idea, these bylaws seem only to exploit the island and its resources for tourism and development. Having in-house B&B's on agricultural land could be a way to have a bit of extra money. However, even B&Bs are a lot of work and this takes away time from actual farming. Running a tourism operation for up to 3 units is huge. This level of Agro-tourism could change Denman's agricultural production from small-scale produce to increased commodities for tourists. The increased demand for water, traffic and use of all facilities would also change the island. If studies showed that a certain area could sustain this level of tourist development then spot zoning could be used but a blanket bylaw such as this is irresponsible!

The current level of environmental disturbance is already impacting most species, many of which have disappeared from other settled parts of their ranges and reside in reasonable abundance only in these little rural protected pockets. We have species that are increasingly rare not only in BC but in all of Canada. Has there been an environmental impact assessment of these bylaws on our critical "species at risk". We are an "Environmental Trust" – special in this province and indeed in Canada – surely that makes us "different" from other areas and thus the Trust governance needs to be responsible for developing our own environmentally sensitive bylaws for agricultural use and other practices.

From the 1960's, key global issues have been human over-population, widespread destructive agricultural practices and rapidly increasing environmental damage. Working internationally was a heartache! So coming home to work for a better way to live on the earth, to make a difference in one's own small community seemed the responsible thing to do. Over the years, Denman has resisted many assaults and limited some of the worldwide destructive impacts. But these bylaws only serve to dramatically change the tenuous protections we have previously had on population growth and environmental over-use and damage.

Yes there are huge human problems in the world. There are way too many of one species that consumes far more than it's share and leaves the thousands of other large species and millions of tiny species under ever-increasing stress. The overall problem as humans dominate the planet is that we need a healthy web of other species as well as abundant clean water, air and soil to continue to provide the necessary environmental services into the future. We do not have the right to exploit it all now. If we want to really help disenfranchised humans, each of us can start by reducing our consumption by at least ½ and by sharing what we have instead of always trying to make more \$ and have more luxurious things, both of which come at the expense of other humans as well as the environment.

I oppose these bylaws. Surely any proposed agricultural development would need at the very least to be accompanied by a complete water study! Thus I insist that before the Trust considers agricultural changes, a thorough analysis of the islands' fresh water, both surface and ground water be undertaken. Also, to understand the impact of development, any proposal to increase human populations on the island, such as with these bylaws, needs to be accompanied by 5 and 10 year human population predictions and the accompanying predictions of the resultant demands on each of the islands' finite resources in both summer and winter.

Sorry to be preachy but these Bylaws are extremely problematic.

Jennifer Balke, [REDACTED]

Aug 2/18