

Farm Plan Implementation Project

i have followed the farm plan for 7-8 yrs and it appears to me that the implementation project has now misstepped in many areas. We need to get this right, not just get it done.

One way to do that is to remove reference to cannabis from the definition of intensive agriculture at this time, thus relieving the Farm Plan of what has been referred to as a time sensitive time line and allow community engagement on the subject of regulated cannabis. It is not the community's fault we have not had the adult conversation about cannabis regulation but I believe the farm plan needs to stand on its own for consideration and refinement with no 'time sensitive' pressure. There is a perception that there could not be a more inconvenient time for input to the Farm Plan Implementation than peak growing season

The first round of referrals on the proposed bylaws contained the following synthesis and also had not yet seen changes to 'intensive agriculture' that would in March 2018 see cannabis added to that definition. But yet the subject of limiting agriculture on the small lots was present in the development of proposed bylaws. A trustee and a planner have recently stated that this concept was originally about cannabis production which was evident except for any mention of cannabis.

\* ATTACHMENT # – SYNTHESIS OF REFERRAL RESPONSES

Nov 14 2017

23.2 Add Land Use Bylaw provisions for subsistence and/or limited agriculture (growing crops or raising livestock accessory to a principle residential use)

Both the current Land Use Bylaw definition and proposed definition are very liberal in terms of what may be deemed "agriculture".

Should the intent be to not liberally permit "farm businesses" in residential zones as under the Right to Farm Act, staff recommend that provisions be added to the Land Use Bylaw to distinguish the type of agricultural uses permitted in residential zones.

Provisions for limited agriculture could include thresholds for livestock or poultry (e.g. number of chickens or gross weight of livestock).

The clarification document distributed to the APC in June 2018 and now available to the community discusses the quandary of anonymous and privacy protected complaints having weight in the approach to small lot permissions and I would like to state that prohibition era has fostered a unbalanced power that has allowed baseless claims to be presented as facts and Stigma has made it difficult to publicly address these legends. I have seen this my entire adult life and feel we need to move forward from the concept of illegal spurious activity to regulated and respected activity. The complaints that I have seen documented can be dispelled due to lack of factual evidence and when that is done all that is left is "i don't like it" which should never be considered the basis of regulation.

I would like to see community discussion on cannabis take place publicly where anonymous opinion has no place. Only then can we speak to the facts and resolve speculation.

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]. i have never seen any damage or danger associated with cannabis that was not a direct result of prohibition.

In May 2018 i questioned where the basis for the new definition of intensive agriculture came from. I would contend that it is entirely from the LTC making this decision in an echo chamber and there is no evidence that the referrals at this point supported this.

May 1 2018

\*The proposed definition of "intensive agriculture" includes cannabis production, except to the extent the use is carried out solely for domestic purposes. What is the source of this additional language?  
o The basis of the definition of intensive agriculture is from the Ministry of

Agriculture and the addition of cannabis production to the definition

Page 2  
T. Wanner

was at the request of the LTC who asked that it be added if possible to clarify that zones R1, R2, and R3 are not currently intended for intensive agriculture including intensive cannabis production.

From Jan 2016 when cannabis was placed under the farm plan implementation project, 3 different staff reports and reports of staff advice to the LTC recommended the first step would be to engage the community on the topic of cannabis.

\*guessing Dec. of 2015

published local article after 3 months of attempts to craft a bylaw that was biased, informed by minimal comprehension, and responding to unsubstantiated claims.

\*“At about the time you’re reading this, the DILTC will be considering a staff report outlining options for creating a bylaw amendment to limit marijuana production based on the scale of operation (by number of plants) and zoning. I can’t predict what direction we will decide to move towards, but I encourage you to watch your Grapevine for a meeting report by Trustee Critchley. As the discussion moves towards a decision, we will schedule and advertise opportunities for public input. “

\*more recently a Trustee stated that she thought at the time putting the subject into the Farm Plan would allow the community to engage on the topic.

But yet from Jan 2016 to spring of this year (2018), the minutes do not mention the word cannabis but 2 times. One of which was a standalone statement in the minutes that the proper terminology should be cannabis not marihuana, the other being a comment from a trustee report on ‘old school open house session’ logging a discussion on cannabis with a member of the community. There is a third example from the fall of 2017 that I cannot lay my hands on but I believe it was a statement of concern about the permissions of farm gate sales and cannabis I believe it was Drew Miles who stated it for the record.

This has not been a community discussion.

Let's now engage on Denman Island and Regulated Cannabis as a deservingly separate issue from the Farm Plan Implementation Project within the context of Federal Provincial and Municipal responsibilities and taking into account accommodation instead of fear mongering and preconceived prohibition notions.

*T. Wenner*

