

**From:** Joseph Fall [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, September 18, 2020 2:57 PM  
**To:** northinfo  
**Cc:** Lasqueti Island Local Trust Committee; Colin JE  
**Subject:** Comments on Lasqueti OCP draft objectives

For Heather Kauer.

Hi Heather,

I reviewed the latest draft Lasqueti OCP objectives, and have a few comments and questions:

### **3.3. Community Stewardship**

#### **Resilience Objectives, Objective 2:**

""""

To support community-driven dispute resolution to handle concerns regarding bylaw non-compliance.

""""

An advocacy policy recommended to support this objective in included with the "General" Community Stewardship objectives (??)

""""

The Lasqueti Community Association is encouraged to develop methods for a community-driven dispute resolution process to handle concerns regarding bylaw non-compliance.

""""

#### **Comments:**

- developing an internal dispute resolution process is key to harmony in a small community where "help" from an external intervenor often creates additional friction and division.
- Is it possible to strengthen the language in this objective / policy -- e.g., to develop, pioneer, put into practice, utilize -- rather than simply "support" and "encourage"?

### **3.3. Community Stewardship**

#### **Economy Objectives, Objective 2:**

""""

To limit the impacts of tourism.

""""

#### **Comments:**

- the original proposal for this new objective included the words "*negative impacts*"
- it seems illogical and counter-productive for the OCP to imply that we would like to limit the positive impacts of tourism (e.g., a primary income source for residents and market vendors).
- can we add the word "negative" back in?

### **3.4. Community Services**

#### **Waste Management, Objective 5:**

""

To establish, modify, provide, and withdraw services, including regional services only with full consultation of the community.

""

#### **Comments:**

- I suspect a missing comma here creates ambiguity, try:

"To establish, modify, provide, and withdraw services, including regional services, only with full consultation of the community."

- this objective seems like it should be a General objective -- does it really only apply to waste management? that would be odd.

### **3.4. Community Services**

#### **General Transportation Objectives, Objective 6:**

""

To support electric vehicle charging stations.

""

#### **Comments:**

- the original proposal for this policy was:

*"To support more bicycle infrastructure, such as shelters, electric charging stations, bike paths, etc."*

- as I recall, support for bike infrastructure, electric bike charging, and bike paths was strongly supported. Are these ideas captured elsewhere?

- electric vehicle charging stations are not useful for charging an electric bike - given the realities of Lasqueti, the later seems more feasible than the former. Did support for public electric bike charging stations get axed?

### **3.5. Land Use**

#### **Residential Land Use, Objective 4:**

""

To encourage the establishment of owner-operated, small-scale, low intensity home based enterprises that prioritize having minimal impacts on neighbours, shared infrastructure, and environment.

""

**Comments:**

- the qualifiers "small-scale" and "low intensity" are not defined, and subject to a wide variety of interpretation.
- the key objective, to my mind, is to "prioritize having minimal impacts on neighbours", etc.
- how can I know that my own home-based enterprise meets these definitions? Say it grows from a very small part-time endeavour into a 6-figure business with several casual sub-contractors (based on a real example). Is that still "small-scale" and "low intensity"? What if I open a branch office in Vancouver and, as CEO, run the company from home? Hopefully this illustrates the problematic nature of these qualifiers.
- why would we want to limit someone operating a home-based enterprise that becomes globally successful, if they can do so without negative impacts on their neighbours, etc.?? My guess is we don't actually intend to restrict a business from growing, we simply intend to limiting potential negative impacts from home-based businesses.
- I am worried about by-laws or by-law enforcement that was predicated on these vague terms -- seems like they could easily be used to make arbitrary assessments about the scale of someone's business, based on perception and bias rather than on an objective measure of any impacts that business is having on neighbours, etc..
- I'd be in favour of either further defining what we mean by these qualifiers or better yet, simply remove them in favour of stating clearly what our real objectives are (as the second part of this statement seems to do well).

thanks for considering.

Please feel free to contact me if I haven't made myself clear enough.

best wishes.

...Joseph Fall

Lasqueti Island, BC

V0R 2J0