

2022 Election Questionnaire

	Candidate Name: BRETT SMYTH				
1.	Do you support waterfront owners having the legal right to protect their properties from erosion, as long as the requirements of Development Permit Area (DPA1) are met?				
	[*] Yes [] No				
	Comments: Such as Peter Kerr's project				
2.	During the OCP process, there has been discussion of the "Green Shores" approach to prevent erosion of the waterfront. While Green Shores may have value in certain favourable conditions, it is not technically or economically feasible on most waterfront properties in North Saanich. If Green Shores is included in the new OCP, will you commit to seeing it is presented as an option, rather than a requirement?				
	[*] Yes [] No				
Comments: Got to say, I always like options. Sort of takes away some of the Big stuff.					
3.	Currently almost all the residential properties on the waterfront in North Saanich are blanket zoned to a very restrictive M6, which we feel is unwarranted for certain properties in view of recent studies and mapping. Would you consider rezoning from M6 to a less restrictive M5 for waterfront properties which have moderate, low, or very low overall ecological rating as identified by up-to-date mapping?				
	[*] Yes [] No				
	Comments: A conditional "yes" because I would have to get a better understanding of the				

recent studies and mapping in relation to this.



4.	Waterfront owners feel the current OCP contains language that discourages development of any kind within the DPA1 15-meter setback. In keeping with the 2008 Marine Task Force Report recommendations, would you support more flexible language in the new OCP to allow for structures such as decks, docks, and seawalls, as long as such development would not cause environmental harm?					
	[*] Yes [] No					
	Comments: I am always interested in nuances. I would guess that an independent opinion would have to be considered. I will bet the costs of such would be expected to be borne by the property owner, knowing how the district conducts its business. How would the membership feel about that?					
5. Waterfront owners are concerned that DPA1 contains restrictions that are not only unfair to result in unintended consequences. For example, restrictions in the 15-meter setback lead a neglect and a buildup of combustible material creating a "wildfire fuse" along the waterfrow Would you support a change in OCP, zoning and bylaw language which allows for flexibit and supports the waterfront owner as wanting to be part of the solution of waterfront protection and not treated as part of the problem?						
	[*] Yes [] No					
	Comments: Language is so important and I always believe in some flexibility. I do think that the example is a bit poor and suggests that, maybe, folks who live on the waterfront do not care about their property. I know that not to be true! I know you want to be a part of the solution.					
6.	For nearly a decade, waterfront owners have been acutely aware of the potential impacts of sea level rise. Studies conducted by the District of North Saanich led to the development of two draft bylaws that would have negatively affected waterfront properties. Would you support having a higher order of government take the lead on this issue?					
	[*] Yes [] No					

Comments: I have never been too keen on this report and how it has such potentially punishing effects on waterfront property owners.



7.	If over the course of your term, Council considers adopting bylaws or changing any
	regulations or zoning requirements affecting waterfront properties, will you commit to
	ensuring that every waterfront owner is notified – individually – with a letter outlining the
	proposed changes and inviting participation in a true consultation process?

Γ	*1	Yes	Γ	No
1	· 1	1 5		LINU

Comments: Yes, of course! It would seem irresponsible and negligent not to do so. This would not be like a Development Variance Permit application where only properties within 50m are notified. Perhaps similarly any waterfront property within 50m of the waterfront should automatically be individually-notified. We could amend the bylaw, for crying out loud!