



## 2022 Election Questionnaire

Candidate Name: Peter Jones

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:

100% agree, it is imperative that waterfront owners have legal right as they want to protect their investment in their land and homes, this includes erosion of their waterfront. Obviously, waterfront owners will need to work with, and assist municipality, province, and federal government. Where disagreement with legislation and/or regulations occur, I expect waterfront owners to be active in “lobbying” levels of government so their voices can be heard and effect appropriate change.

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:

I have worked on “Green Shores” since it became “popular” for major clients on Port of Vancouver land on the Burrard Inlet, Fraser River just past Patullo Bridge, and Roberts Bank – “Green Shores” simply was and is not useful.

Locally “Green Shores” is applying a cookie cutter style approach of points/ranking that simply does not recognise the differences of shoreline at Finlayson Arm (Saanich Inlet), Satellite Channel, and East side of North Saanich.

District of North Saanich is again undertaking a top down rather than a bottom up. Top down is District using consultants, including “Green Shores”, bottom up are the waterfront owners.

Waterfront owners and First Nations know what works, they must be listened too, consulted, and be part of the solution. Again, District has ignored residents. “Green Shore” is



## Property Responsibility On the Waterfront

appropriate but again its application for North Saanich is good product wrong location aka proposed OCP.

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:

M6 is appropriate for commercial operations. Example, whilst not in North Saanich, is Brentwood Lodge, and more local business at Blue Heron Basin and around Canoe Bay. Water lot residential zoning is more appropriate as M5.

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:

Flexible language is needed and will require coordination with “armoring” shoreline from global warming. Any changes to OCP and any bylaws must be after discussions with waterfront owners – they know where they live.

For me there are two considerations when changes must be made: firstly, high watermark and shore, secondly high high watermark. Waterfront owners almost always have property rights from high watermark upland (Riparian) and no property rights, other than certain Federal and Provincial leases, shoreline to deep water (littoral). No one should have the right to arbitrarily trespass on property that is riparian without first being consulted and all alternatives discussed.

In the last 22 years my business partner and I have been consulted on riparian and littoral rights for large clients on Burrard Inlet and Fraser River, to a smaller extent, Roberts Bank.



## Property Responsibility On the Waterfront

Decks, docks, seawalls from high water mark continues to be in conflict as frequently what waterfront owners desire. Key issue is grandfathering and new docks and piers. It is very difficult to obtain leases for new docks and piers – this is a complex issue and voluminous to discuss in this response.

Of note is 9 months ago my business partner and I were asked by the Provincial Government Ministry of Finance to undertake identification of all docks and piers on tidal water and still water in BC. The province has received reports written by Dr. Stan Hamilton of Saunderson School of Business at UBC and a second, more recent, report by Ian Carmichael private consultant.

My Business partner and I turned down the contract. The intent of the contract was to identify and value for lease and property tax purposes of all docks and piers that are provincial jurisdiction. My business partner and I undertook the same report on tidal waters for the Federal Government approx. 15 years ago. Result will be higher lease rates and property tax for waterfront owners.

5. Waterfront owners are concerned that DPA1 contains restrictions that are not only unfair but result in unintended consequences. For example, restrictions in the 15-meter setback lead to neglect and a buildup of combustible material creating a “wildfire fuse” along the waterfront. Would you support a change in OCP, zoning and bylaw language which allows for flexibility 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:

Fully agree; for waterfront owners’ pride of ownership and reasonable/knowledgeable control of their property will result in owners maintain their property, not only for neglect but also to protect from water and fire.

Update of current OCP to reflect today must include zoning and bylaw flexibility with input at all stages of OCP development those who the finish product reflects. Current proposed OCP is again top down with Vancouver consultants telling us what we need, must be bottom up with affected residents and local expertise being the driving force for an OCP that we can be proud of.

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



Property Responsibility On the Waterfront

support having a higher order of government take the lead on this issue?

Yes             No

Comments:

Sea level rise will affect the World, Canada, BC, and will particularly affect waterfront owners in BC. Decisions that affect North Saanich land and improvements must be collaborative with residents, province, and Federal Government.

Right now, effect of sea level rise is an educated guess. High and high high water level mark will change. We need any District bylaw to reflect and follow discussions with waterfront owners as these owners are at the forefront of changes as waterfront owners will be first to see and manage changes.

We need Federal Government and Province of BC to be actively involved and be parents of legislation, regulation, bylaws as an ad hoc approach by each municipality is a recipe for disaster.

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?

Yes             No

Comments:

As Mayor I will consult with waterfront owners on any and all proposed changes to zoning and resulting bylaws; this will be from inception to enactment – we must have an open and resident informed Mayor and Council.