

From: Nora Layard [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 22, 2026 8:22 PM
To: Islands2050
Cc: Rbotterell@botterell.ca; HMA.Minister@gov.bc.ca; [REDACTED]
Subject: Islands Trust Policy Statement

I just read, with interest, the draft Islands Trust Policy Statement. It is reassuring to see that the original mandate of the Islands Trust (IT) remains intact, and that there are many good measures to carry out this mandate.

There are points that concern me.

You use the term “directives”. How enforceable is a directive? Are they mandatory? If not, are they open to interpretation by each Island? What can you do to strengthen this wording and intent?

The policy statement would be greatly improved by including a preface that describes the unique natural environment here. Most people have no idea how rare and threatened is our ecosystem. Nor do most people understand that our very lives depend on our natural world’s “services” for us.

3.4.1

The deletion of the following concerns me (in yellow). Any future development needs to be compact – as in clustered, not spread out across the island. But this needs further clarification to ensure that developments are carefully planned and very few in number to prevent loss of environmental considerations.

Sustainable Development

Consider site capabilities, environmental and protected areas, and existing development patterns when determining the land use designation and appropriate locations and intensities of various uses of the land.

DELETED: WHY? Ensure development is compact, energy-efficient, and appropriately situated on the island and on the site in order to:

- reduce dependency on private automobile use, and support increased use of trail systems, public transportation, and active transportation
- be compatible with preservation and protection of the Trust Area and its unique amenities and environment, and limit impacts on Indigenous cultural heritage, harvesting and hunting areas.

3.4.2 Density Limits

The following is very tricky, but we need to come to grips with how many is too many. Density limits seem like the best approach to curb unwarranted development. I use “unwarranted” cautiously but with intent – why do we think it’s appropriate to agree to development on the basis of profit to developers? Especially in the face of lack of/inappropriate housing for so many.

DELETED: WHY? Establish appropriate density limits for efficient and sustainable use of the land base that help to safeguard protected area networks, and is compatible with preservation and protection of the Trust Area and its unique amenities and Environment. Why was this replaced with:

Manage community growth and its associated impacts by directing residential and mixed use development into appropriate locations, to prevent sprawl and relieve growth pressures in the surrounding rural areas, and to help safeguard protected area networks.

Areas that are missing or inadequately addressed:

- climate change – this should have an objective and associated directives. This is a huge omission.
- wetlands – these are critical to ecosystem protection, and they need a separate section.
- affordable Housing for the entire spectrum of islanders is a crisis, at least here on Salt Spring. Please strengthen all parts of the policy to require that this be a priority, and that long-term/always agreements are required (a directive) to this end.

This policy statement is deeply important and will require further explanation through bylaws and good decisions. It needs to be robust enough to ensure that all trustees and Trust staff are guided by its intent.

With regards,
Nora Layard

[Redacted signature]