

**From:** Frances Hill [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, January 23, 2026 8:57 PM  
**To:** Islands2050  
**Cc:** HMA.Minister@gov.bc.ca; Rob.Botterell.MLA@leg.bc.ca  
**Subject:** Trust Policy Statement Draft

January 23, 2026

Dear Trust Council,

Re: Draft Trust Policy Statement

At a recent Trust meeting on Salt Spring Island, Laura Patrick asked for feedback on the TPS, and how it could be improved. I am quite concerned about this revised version and feel like it fails in many ways.

The draft TPS fails in its most important task to prioritize the preservation and protection of the natural environment and the unique amenities of the Trust islands—such as rural character. The current draft could allow inappropriate development that would, over time, erode the unique character and natural environment of these islands.

The word “environment” needs to be defined. The draft TPS had previously included a definition of environment but it was subsequently removed as being too broad in scope. A definition is still needed to make clear that the intention of the Trust Object was and still is largely focused on protecting the natural environment for the benefit of all British Columbians. Without clarity on the scope of the term, it is open to broad interpretation, potentially undermining the Act’s objective.

The draft TPS proposes to “*manage*” growth rather than “*limit*” it. The TPS needs a directive clearly directed at limiting growth. The natural environment and rural nature of the islands cannot continue if growth is not limited. The Trust was established in 1974 to protect against unrestrained growth and development.

A directive is needed that requires each island to produce a **Build-out Report** based on current zoning and a **Growth Limits Report** setting out with the level of population it can sustainably support. These reports are needed to enhance protection of limited resources such as freshwater, native ecosystems and each island’s rural character.

introductory text in the draft that states that directives “should” be followed “where possible”. The TPS has advisory and directive policies. Directives are mandatory policies. However, the draft TPS is ambiguous in that while directives use the term “must”, the draft states elsewhere that directives “should” be followed “where possible”. TPS directives need to be clearly mandatory; otherwise, they in essence become advisory policies. All bylaws and Official Community Plans must be consistent with the TPS directives, as required by the Trust Act, with no exceptions.

Identification of various ecosystems (forest, watershed, marine, etc.) is addressed in directives. However, the draft TPS does not include any specific direction on *how* they are to be protected. The directives should include requiring Development Permit Areas for that purpose. These DPAs have recently been successful in saving Baker Road Beach from development.

Density increases should only be granted for genuinely affordable and workforce housing, backed by binding housing agreements. These increases must be of a scale appropriate to each island and be contingent upon adequate sewage disposal capacity and sufficient water to serve both new and existing developments while protecting the natural environment.

The TPS should include directives that require that local knowledge be considered (along with other information) when measuring the condition of island water supplies, and that importing of water and the increased occurrence of salt water intrusion into wells be monitored and reported.

Climate change is only briefly addressed in the draft TPS. It should be a major focus as the Trust Area is and will continue to be significantly impacted by aspects such as sea level rise and erosion, diminishing freshwater resources and wildfire risk.

The TPS should include stronger policies and specific mention to protect rural character as an important amenity of the Trust islands. “Rural” is mentioned in only one directive requiring the identification and protection of rural roadways.

Unlike the current TPS, the draft includes little information in the introduction about the history and purpose of the Islands Trust. This information should be included as it is essential that the public understand the intention and value of the Trust Act.

Your work to update the TPS with respect to Reconciliation is well done, but I urge you to change the language around the key points mentioned above, in

order to preserve and protect these fragile islands and carry the legacy of the Trust into the next 50 years.

Sincerely,

Frances Hill