

**From:** lucich [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 22, 2022 12:06 PM  
**To:** Islands2050; Adam.Olsen.MLA@leg.bc.ca; Laura Patrick; Peter Luckham;  
Peter Grove  
**Subject:** submission re TPS  
**Attachments:** TPS 2050.odt

To Whom it May Concern,

Please find attached our submission in opposition to the draft Trust Policy Statement.

Mark and Julia Lucich

Re: Islands 2050

Submission in opposition to the draft Trust Policy Statement

We are long time residents of Salt Spring Island and have numerous and serious concerns about the proposed 35 page long Trust Policy Statement.

Approaching this with a broad brush:

- This TPS appeared out of nowhere. Certainly, it wasn't from community initiative and, from our perspective, it remains largely unfamiliar to many islanders. Although it has been posted on the Trust website, the notion that we each routinely access that source is a myth promulgated by those for whom the Trust is the centre of the universe. That it was allowed to proceed to first reading absent genuine public consultation is disrespectful of the Trust's constituents and of the democratic process.
- There is a “one size fits all” approach which is contrary to local needs and/or determinations. The demand that an island like Thetis, with population of less than 400 residents, shall provide detailed planning to address “long term needs for educational, institutional, community, and health-related facilities and services, as well as cultural and recreational facilities and services” [6.1.17] is ludicrous.
- In a nutshell, the TPS is an exercise in “mission creep” and governance redundancy. It creates a false expectation that the Islands Trust is able to address an array of issues (e.g., affordable housing) for which it has neither the mandate nor the ability to achieve, while at the same time attempting to regulate matters (e.g., forestry, farming) already within the jurisdiction of other branches of government.
- The TPS fosters a regulatory environment couched in subjectivity and ambiguity. What is meant by “small” or “compact”? Who will determine what is considered “sustainable”?
- The TPS is riddled with contradictions and inconsistencies:
  1. On the one hand, there is repeated reference to the islands being/remaining “rural”, yet the attempt at regulatory micro-management is more akin to a suburban HOA.
  2. How does one reconcile prioritizing food security while making it difficult to clear land of trees in order to farm?
  3. The need for affordable housing is identified as a priority, but the layers upon layers of new regulations and their attendant costs (an array of consultants) have the opposite result. Add to that the uncertainties created by subjective criteria will leave a playing field that only the wealthy will be willing to approach. The outcome of this TPS will be communities of exclusivity, not diversity.

There should be no attempt to “tweak” this document. It should be abandoned in its entirety.

Mark and Julia Lucich

cc: MLA Adam Olsen