

From: Olaf [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, April 10, 2022 10:09 PM
To: Islands2050
Cc: 'Megan Hanacek'; 'Robert Preston'; Russ Hotsenpiller; [REDACTED]
Subject: Islands Trust 2050 Policy Input.April 2022docx
Attachments: Islands Trust 2050 Policy Input.April 2022docx.pdf

Attached as per the latest “ public Consultation” please find my input on Your 2050 Policy proposal.
Olaf Knezevic

RE; Islands Trust 2050 Policy Input.

April 10 2022

I have owned property on the Gulf Islands for over 40 years. I plan to leave the property for my daughter and her family to enjoy. I have taken care of the property and am leaving it in better condition than when I purchased it. I did not then need the Islands trust nor do I need the Islands Trust now or in the future to tell me how to use or care for my land.

The islands Trust has made it difficult and expensive for me to enjoy my property. The 2050 plan envisions jurisdiction creep that will significantly increase the needless Islands Trust Tax Burdon. The trust it seems wants to turn the trust area into a park. I do not want to live in a park. If they want to preserve and protect then do like the National Park Service has done, buy their own land and turn that into a park, not my property.

The Trust was formed to preserve the essence of the Gulf Islands. The National Park Service has done that with the formation of the Gulf Islands National Park. The Trust zoning authority could easily and more cost effectively be handled by the regional districts.

Clearly the Islands Trust is now redundant. The Islands Trust should be phased out not expanded as proposed in the 2050 plan.

A fiscally responsible 2050 plan would permit the Trust to phase out of our lives instead of growing cancerously beyond its mandate suffocating those it claims to serve with ever more costly and onerous studies and requirements.

The proposed 2050 plan claims a need to address issues such as housing, reconciliation, climate change, sea level rise agriculture, forestry, etc. all of which are outside their mandate and actively addressed by other more experienced and capable governmental departments and agencies. This duplication is not only redundant but arrogant in subtly saying the Trust thinks it will do better.

The following are unacceptable proposed requirements derived from the Trust insular thinking:

1. Pay for a permit to cut a tree on your own forested property.
2. Ban new docks on Islands. The trust has already prohibited docks and wharves on an Island that has no ferry service, Ruxton Island. This creates needless hardship for the residents and a needless barrier for the physically challenged and or elderly. Islands for the elite not the people?
3. The Trust wants control or input on Forestry matters when there is a whole ministry of forests to do just that. More duplication and extra cost.
4. Prohibition of desalination plants on Islands where the trust complains there is a shortage of drinking water. How does that help the water issue?
5. Dictating house size.
6. Stripping Private Property rights with ever increasing trumped up development permit areas.
8. Calling for agricultural and farming restrictions when we have a need to grow our food locally.
9. Requirement to address undefined and open ended issues such climate change, reconciliation etc.

I suggest the proposed 2050 revision be torn up and replaced with a policy to phase out the Trust and let its zoning responsibility be replaced by the regional districts.

Olaf Knezevic



Vancouver B.C

V6N 3L6