

Policy Statement Amendment Project (PSAP)

Consolidated Feedback from Trustees

January 2021

The following feedback was received from trustees in response to a Trust Programs Committee (TPC) request for feedback on three questions pertaining to the Policy Statement Amendment Project.

Q1. How would you define the “unique amenities” that are to be preserved and protected in the Islands Trust Area?

<u>TRUSTEE & LTC/IM</u>	<u>FEEDBACK</u>
<p>Alex Allen, Hornby Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>To me, “amenities” was a polite term for working hot water, decent plumbing, and maybe room service.</p> <p>In <i>The Concise Oxford English Dictionary</i>, amenities is defined as “pleasantness (of places, persons, etc.); (pl) pleasant ways.” Personally, the word “pleasant” has as much cachet as the word “interesting.” Neither instill confidence or enthusiasm.</p> <p>So I went back and leafed through the history and reality of Islands Trust. From the preface of the book, <i>Islands in Trust</i>:</p> <p><i>“The beauty and tranquility, small rural communities, and unique natural environment make the islands of Georgia Strait* and Howe Sound an area of national significance.”</i> [* Ever thought that in actual fact it’s not Gulf Islanders, but Strait Islanders?]</p> <p>From the foreword:</p> <p><i>“...how [can] we...effectively spread the word about the islands, their fragile beauty, their recreational potential, and their susceptibility to over development and resource extraction...”</i></p> <p><i>“...fragile ecosystems and places of rare beauty...afford a level of protection that will assure their natural values remain intact for future generations to enjoy. There is also a growing awareness that ecosystems and non-human life forms have a right to survival.”</i></p>

	<p><i>“...retreats of breathtaking beauty and rural serenity...scattered in the protected waters of an inland sea...The sea isolates and insulates; it makes us what we are.”</i></p> <p>So, there you have it, all of the above. Poetic, indeed. If I had to put it into three words or less, I’d be challenged even as a closet wordsmith. Here’s a go, “our fragile ecosystems and hippies.” Like the goats on the roof in Coombs.</p> <p>We all moved to the islands, I would think for very similar reasons. As Sharon Ann Weaver wrote in her 2013 Doctor of Philosophy in History Thesis, <i>Making Place on the Canadian Periphery: Back-to-the-Land on the Gulf Islands and Cape Breton</i>:</p> <p>“The growing disquietude over the pace and direction of urban society, where unchecked growth reigned over the environment, caused many who had grown up in North American cities to question this fundamental disregard for the quality of air, water and land.”</p> <p>“However, although people revered the tree, they also wanted light, which required a choice and a recognition that they were of necessity actively involved in shaping their environment.”</p>
<p>Benjamin McConchie, North Pender Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>Nature. First Nations Historical Sites</p>
<p>Cameron Thorn, South Pender Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>My approach to defining “unique amenities” is to reflect upon the intentions of the drafters of the Islands Trust Act when this legislation was created in 1974. As correctly noted on the Islands Trust website under legislative history, the intent of the Act was to control unbridled development. Specifically in 1974 “The Province recognizes the Gulf Islands as a unique area threatened by over-development and establishes the Island Trust. The Islands Trust Act solidified the Province’s mandate to preserve and protect the environment and unique nature of the islands.”</p> <p>The above statement in my view, succinctly summarizes the “unique amenities” - that is, the environment and unique nature of the islands - that are to be preserved and protected. With the greatest of respect to my fellow trustees who have taken an expansionist view of “unique amenities” I don’t believe unique amenities includes the preservations and protection of a “socially diverse local population” or communities or subsets thereof.</p>

<p>Dan Rogers, Gambier Island Local Trustee (Keats Island)</p>	<p>I find the focus on the phrase “unique amenities” unfortunate and frankly, it leads to a misinterpretation of section 3 of the Act. I am of the view that any understanding of the breadth of s. 3 of the Act must consider the complete phrase to “preserve and protect the Trust Area and its unique amenities and environment...”</p> <p>Having said that, unique amenities refers to something other than the environment as that is mentioned separately. It is the <i>characteristics</i> of the Trust Area. The people, the culture, the heritage and the communities. It is how they have developed because they are surrounded by water and thus accessible only by water.</p>
<p>David Critchley, Denman Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>In my view “unique amenities” in the context of the Islands Trust Act means special features or attributes of the trust area that have value such that they merit protection and preservation. An amenity is generally something of use or benefit to human beings. The use could be aesthetic, recreational, historical or practical. Examples would be: a view-scape, a lake, a herring spawning area, an old growth forest, pictographs, ancient burial sites, a gravel pit, an historic building.</p> <p>The word unique suggests that the amenities should be of a kind that is not found outside the trust area. However, I do not favour a strict interpretation of that or else the protective mandate would be unduly restricted. For example, St. Mary Lake on Salt Spring Island is undoubtedly an amenity to be protected. It could be said that there are many lakes outside the trust area and therefore lakes are generally not unique. However, the nature of the lake, it’s location on an island and its relationship to the local ecosystem all contribute to establishing uniqueness.</p> <p>Most islanders appear to strongly value peace and quiet and this aspect of the trust area environment could rightly be considered an amenity as could the night sky. These qualities are becoming increasingly rare in urban life and therefore take on an aspect of uniqueness in the trust area.</p>
<p>David Maude, Mayne Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>How would I define the “unique amenities”? I believe the historic point in time dates to the inception of the Trust in the 1970’s, so the “unique amenities” referred to date to that point in time. At that time the islands were rural in nature, pushing back on the pressures of development. I would define those amenities as rural, self sufficient communities that worked in a careful, sustainable balance with the natural environment.</p> <p>I recognize there are many interpretations on this question and it perhaps would be nice if the Province was to provide a proper definition of the “unique amenities” so broadly spoken of.</p>

<p>Deb Morrison, North Pender Island Local Trustee</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - environment and natural resources - sustainable cultural histories in the islands - not colonial history (not unique) though it may include some settler colonial peoples activities who have learned how to live sustainably in the region eg. Conservancies
<p>Doug Fenton, Thetis Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>Land, air, water and marine environments, <i>Inextricable connected...i.e.</i>, literally for humanity to survive, it must learn to live within the constraints of nature. I would argue going forward; this is not an option; it's an imperative.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Love and respect for animate and inanimate objects; • Ecological communities all around us: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o e.g. Arbutus, Coastal Douglas fir, salal, Oregon grape, mosses; o All of the species of the terrestrial and marine wildlife that live among these communities; o We must find a way to slow down and see, hear and smell not the roses from a flower shop, but the Baldhip and Nootka roses along our coastlines; <p>What I would like to cherish is the unique opportunity to live & share among our First Nations people as they steward the Trust Area's land and seas. Instead, I am almost panicked to think that this may be a missed opportunity for my generation.</p>
<p>Grant Scott, Hornby Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>No response received.</p>
<p>Jane Wolverton, Galiano Island Local Trustee</p>	<p><i>Submitted jointly with Tahirih Rockafella</i></p> <p>We both felt that the “unique amenities” to be preserved and protected fall into three areas.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The Indigenous Cultural Heritage that includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Former village and food gathering sites – Unlike in other communities where most human remains are confined to cemeteries, we live where the remains of the people who have been here from time immemorial are located throughout the environment. This requires a very special and sensitive approach to preserving and protecting. It also requires of Trustees to help island residents understand this responsibility that we all carry. ▪ Opportunities to learn from Community Knowledge Holders especially about protection of the environment b. The Natural Environment that includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The physical environment of plants, trees, birds and animals – both land and marine

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The darkness on moonless nights – the absence of light pollution - seeing the Milky Way ▪ The bright moon on moonlit nights ▪ The quiet ▪ Lands for growing and foraging ▪ The approximately 20% of public and/or protected lands on Galiano to walk and hike in <p>c. The Community</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The sense of belonging – especially for marginalised people – being noticed and seen ▪ The interdependence, cohesiveness and resilience - the sharing of skills and money ▪ Freedom and safety - to be able to walk and be anywhere on the island without fear ▪ The large percentage of volunteers among islanders ▪ The sharing of food ▪ The way islanders mobilised during the pandemic to deliver food, check on people, pick up medicines in Sidney, etc. ▪ The sharing economy as represented by Galiano Buy, Sell and Share Facebook page ▪ A diverse population- the way in which the eccentric and quirky are accepted ▪ The contributions of iNaturalist citizen science <p>May Sarton’s poem “On Sark” contains lines that describe islanders:</p> <p><i>“The isle is for islanders, some born - They like being surrounded by And anchored in the ever-changing sea, For it is just this being enclosed In a small space within a huge space That makes them feel both safe and free...”</i></p> <p><i>Islands are for people who are islands, Who have always been detached from the main For a purpose, or because they crave The free within the framed as poets do, The solitary for whom being alone Is not a loneliness but fertile good....”</i></p>
<p>Jeanine Dodds, Mayne Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>The unique amenities are the waters that surround us and isolate us, the mild climate that creates a lifestyle without harsh hardships, a pioneer spirit that the isolation and natural landscapes enhance. I believe our unique amenities</p>

	<p>are the human spirit that thrives within this area as it has since the first peoples arrived some 3000 years ago. An independent spirit and need for community cooperation in a location that is not readily accessible to all thereby creating many challenges, that defines the unique amenities that existed in 1974 and long before the Islands Trust.</p>
<p>Kate-Louise Stamford, Gambier Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>To me “Unique Amenities” means what informs the island way of life whether it be the specific history, ecological structure, or community make-up, and what is required to maintain that vision within the confines of a specific landmass bounded by the marine. For instance, on this island, the lack of a vehicle ferry defines the community but also requires more focus on the impacts of private and community docks both on the environment and the culture of the island.</p>
<p>Kees Langereis, Gabriola Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>I believe the phrase “unique amenities” refers to the characteristics of the Trust Area such as its geographical, ecological and environmental aspects, cultural aspects and location all of which individually, and in combination with each other, create an overall atmosphere people find pleasing, attractive and feel drawn to.</p> <p><u>Rationale:</u> The phrase is used in legislation and as such each word used is intended to bring meaning¹ to the purpose of the legislation. Therefore, if the modifier “unique” had not been added, the catchment of the word “amenities” would be broader. Consider when we refer to a “car” or a “red car”. A “car” is a broad term capturing, in the usual sense of the word, all vehicles, including a “red car”, but a “red car” captures only a particular subset of “cars”. To understand what the phrase “unique amenities” refers to we need to consider the import of the word “unique” to the meaning of amenities. The term “amenity”, as found on the internet, can refer to: a desirable or useful feature of a building or place, something that provides comfort, convenience, or enjoyment, the quality of being pleasing or agreeable in situation, pleasantness or an atmosphere. Atmosphere is used here in the sense of an experience or feeling experienced by people.</p> <p>Amenities may include human made amenities such as community centres, internet service, garbage collection, housing, etc. It could also include an area with an attractive or pleasing setting or atmosphere.</p> <p>The adjective “unique” refers to concepts of “being the only one”, “being without a like or equal”, “distinctively characteristic”, or “unusual”. Combining the adjective “unique” with the noun “amenity”, the phrase refers to something pleasing or attractive arising from it being distinctively</p>

¹ “...every word and provision found in a statute is supposed to have a meaning and function.” Source: Ruth Sullivan, “Sullivan on the Construction of Statutes”, Canada: Lexis Nexis Canada Inc, 6th edition 2014, page 211

characteristic, rare and/or unusual.

The Trust Area has a number of characteristics such as its landforms (islands), ecology, First Nations historical connection and archaeological/cultural artifacts, ruralness (low human population), quietness, natural landscape less impacted by human development than urban areas, large tracts of forests including the rare and endangered CDF ecosystem, farms, seascapes, seashores, land and marine wildlife, dark nights, lack of extensive industrial activities, clean air, sense of “open space” and small closely knit communities. Individually, these characteristics are not necessarily “unique” as they may be found elsewhere. With respect to the Trust Area, the presence of the Coastal Douglas Fir ecosystem may be the exception as that ecosystem is small, rare and endangered.

So, if not any one characteristic of the Trust Area is “unique”, I believe the phrase is referring to the combination of these characteristics creating an area of characteristics both distinct and unusual generating an overall atmosphere people find pleasing, attractive and are drawn to. The Trust Area is surrounded by large urban/suburban settings and its location may also contribute to it being a “unique amenity”. In many ways, an oasis. People come here for many reasons including as a respite from city life, much like they are drawn to their urban parks. A park is a place to experience a healthier relatively unchanged ecological setting, a place to escape from hurry, noise, crowds, traffic, high density of housing and a steel/concrete dominated landscape.

Urban parks are a means to retain some measure of what existed prior to human disturbances of the natural environment. A reminder of what once was. The Trust Area is similar but with the capacity to have humans live within the area.

The goal of the Trust Object (preserve and protect) with respect to amenities is to retain that which people find pleasing about the Trust Area and why they may want to visit or live here. It’s about protecting and preserving those characteristics that contribute to and comprise the overall attraction of the Trust Area. This objective is a subjective perspective of the area but one that includes undertaking ecological protection measures to protect that perspective. The Trust Object also refers to preserving and protecting the “environment”, the physical setting of the area such as forests, marine and freshwater areas, topography, air etc. The environment is the land, air and water, soil, external factors etc surrounding and supporting (or not) the ecological health of the area.

The purpose of the ITA, as indicated in Hansard debates on its introduction and government reports in the 1970s, was to respond to overdevelopment and population growth potentially damaging the Trust Area’s inherent beauty and ecosystem.

	<p>Consistent with this purpose, one of the principles in the Islands Trust Policy Statement states that the rate and scale of growth and development in the Trust Area must be carefully managed and may require limitation. The Policy Statement also describes the Islands Trust as having a special conservation-oriented responsibility.</p> <p>The current policies of the Islands Trust direct us to limit the impacts of human activity on the Trust Area’s ecology and environment. Human habitation is part of the Trust Area, but the focus is the degree to which human activity negatively impacts the Area’s ecosystem and environment. It is about people living in the area in such a way that the health of the ecosystem is sustained and the area’s inherent draw for people is retained.</p> <p>The Trust Area is seen as worthy of special protection from excessive human disturbance.</p>
<p>Laura Busheikin, Denman Island Local Trustee</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Incredible and relatively unspoiled* natural beauty that provides us humans with a powerful sense of (re)connection to the natural world. Out of respect for this, and their place in it, residents develop, build, and live in harmony with natural systems and processes, in ways that support these. The natural splendour allows visitors to have meaningful, rejuvenating, healing and transformations experiences of nature. “Natural beauty” means, in particular, the forests, shorelines and viewscapes, but also, the smells, the tree frog song, the moss, the slugs, and above all, the relationships between all of these. (*Unspoiled here means still in a natural state—unpaved, quiet, muddy, dark at night, full of places with few visual reminders of settler human habitation—and intact, although I think really that applies only to special places in the Islands) 2. Rare and special ecosystems, including species at risk and the CDF forests—the Islands Trust Conservancy can describe this better than me. (#1 is the spiritual, cultural, psychological and poetic power of nature, as valued by humans; #2 is the actual physicality of it, as valuable to itself.) 3. A rich history of Indigenous occupation and stewardship, currently being rediscovered. There is , huge potential for preserving and celebrating that history, and for letting what we learn from it reshape human activity and culture on the islands, in ways that we perhaps can’t yet fully envision. This potential is an amenity. 4. Diverse and unique communities, with lots of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • artists, writers, crafters, musicians and other creative people; • people with rural living skills; farmers and people practicing various types of self-sufficiency;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • community engagement (politically, culturally, and socially; mutual aid; volunteerism) • support for alternative lifestyles of many kinds • environmental awareness, initiatives and actions. <p>The community is welcoming of visitors but in a low-key way (with limits on visitor services and entertainment facilities; modest accommodation that may often involve a level of “roughing it”; and less convenience than other popular places. These islands do <i>not</i> offer your average tourist experience.</p> <p>5. Nurture and support for innovative, sustainable ways for humans to live on the earth (alternative building and resource technology; innovative green planning approaches; alternative political, justice and social structures; intentional communities; low-impact living; slow everything; circular economies, and more).</p>
<p>Laura Patrick, Salt Spring Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>Harkening back to that stormy September 2019 day on Bowen Island, I ask you to recall the incredible rich conversation that was held about unique amenities. If I could sum up that conversation, I believe it discovered that the term “Unique Amenities” was indeed an important term and the definition is dependent on the audience, place and time – an important feature of a legislative object that allows it to remain relevant with the times.</p> <p>A dive into the various, and I dare say somewhat dated, agreements with other agencies, we can find various references to “unique amenities”, such as agricultural land, crown land, forest land reserves and even roads. Those references to unique amenities are found in various provincial agency agreements which can be found at:</p> <p>http://www.islandstrust.bc.ca/trust-council/cooperation-agreements/provincial/</p> <p>This is not an exhaustive search of all the agreements, but here are a few examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The Agricultural Land Reserve forms part of the unique amenities of the Trust area;” • “Aquatic Crown Lands in the Trust Area form part of the unique amenities of the Trust Area and require special attention to maintain their unique character” • “Forest Land Reserves form part of the unique amenities of the Trust Area” • “Roads in the Trust Area form part of the unique amenities of the Trust Area” <p>The Young Anderson legal opinion is consistent with my understanding, and reminds us that the Islands Trust object must be considered in its totality, not</p>

	<p>by individual words. However, as you have only asked about two words, here is my understanding:</p> <p>The term “unique amenities” refers to unique values whereas the term “environment” is the complex of physical, chemical, and biotic factors (such as climate, soil, and living things) that act upon an organism or an ecological community and ultimately determine its form and survival. Why would the authors of the Object say the same thing twice? Preserve and protect the unique environments and environment? Unique amenities can be translated into a more cultural, societal, recreational, spiritual, or other value of the Islands Trust area. It also means that defining unique amenities is dependent on the audience, place and time.</p>
<p>Lee Middleton, Saturna Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>Firstly the integrity and diversity of the ecosystem on the Islands, which includes the waters of the Local Trust Areas. Secondly, the pattern of historic human habitation in concert with the ecology of the area. This has archaeological aspects as well as aspects of current settlement. Settlement that strikes to live in harmony with the ecosystem which includes aspects of infrastructure, less paving, narrower roads and even hedgerows that have survived highway maintenance. Further small scale agriculture is a unique amenity that creates the landscape associated with the preserve and protect mandate however the preservation of remaining forest core is an important value that will need to be balanced with any future agricultural expansion.</p>
<p>Michael Kaile, Bowen Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>“Unique amenities” represent a number of characteristics found within the Trust Area. These include ecological and environmental elements, plus a life with culture and community readily available. However this term ends up in being described, boils down to the “reasons we moved here” and while there will be much found to be in common also just a little different in each case.</p>
<p>Paul Brent, Saturna Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>Unique is defined as “one of a kind” so a simplistic view would identify a single thing or attribute. But in my view there is no single thing unique about the Trust areas - there are lots of islands with similar environmental characteristics on the Pacific coast. And there are lots of small communities where rural character and community engagement are in abundance. So I and many on the island I represent and on those adjacent islands where I have involvement believe the unique amenities are those things that bind and support a community. Things like it’s resilience and it’s passion to protect its inhabitants and the environment they occupy. So it can be a community hall, a playground, affordable housing, bike & walking trails, a ritual like a lamb barbecue fundraiser for a local medical centre, an array of hydrophones to support the science to protect marine mammals and many other things that make an island unique.</p>

<p>Peter Grove, Salt Spring Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>What makes the area special including: location, environment, nature, communities, population density</p>
<p>Peter Johnston, Lasqueti Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>I would include in "unique amenities" all characteristics of our islands that contribute to making them the way they are. This starts with the fact that they are islands, surrounded by the Salish Sea, and that access to them is by boat or ferry, usually vehicle ferry for most major islands, but passenger-only ferry for others, and no public access service for many islands. Each island has its individual pre- and historical settlement and development history, and its own current community makeup and circumstance.</p>
<p>Peter Luckham, Thetis Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>First Nations Cultural Heritage, Viewscapes, Seascapes, the Natural environment, Silence, Fresh Air, The rain. Trees, flowers and animals. Lakes, ponds streams and rivers.</p>
<p>Scott Colbourne, Gabriola Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>No response received.</p>
<p>Steve Wright, South Pender Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>“Unique amenities” accurately describes the peaceful enjoyment of a place that people experience while in relatively undeveloped natural areas as opposed to what is found in surrounding urban areas. It is exactly these “unique amenities” that were the “valued attributes which were not to be compromised or destroyed”, which the legislature clearly expected the Trust to protect and, by being a public trust, trustees have a duty of care on behalf of residents and for those of the Province generally.</p>
<p>Sue Ellen Fast, Bowen Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>I would define unique amenities broadly, as Bill Buholzer described them. Certainly not restricted to environment, or the Object would not include the words “and environment”. To me “unique amenities” answers the question, "What is special about this place?"</p>
<p>Tahirih Rockafella, Galiano Island Local Trustee</p>	<p><i>Submitted jointly with Jane Wolverton (listed under Jane’s name)</i></p>
<p>Timothy Peterson, Lasqueti Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>I think the key to “unique amenities” is the word unique. From my perspective, this essentially excludes the built environment. Schools, community centers,</p>

	<p>art galleries, etc., certainly have much value within our communities, but I would argue that such structures do not constitute anything unique. Certain natural features of our islands, on the other hand, can be considered unique, in the sense that many cannot be replicated. Rock formations, waterfalls, bays, streams...these are what I think of as being unique amenities.</p>
--	--

Q2. How do you feel that Islands Trust ecosystem preservation and protection policies relate to policies primarily about community need? Please explain.

<u>TRUSTEE & LTC/IM</u>	<u>FEEDBACK</u>
<p>Alex Allen, Hornby Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>I had to read this question four times. I’m still not sure I know what the ask is.</p> <p>Here’s my take: As Island Trustees “preserve and protect” is our mantra. Everything we do is within that lens for the reasons noted above. But, of course, many in our communities have a different mantra.</p> <p>Those who remember how their islands used to be are the lucky ones. As Peter Murray wrote back in 1991, “...as the ferry drops another load of automobiles on our doorstep, how do you maintain that way of life when more and more people want to share it?” How could you not want to come and enjoy the most beautiful scenery and salubrious weather in Canada? And then tell 10 of your friends.</p> <p>On our island, we need year-round housing (rental not affordable). We also need to look at visitor capacity on our resources and illegal STVRs. I’d rather see an illegal dwelling than an STVR advertising year-round rentals like a hotel. So we have the STVRers on one side and others on the other side. An analogy would be at a campsite. There are those in a tent and those in a RV. The tenters don’t have anything against RVs, but if there are too many then it’s too much (especially the diesel fumes).</p> <p>I ask members of our community, What is our vision statement? Profit is life, tourists bring profit, therefore let us sacrifice everything to tourism? A life of untrammelled pleasure-seeking? Are we a provincial park or a national recreational area? Economic development over preserve and protect?</p> <p>Every year the schism gets wider. New folks with lots of money buy an acreage and two weeks later the construction is starting. Or the funky rural cabin demolished and a million dollar home is built on a tiny piece of land. Each becoming another summer rental. It goes on. Progress, apparently.</p> <p>I ramble, sorry. Policies on community need? Economics versus ecology. Evidence shows it is just not sustainable. The term “economic development” was not popular on Hornby so the group changed their name to ... “economic enhancement.” Hornby does not have an issue with marketing, we have an issue of being loved to death. And this group has just come up with a "brand" for Hornby!</p>

<p>Benjamin McConchie, North Pender Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>The community's needs should come secondary to the preservation of ecosystems.</p>
<p>Cameron Thorn, South Pender Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>There is a balance to be had here. In the purist sense of the word, 'preserve and protect' could be taken to mean the islands are off-limit to human habitation or presence. That would not be a realistic interpretation the intentions of the Act. However, there is a limit to the carrying capacity of the natural resources on the islands and "community need" and community growth must be respectful of the islands' natural carrying capacity. There is a limit to the populations and consumption of natural resources on the islands. Ultimately, our mandate is to preserve and protection the environment and unique nature of the islands, not the expectation that we can or should permit and build housing for everyone for wants to be here.</p>
<p>Dan Rogers, Gambier Island Local Trustee (Keats Island)</p>	<p>They need to be compatible. I believe that what makes Islands Trust unique as compared to other local governments is that we have obligations to four sets of constituents – the people who vote for us, the indigenous peoples for whom this is their traditional territory, the people of British Columbia generally and the environment. The latter two don't vote for us but we are mandated to provide for them by s. 3. We must respect all of those obligations in making decisions. Ordinary local governments may have obligations to the first two of the four but no legal obligation to the latter two.</p> <p>As a result community needs policies cannot be ignored to ensure ecosystem protection. To use an extreme example we would not evict people from their homes to protect a specific endangered species. To the contrary we would have to take steps to preserve ecosystems (for example a forest) to provide for a new community centre or housing complex i.e. to facilitate a community need.</p> <p>Ironically, the Trust often places far higher "protection" requirements on "community" projects than it does on individuals who want to build a personal home.</p>
<p>David Critchley, Denman Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>This question raises the issue of whether the needs of the human community are within the mandate of the Islands Trust to protect. These "needs" can also be termed social needs or human needs. In order for such needs to be within our purview they must be either part of "the environment" or "unique amenities" of the trust area.</p> <p>It is obvious that in a biological sense humans are part of the environment but often they are destructive of the other components of the environment and threaten it even to the point of extinction.</p>

	<p>I wonder if the Act intended that the Trust directly preserve and protect humans? I cannot think so. The legislative history, the wording of the Act and its judicial interpretation all indicate an intention to stop, or at least diminish, the depredations of humans against the environment of the trust area. Regulating human development activity in the trust area is the very essence of the Trust.</p> <p>Some people have suggested that either the environment or the unique amenities wording encompasses such concepts as the “character” or “culture” of island communities. These expressions refer to the fact that as a percentage of population there has been a relatively higher number of residents who are artists, philosophers, free-thinkers, eccentrics, back-to-the-landers, hippies and devotees of mystic religions. This wonderful mix is being diluted by the influx of retirees and more wealthy people, a process described as gentrification.</p> <p>The supply and demand forces of the property market will inevitably shape the composition of all our island communities. The pressures are growing, and realistically they cannot be stopped. Our destiny is to become, in essence, a monoculture of the rich (timeframe to be determined).</p> <p>Against these forces the Trust is more or less helpless. We could tinker around the edges by encouraging affordable housing projects and approving those that are suitable, but inevitably the effect will be small.</p> <p>Having said this, I think it is quite proper for the Trust as the planning agency/ custodian of the area to plan for housing that will accommodate some of the community members who otherwise could not afford to live here. I do not see this as being part of a mandate but rather something that is permissible. Therefore, I do think that it is appropriate to include provisions about affordable housing in the Policy Statement.</p> <p>To me it is not necessary to finesse the meaning of “unique amenities”. The Trust, for example, could approve a golf course which admittedly would be regarded as an amenity. It could do so because such approval is within its ostensible planning authority, not because it is mandated to preserve and protect golf courses.</p>
<p>David Maude, Mayne Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>Ecosystem Perseveration and Protection Polices. I feel that on our island they are weak. DP’s are ‘Permits to Develop’, offering little in the way of ongoing preservation. I believe tree cutting bylaws to protect specific species (ie: Arbutus) need to be considered, but as we don’t have large logging being undertaken and little appetite for it the broader reaching bylaws do not appear to be needed. I do feel that aquifer protection / preservation needs to be something that needs to be focussed on. Our land use bylaw only speaks of utilization of wells as a water source, we require 24 hour pump tests that</p>

	<p>stress aquifers and risk irreversible salt water intrusion issues. We remain in the dark ages in regard to rainwater use (appreciating the Province is lagging behind in permitting such uses), but as the Province allows rainwater use for single family dwellings surely we should be doing the same when considering subdivisions?</p>
<p>Deb Morrison, North Pender Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>I think the way in which people live in ways that are sustainable is important. E.g. The way that any housing is sitting in and with the land and water needs of the surrounding ecosystem with minimal negative impacts</p> <p>I think community needs that are related to reducing greenhouse gas emissions e.g. Composting, local foods, etc. are important</p> <p>I do think there needs to be a focus on environment over people, so peoples' needs should come second where there is a conflicting issue.</p>
<p>Doug Fenton, Thetis Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>Community need:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently, the policy focuses unilaterally on humans and human activities that benefit humans. <p>This policy shift in the mid to late 1990s has led to ecological/environmental devastation through the TA and Salish Sea (SS).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The evidence shows that the baseline ecological status (biodiversity) has plummeted over the past 2 decades, let alone the base line was 150++ yrs ago before contact. • Another omission of the past policy, but a critical element or arm of the policy was the existing Indigenous Peoples (Coast Salish Peoples (CSP)) who had existed here for millennia. • The CSP had cared for the TA (Trust Area) for millennia. • The colonial government forced them off their traditional territories into colonial encampments without considering their way of life, sustenance (land, sea/coastal highway, and air), and cultural practices. That stated, it is evident that merely starting with policy using the existing baseline as a starting point would ignore these facts and only cement these colonial actions of the extermination of a current people. We need to openly acknowledge this wrong and create a policy framework/s that allows for dynamic change over a short time (literally years, not decades). • The currently devastating ecological biodiversity status further exemplifies this. • The opportunity here is to enact policy framework Community Needs/Development by reestablish the CSP throughout the TA via policy that supports Indigenous-led Restoration, Protect and Preservation of the ecological communities through policies that support collaborative actions, multiple knowledge systems (TK, TEK, Western Science), and 7+ generation

	<p>visioning.</p> <p>This policy revision should reflect the indigenous respect for Animate and inanimate objects that exist with the TA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o This policy framework must command respectful dialogue, and seek to understand from multiple sides of the conversation. • Further to that, there needs to be policies support recognition of the culturally sensitive areas and <i>immediate and overarching protection</i> of these areas. There are existing issues with colonial development and will be more in the future. Still, regardless of landowners' situation, we must seek the policy that protects/mitigates current sites we are aware of and seeks a pathway to identify and prevent similar wrongdoing in the future. • Again, a dynamic framework opens the door to talks and negotiation with settler residents, Indigenous & Colonial Governments. An inspirational message from Senator (Rtr) Murray Sinclair, who stated recently on a CBC interview (the Current), and I am paraphrasing, that he has <i>hope</i> for change. He expressed the need for <i>patience</i> for the colonials (as a whole), as they too need to learn from the lessons of the past 150+ years (TRC, UNDRIP, MMIWG, and BC DRIPA). Their background, worldviews and cultural influences won't change overnight; it will most likely take decades before the masses have shifted their worldviews.
<p>Grant Scott, Hornby Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>No response received.</p>
<p>Jane Wolverton, Galiano Island Local Trustee</p>	<p><i>Submitted jointly with Tahirih Rockafella</i></p> <p>We weren't sure what this question was about. Part III of the Islands Trust Policy Statement seems very clear?</p>
<p>Jeanine Dodds, Mayne Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>In general all actions by the Trust are reactions to applications. When community or individuals want change we balance the potential to cause environmental harm in relation to benefits of change. In most cases harm is mitigated through DPA's etc. I believe this approach works, It is best to remember all our Islands had a significant amount of development long before the Islands Trust was put in place. I sometimes wonder if Trustees are aware of how much development was in place prior to the OCP's LUB's etc being adopted.</p>
<p>Kate-Louise Stamford, Gambier Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>As the Trust was created in recognition of the extreme development pressure the urban centres posed on fragile island ecosystems, I consider that the environmental aspect has priority over community growth. Even so, I cannot ignore the existence of human settlement which requires basic structural</p>

	<p>support to sustain itself in a rural setting. Providing some social planning initiatives (ie housing option)s to maintain a viable community is important, but not to the extent that it attracts a bigger population than the island can support ecologically.</p>
<p>Kees Langereis, Gabriola Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>Human developed community amenities such as housing, internet services, or community centres may well contribute to the draw of the area, but the authority to provide these amenities falls under the Local Government Act (LGA) and its purpose of meeting community need.</p> <p>The Trust Object is focused on how human developed amenities impact the Trust Area’s ecosystem and environment (unique amenities). It is not whether human developed amenities are necessary or desired by local residents- that is determined under the LGA mandate.</p> <p>I believe the history of the ITA supports this contention. Prior to the 1974, government had two concerns: overdevelopment and population growth in the Trust Area. These factors were seen as threatening the Islands’ peaceful rural area atmosphere and its inherent beauty. The lack of community amenities was not at issue.</p> <p>In response, the 1974 ITA established the Trust Object for the benefit of all BC residents, including local residents. At this time, Regional Districts provided local services, established community amenities and regulated land use (planning services) in the Trust Area under authority of the Municipal Act (now the Local Government Act).</p> <p>Trust committees did not determine whether human developed amenities were necessary. They were limited to determining whether bylaws proposed by a Regional Districts were consistent with the Trust Object. In other words, that what the bylaw proposed would not negatively impact the area’s unique amenities such as the health of the ecosystem, the health of the Coastal Douglas Fir forests and/or rural community character.</p> <p>Trust committees essentially applied a second lens (Trust Object consistency) to the Regional District’s proposed bylaw.</p> <p>Then in 1977, the ITA was amended (actually repealed and replaced) with the changes essentially establishing the basic framework of today’s ITA. The trust retained its original purpose (Trust Object) but several administrative changes were made to the Islands Trust’s operation.</p> <p>Trust committees now had two tasks: regulate land use to enable the provision of community amenities under the Municipal Act (now the LGA) and concurrently ensure proposed land use bylaws they themselves developed were consistent with the Trust Object.</p>

	<p>In 1989, further administrative changes were made to the ITA, including the requirement that Islands Trust policies on how the Trust Object was to be carried out would now be set out in a bylaw (ie Islands Trust Policy Statement). There was no change to what the Trust Object intended. The LGA continued to authorize the provision of community amenities and services. Local trust committees continued to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) regulate under the LGA land use that included enabling the provision of community amenities, and (b) under the ITA determine whether the bylaw enabling a community amenity was consistent with the Trust Object, as set out in the Islands Trust Policy Statement. <p>If the Islands Trust Policy Statement incorporated policies authorizing or mandating the provision of community amenities it would be duplicating provisions already authorized under the LGA.</p>
<p>Laura Busheikin, Denman Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>Reconsider the term “community need” “Community need” as a term leaves things really open. Any community group can identify needs and push to have them met. We as regulators need to look at what a community need serves in the short run and the long run. Does a community need more entertainment venues so people stay connected? More paved areas to make transportation easier? Brighter lights to make it safer? A golf course to draw visitors and make the community world class? Skateboard parks? Maybe. But what are the long-term impacts of this. We need to ask: will policies and zoning to support that serve the overall vision and goals for the community and the Trust Area?</p> <p>Also, it’s important for all of us, and all islanders, to recognize that land use planning is <i>not</i> a way to directly meet community needs. It can encourage or discourage various types of development, which can create conditions in which some community needs can more easily be met, or not.</p> <p>Instead of using this term, let’s define what our goals and values are for communities in the Trust Area. Policies and actions should strive to support a sustainable, vibrant, diverse, unique, rurally-oriented, culturally-rich community that lives in environmentally-sound ways. That could mean buildings that are modest in size, developments that use renewable resources, lots that retain significant tree cover, affordable housing built into upzoning proposals, parks and protected areas created via amenity zoning, being leaders in rainwater catchment and use, and much more.</p> <p>Find Balance There needs to be guidelines for how to support a sustainable level of human use—having a vibrant diverse well-functioning full-time and part-time community and allowing people to visit—while also protecting the environment.</p>

	<p>To get to this we need clear, rational, objective criteria for determining what is sustainable, and this will vary somewhat Island by Island. Those criteria could include overall density; amount of protected land; amount of disturbed land compared to undisturbed (and how much of this is contiguous); aquifer health; the health of wildlife and plants (not sure how to measure this but someone must know); and standards and metrics for defining and measuring rural community character, diversity and sustainability (for instance, for housing issues, this could be a target number of dedicated affordable housing units per population, or per the overall number of dwellings) (a measurement tool could be created that would look at metrics like that one and others, such as numbers of arts events, measures of support services like food banks, free stores and hamper programs, diversity of income, the degree to which people shop locally and/or grow their own food, signs of food security such as how many farms, farm gate stands, and if there’s a farmers market, etc; It could be reviewed every five years.)</p> <p>Provide Clear Guidance Suggestions by some trustees and community members that the ITPS should not deal with community issues at all leave a free-for-all where any LTC can approach these issues as it wants. This increases the likelihood of rampant overdevelopment and/or inappropriate development. This is not supportable. The Trust is tasked with land use planning, and that means setting policy and creating regulations for human use of land.</p>
<p>Laura Patrick, Salt Spring Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>I do not look at our role as a question of do we preserve and protect ecosystems or community. I fundamentally believe in the concept of “Ecosystem-Based management”. Use of this concept is based on Coast Fund’s definition: “Ecosystem-Based management is an environmental management approach that recognizes the full array of interactions within an ecosystem, including humans, rather than considering single issues, species, or ecosystem services in isolation” (source: coastfund.ca). Please refer to the 2001 Principles and Goals of Ecosystem-Based management from the Central Coast Land and Resource Management Planning Table for further information. PLEASE READ THESE PRINCIPLES AND GOALS OF ECOSYSTEM-BASED MANAGEMENT as they are directly relevant to the policy statement work. People living in the Islands Trust area are the protectors and the stewards of the environment. The second principle of ecosystem based management from the referenced document above says: “Empowered and healthy communities play a leadership role in sustaining healthy eco-systems, cultures and economies.” Salt Spring Island’s Official Community Plan (OCP) contains the vision of a diverse community that lives in harmony with the environment. If our local trust committees are making ecosystem-based land use decisions, our residents would be the ones doing the preserving and protecting. The following are a set of principles that I apply to the role of the local trust committee (please note that I would love to adopt the 2001 principles and goals of ecosystem based management):</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LTC believes the Islands Trust “preserve and protect” mandate, as set out in s.3 of the Islands Trust Act, is interpreted to not only preserve and protect the environment, but to also preserve and protect a socially diverse local population. • The LTC is part of a federation and this means that we can learn from, share with, and work collaboratively with other LTCs. • The LTC decisions should be balanced and be acutely aware of social, environmental and economic elements and are rooted in Reconciliation, sustainability and justice. Good solutions are integrated solutions that will also address other challenges and crises we face on our islands (e.g., forest health and biodiversity, watersheds, changing climate, land use, community spirit, and resilient small businesses.) • The LTC will facilitate, early and throughout each and every planning process, regular open dialogue with the full spectrum of the community and First Nations. The LTC understands that this dialogue will not make differences disappear or that everyone is brought to consensus. Through dialogue we can search for common understanding. • LTC is enabled and entrusted with the responsibility, through the Local Government Act, to direct the location, density and form of all housing, and to offer land use incentives for the development of housing on private, non-profit and public lands. Zoning, subdivision and other land use bylaws are powerful and foundational tools our community can use proactively to achieve a diverse and sustainable supply of housing and to curtail residential development that is out-of-step with our community’s climate action and equity needs.
<p>Lee Middleton, Saturna Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>What first comes to mind is that the majority of the Trust’s preservation measures are triggered through development applications (as in DPA’s) or other human activity that is centred around a subdivided small lot. There are no planning goals related to ecosystem preservation regionally that I’m aware of due to planning legislation not really supporting ecosystem goals that span lot boundaries. Hence the Trust has paid a lot of attention to educating private landowners in the past about natural stewardship of the land. This may inevitably be an ongoing tension between regional ecosystem preservation and law driven by subdivided lots. However this is where each Island has somewhat different needs in terms of supporting community needs.</p> <p>Saturna is now hovering around the 50% mark in terms of preservation of land as parkland (in some cases wilderness designation although the wilderness has been modified with some old growth pocket exceptions in the past century by logging and ranching although is now healthy second growth). So policies affecting local land owners can be quite targeted as broad preservation goals</p>

	<p>are well on the way to being met by parkland acquisition. We expect that another 190 hectares will be added to the park reserve over the next three years and with the addition of the watershed park newly created as well as the transfer of 600 acres from Environment Canada to Parks Canada the Island will be around 55% fully protected. At this point supporting the viability of a unique way of life on the Island becomes a policy goal - good internet, effective ferry travel, green building and effective interface with the parklands by humans to nurture both (guiding, invasive species restoration etc.). Not all islands need these policies - I imagine that Gambier would as possibly would Lasqueti but certainly not Slat Spring which has genuine housing affordability needs that while certainly the case on Saturna are the result of different market forces. The policy approach to each island can certainly be informed by regional conservation goals but the application of these goals may need to be different across different islands as they apply to communities.</p>
<p>Michael Kaile, Bowen Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>Preservation and Protection and Community Needs will frequently be in conflict. This cannot be avoided so invariably a judgement issue. To complicate the matter judgements will change over time as needs change. To negate / reduce conflict; in addition to the Community plan, defined ecosystems need to be specifically preserved, so removing them from the discussion and potential argument. (Oil and water can be separated but not easily).</p>
<p>Paul Brent, Saturna Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>Ecosystem is a broad term that can include many components and I was unaware that the Trust is now branding its preserve and protect mandate as ecosystem policies. There are amongst many ecosystems the human ecosystem, which is part of the broader ecosystem in totality. So when the object refers to preserving and protecting ... for the benefit of residents and all British Columbians, I'm certain that human ecosystem protection and preservation is included, and in particular for residents of the area, as they are specifically included.</p> <p>Land use planning can and does support many community needs, including a vital economy, social, physical and emotional health, a broad demographic, reasonable access to housing, supportive transportation & communication infrastructure and other attributes that would benefit residents as all part of the human ecosystem. So yes, I assume that the Trust's "ecosystem" preserve and protect policies should encompass these.</p>
<p>Peter Grove, Salt Spring Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>Ecosystem preservation must trump community needs</p>
<p>Peter Johnston, Lasqueti Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>"Community need" conflicts directly with preservation and protection of ecosystems in nearly all cases. Land use planning for anything other than strict preservation and protection dilutes and weakens or discounts protection and preservation. I think it would be good if Islands Trust bodies and processes</p>

	<p>recognized and acknowledged this whenever it considers community needs, which also need to be planned for.</p>
<p>Peter Luckham, Thetis Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>This is difficult because of the phrase "Community need", needs have not been specified however in respect of human habitation the preserve and protect policies accommodate the necessity of environmental impacts that must by their nature compromise ecosystem integrity. I think that the preservation protection policies could be more stringent in requiring evidence of the impacts with limits set to acceptable levels of impact based on science not on political pressures.</p>
<p>Scott Colbourne, Gabriola Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>No response received.</p>
<p>Steve Wright, South Pender Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>The policies' relation to communities must be to ensure sustainability: the most important factor to any community's long term health and well being. Our communities will not survive if the ecology, environment, and natural resources are not viable to support them. I suggest the Trust's focus should be and in fact, is specifically mandated to do, is to do only that. Our responsibility is to regulate land use with the primary consideration that the uses do not negatively impact the environment, its resources, or its natural character.</p>
<p>Sue Ellen Fast, Bowen Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>I feel that ecosystem preservation and protection policies <u>support</u> the policies primarily about community need. It's about living sustainably, in harmony with nature and within island limits for drinking water and many other ecological goods and services. Also economic - on Bowen our green oasis of nature and peace and quiet have been identified as a business asset (let me know if you want links to the studies and reports.) Islands Trust is not unique, even in Canada, when it comes to areas where a preserve and protect mandate is legislated, and that have people living and/or working (especially farming) in them. I have been involved in some through my work in conservation and learning. Some examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservation Authorities in Ontario conservationontario.ca These began 70 years ago, started with just a few around Toronto etc, now there are many. They protect soil for farmers, biodiversity, and manage freshwater and runoff; based on watershed planning: https://www.guelphmercury.com/opinion-story/6400995-taking-action-on-climate-change-saves-us-money/ <p>They are currently being constrained by amendments passed by the Ford government last month: https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/toronto/david-crombie-ontario-environment-1.5830385</p>

	<p>(Also see Globe and Mail if you are a subscriber, National Observer had a good one, and this one speaks specifically to the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority which I assume is the example in the governance and management review committee's terms of reference: https://www.thestar.com/news/canada/2020/12/08/a-matter-of-principle-niagara-mpps-npca-respond-to-greenbelt-council-resignations.html?rf)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ottawa Greenbelt ncc-ccn.gc.ca/places/greenbelt This began 50 yrs ago, and is run by the National Capitol Commission. It's like a green necklace through the city with both ends on the Ottawa River. Farming, trails, forests and wetlands, bicycle camping, and a few federal research facilities. Was denigrated for not limiting development which had leapfrogged over, but recent public input was plentiful and positive and led to strong management plan • more Canadian examples: Toronto's Rouge National Urban Park, Calgary's Fish Creek District, Hull/Ottawa's Gatineau Park, Yellowstone to Yukon, Western Wildway and other wildlife corridors, some of which cross international borders • internationally there are plenty, including European National Parks, World Heritage Sites, Biosphere Reserves; and over many centuries before this one: http://www.alternativesjournal.ca/community/blogs/backstage-aj/14-centuries-greenbeltsm (I purchased the issue years ago but in hard copy I think - very interesting). Here's one of the articles, including Canadian examples: https://www.alternativesjournal.ca/sustainable-living/bigger-better-belts
<p>Tahirih Rockafella, Galiano Island Local Trustee</p>	<p><i>Submitted jointly with Jane Wolverton (listed under Jane's name)</i></p>
<p>Timothy Peterson, Lasqueti Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>Although this question is perhaps a bit vague, here's my take. Protection of ecosystems is a one way street. Once damaged, even the most diligent restoration programs cannot fully restore what is lost or damaged through human intervention. Community needs, while very important, are much more of a moving target. I share the concerns of many that the maintaining of socio-economic diversity on our islands is very important, for example, and that policies in support of these goals are laudable, but must not be allowed to override environmental concerns.</p>

Q3. Broadly speaking, would you like to see more mandatory directive policies in the Policy Statement? If so, are there particular topics where you would support more specific or explicit direction to local trust committees/island municipalities?

<u>TRUSTEE & LTC/IM</u>	<u>FEEDBACK</u>
<p>Alex Allen, Hornby Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>Mandatory directive policies? No, I don't like mandatory anything. And I think I would be speaking for a mass majority on my island.</p> <p>"The intent here would be to provide more definite policy direction to the local trust committees and island municipalities, such that particular subjects are addressed in a specific way or to a specific effect."</p> <p>I don't like the footnote above. One, I do not think us LTCs are lacking in "definite policy direction." Two, "subjects addressed in a specific way..." sounds like we are creeping towards generic OCP/LUBs for all Islands Trust islands which I do not think that was the intent of the IT Act. We are all the same but different.</p> <p>We hardly have any power at all us Trustees or islanders on matters on our islands to start with, so I have major concerns with a homogenized version of bylaws for the islands in that is the direction we are going in. No, I do not support this broadly or narrowly speaking.</p>
<p>Benjamin McConchie, North Pender Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>I am unclear about this question.</p>
<p>Cameron Thorn, South Pender Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>Yes, I would like to see more mandatory directive policies in the Policy Statement. In particular, I believe decisions made by LTC's must be consistent with the following commitments: (1) proactive land use planning to protect our natural environment and its carrying capacity, (2) protection of the rural character, (3) protection of the Coastal Douglas Fir, (4) that the size and siting of housing be consistent with the preservation of agricultural land for current and future use, (5) that decisions on the density and intensity of land use be consistent with water stewardship and water supply</p>
<p>Dan Rogers, Gambier Island Local Trustee (Keats Island)</p>	<p>Yes but on a limited number of topics. Whether we like it or not, islands are different. It may have been easier to put more directive policies in place in</p>

	<p>1974 but over the past 47 years, various islands have evolved “culturally” in different ways. So I would limit the mandatory policies to:</p> <p>Reconciliation Forests Foreshores Water Housing development - and I say that with a bit of hesitancy as likely the policies would be different for big islands than for smaller islands.</p> <p>I could be convinced perhaps on a few other topics.</p>
<p>David Critchley, Denman Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>I would say yes. I support appropriately worded directive policies on affordable housing, on limiting the size of houses, on requiring energy efficient building, on rain water supply standards, on water conservation, on helping to protect indigenous sacred places, in acknowledging reconciliation as an objective etc.</p> <p>I would also welcome a discussion on ultimate build-out provisions for all islands; for example no density greater than X number of dwellings per Y hectares of island size. That would really be grasping the nettle!</p> <p>Generally, I support tightening the Policy Statement towards more directive policies rather than mere recommendations.</p>
<p>David Maude, Mayne Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>As each island is unique and independent in nature, I do not support mandatory directive policies.</p>
<p>Deb Morrison, North Pender Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>Yes Anything to do with marine area should be directive as these are shared seas. I would also like to see reconciliation issues as directive If we ever get forest control, that would also be great directive policies.</p>
<p>Doug Fenton, Thetis Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>Yes, I fully support the notion of more mandatory directive policies. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development capacity within the TA – currently questionable in numerous islands; • FN or Indigenous relate Policies should reflect a TA wide rollout/adoption; • Water and watershed preservation; • Shoreline protection; • Aquaculture; • Subdivision, specifically DP that reflect the overarching interconnectedness (air, land, water, marine) and potential of archaeological sites thought the entire TA; • Farming – farming activity within the TA must/comply with the

	<p>Environmental Farm Plan (acknowledging it is advocacy only) but still as part of the OCP development TA wide.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education as a TA comprehensive initiative; • LTCs should be participating and supporting this kind of work.
<p>Grant Scott, Hornby Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>I think we need more “directive policy” on how LTCs may deal with First Nations’ issues and applications. I think it would be very useful having suggested wording that we may include in our OCP and LUBs regarding what we actually do when we get an application that we expect may have a direct impact on aboriginal rights. Like when an application may impact on a midden or potential burial ground.</p>
<p>Jane Wolverton, Galiano Island Local Trustee</p>	<p><i>Submitted jointly with Tahirih Rockafella</i></p> <p>We believe that there should be more directive language in the area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ of engaging and partnering in meaningful ways with First Nations ▪ in protecting the environment - having Development Permit Areas are a means of protection
<p>Jeanine Dodds, Mayne Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>I do not see the need for more directive policies. I am speaking for my Island which is almost at build out but which has less density today than it had in 1974 due to good planning without a heavy hammer.</p> <p>Pressures to develop our Islands beyond current zoning are inevitable in the future. If the Trust choses to close the door on change we will become home to only the rich and famous, be careful what you ask for.</p>
<p>Kate-Louise Stamford, Gambier Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>Our directive policies around no external water intake or no fixed links are an important part of ensuring there are limits to human community growth on most of the islands. I’m not sure of what other directive policies would be as defining. I think it is important that LTC’s be given the widest possible leeway to determine their particular community vision within the confines of maintaining their island ecology. It would also require determining to what extent the ecology/ of an island is a closed system and therefore how much human impact can occur before the basic natural systems unique to each island falls apart. This would also have to include accounting for the impact of climate change</p>
<p>Kees Langereis, Gabriola Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>I favour more mandatory policy directives related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) preservation and protection of the land and marine ecosystems (ie Parts III and IV), and

	<p>(b) preservation and protection of FN’s cultural artifacts and heritage sites.</p>
<p>Laura Busheikin, Denman Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>Cautiously, I’d say yes, to a degree, because this can strengthen the fulfillment of the mandate, and make it easier for LTCs to say no to things they should be saying no to. But cautiously, because the islands are very different in so many ways (partly because of physical geographic qualities, partly because of where they are situated geographically, partly because of historical development patterns and cultural differences). I would want this approached with caution. I really need more specifics to comment further, and maybe a list of topics where this is being considered.</p>
<p>Laura Patrick, Salt Spring Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>I want to share the following quote that is found on page 35 of an Urban Systems report titled “Final Report – Islands Trust Impact Analysis”. I believe this text as accurate:</p> <p><i>“To enhance the strength of the Islands Trust ..., one possibility (raised for discussion purposes only) may be to enhance the relationship between the Islands Trust Policy Statement and Official Community Plans for Island Municipalities and Local Trust Areas. Currently, adopted Official Community Plans must be consistent with the Islands Trust Policy Statement. Potentially, an enhanced Trust Policy Statement could effectively function as a high-level land use plan for the entire Trust Area. The Trust Policy Statement could stipulate content to be included in all Official Community Plans in the Trust Area, and Official Community Plans could be required to include Context Statements to demonstrate how they conform to the Trust Policy Statement. This approach would be similar to the approach undertaken in many regional districts today (i.e. regional context statements consistent with a Regional Growth Strategy). It is noted that this approach is within the purview of the Islands Trust, and no legislative changes would be required.”</i></p> <p>While I fundamentally believe that the Islands Trust would be best served if the Policy Statement stipulated content of all OCPs, this cannot occur without political will. That said, I think the current policy statement review process should look at opportunities to take explicit action. For example, shoreline protection should be identical throughout the Trust Area, just like it is in the San Juan Islands.</p>
<p>Lee Middleton, Saturna Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>I don’t really think mandatory policies on Saturna would be as effective given the portion of the Island that is Parkland. They’d have to be carefully chosen or would be seen as a token effort in comparison to what has been achieved through spearheading conservation by Islanders. This is a problem because the Policy Statement applies Trust Area wide and so policies must be applied across all Islands - unless there is some other arrangement possible of course to be island specific in ‘must’ statement application. ‘Must’ regulations applied from afar is a situation currently in effect on the Southern Gulf Islands through</p>

	<p>CRD regulation of building codes which are currently stifling innovation in green building to some degree on the SGI's. Now if the Island's Trust were to assume authority over the building code in the SGI's then I think we'd really have a vehicle to support climate change goals in the SGI and by extension the other Islands through a voluntary code.</p> <p>Regulation in partnership with senior levels of government would be very effective in restricting vessel speed in the waters of the Trust Area - this in support of SRKW recovery. Port Metro Van, San Juan County, Transport Canada and Fisheries and Oceans have all shown appetite for such collaboration. Further the National Marine Conservation Areas (NMCA) should be more prominently profiled in the policy statement as an aspirational goal with a concrete and measurable framework working toward, supportively, the NMCA designation.</p>
<p>Michael Kaile, Bowen Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>No I would not, I support the present language which avoids "mandatory and directive" policies. Mandatory policies imposed on Bowen Island being a Municipality for twenty years, would prove extremely divisive.</p>
<p>Paul Brent, Saturna Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>Broadly speaking I believe the majority of my local trust area would be opposed to more mandatory directive policies in the Policy Statement.</p> <p>Our LTA is passionate about its community and the environment we live in. This is evidenced by the immense volunteer efforts to preserve and protect our community and environment, in a way that has and continues to be successful. Those who don't live on these small islands don't understand how 10% of an island's population volunteer for ambulance and fire fighting duty, where (many) meals are cooked and delivered to elderly or immobile neighbours and where we visit those in need of visits during Covid times. It just happens.</p> <p>The same with environment. Without directive policies our residents continue to strive to expand conservation area, notwithstanding almost 1/2 our island in that category. Initiatives last year added 70 acres, and a further 85 acres should be conserved in 2021 with a similar amount on the books thereafter. Shoreline cleanups happen spontaneously.</p> <p>The same can be said for reconciliation efforts, whose success has not been by dictate or fiat from above but from the bottom up, with residents who do so at a pace that corresponds to what the other parties believe is appropriate. Fundraising efforts to support those initiatives are community-driven. Frankly, the Trust's participation to date in such initiatives has not been viewed positively.</p> <p>So it goes without saying that directive policies will not be well received, particularly if perceived to come from those who aren't involved in this</p>

	<p>community and may not have a full appreciation of what actually happens on the ground. The bottom up approach works very well, and the experience with top down directive policies has not been as positive.</p>
<p>Peter Grove, Salt Spring Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>I think it best not to be any more specific or directive....</p>
<p>Peter Johnston, Lasqueti Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>I would not like to see more mandatory directive policies in the Policy Statement. I think it is best to leave as much discretion and decision-making power to Local Trust Committees and Island Municipalities as possible. One way to achieve this would be to include in the Policy Statement a list of topics that each LTC/IM must consider and address in their OCP and LUBs, and leaving them as much discretion as possible in how they do so.</p>
<p>Peter Luckham, Thetis Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>First Nations Consultation, water protection beyond human needs, retaining forest land, community amenities (see above) for development that is above absolute minimum requirements to support human habitation.</p> <p>No encroachment on foreshore, water bodies, sensitive habitat. Agriculture land must be retained and used for it's most optimal use unless left wild for natural ecosystem function.</p> <p>Shared community use of lands for those necessities that create environmental impacts, docks, sources of potable water, water ways, agricultural lands.</p> <p>Any and all explicit direction that protects "unique amenities".</p>
<p>Scott Colbourne, Gabriola Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>No response received.</p>
<p>Steve Wright, South Pender Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>This presents the conundrum of whether the Trust Area is to be considered a single entity or a conglomeration of separate islands in carrying out the mandate. If it is to be a group of independent and autonomous island communities, then directive policies are not of any real consequence because there are no means (other than not providing funding to LTCs), to ensure LTCs to adopt them in their OCPs.</p> <p>There is another problem in that policies by themselves are simply an encouragement for people to follow, and as such can not be enforced. It is our regulatory bylaws that carry weight in the Courts and those bylaws are written not for the vast majority of people who comply, but for those who do not.</p>

	<p>Unenforceable policies by themselves are not an effective means of advancing the mandate on the ground.</p> <p>I believe all the necessary topics are already included in policies. What is missing is the authority to create the bylaws to reflect them and the enforcement to ensure they are adhered to.</p>
<p>Sue Ellen Fast, Bowen Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>Yes I would like to see more mandatory directive policies in the Policy Statement. Also I would like the existing ones to be more clearly defined or explicit and specific. Eg 4.4.2 which is hard to defend re “density” and “intensity” will change or affect water availability or quality. Wording like “development must ...” might be helpful.</p> <p>Also what happens when a LTC or Island Municipality does not follow these? Eg 3.4.4 which BIM does not do.</p>
<p>Tahirih Rockafella, Galiano Island Local Trustee</p>	<p><i>Submitted jointly with Jane Wolverton (listed under Jane’s name)</i></p>
<p>Timothy Peterson, Lasqueti Island Local Trustee</p>	<p>Mandatory Directive Policies are essentially the one way in which Trust Council can act with any effectiveness throughout the Trust Area. In my opinion, if we as elected officials seek to carry out our preserve and protect mandate with any effectiveness, we must enact Mandatory Policies with regard to minimum lots size at subdivision immediately. Trust Council has declared a Climate Change Emergency, but I see very little that has changed on the ground. While restricting further subdivision would undoubtedly be unpopular with many, it is essentially the only tool we have to limit development, and thereby further environmental damages to the ecosystems on our fragile islands. Without policies that have meaningful consequences on the ground, we risk being a hollow and toothless witness to further destruction.</p>