

From: Tim Peters [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, August 25, 2026 1:36 PM
To: northinfo <northinfo@islandstrust.bc.ca>
Cc: Ian Cox <icox@islandstrust.bc.ca>
Subject: Public Submission Opposing PL-TUP-2026-0161 – 4000 Central Road, Hornby Island

Dear Hornby Island Local Trust Committee and Islands Trust Staff,

Re: Public Submission Opposing PL-TUP-2026-0161 – 4000 Central Road, Hornby Island

I am writing to oppose Temporary Use Permit application PL-TUP-2026-0161 for 4000 Central Road, Hornby Island.

My wife, Jodi Alton, and I are the existing residential occupants at [REDACTED]. We have lived on the property since [REDACTED] 2023, and it is our primary residence. We first entered into a Manufactured Home Site Tenancy Agreement beginning [REDACTED] and we are currently under a further fixed-term Manufactured Home Site Tenancy Agreement running from [REDACTED]

I understand that PL-TUP-2026-0161 seeks to allow six recreational vehicle sites to be used for residential accommodation in RVs for Island residents. I also understand that a Temporary Use Permit, if granted, could allow that use for up to three years, with the possibility of renewal.

I do not object to efforts to address housing needs on Hornby Island. Housing is a serious issue. However, I do object to this proposal because it appears to place six residential RV sites into or immediately beside an active highways works yard, while also affecting the existing long-term residential occupants already living on the site.

For the reasons below, I respectfully ask the Local Trust Committee to refuse PL-TUP-2026-0161. In the alternative, I ask that the application be deferred until the significant unresolved issues identified below are addressed.

1. Existing residential occupants and proposed relocation

The proposed Schedule “A” site plan includes the note:

“Relocate existing RV to one of the new sites.”

That existing RV is our home. We are not temporary campers or short-term occupants. We have lived at this address since [REDACTED] pay rent, maintain the site as our primary residence, and have established our day-to-day life here.

I have not agreed to relocate.

The Temporary Use Permit application appears to be designed around moving the existing occupants rather than protecting the existing residential tenancy and established home site. That is a serious concern. Even if tenancy issues are formally outside the Local Trust Committee's direct jurisdiction, the planning application before the LTC should not rely on unresolved displacement or relocation of existing residents.

Before this permit is considered, I respectfully ask that the applicant be required to clearly explain:

- whether the six proposed RV sites include our existing RV site or are in addition to it;
- whether approval of the TUP depends on relocating us;
- what exact area is proposed for our continued occupancy;
- how our privacy, access, utilities, garden, and established use of the site would be protected;
- and whether the applicant has lawful authority to relocate us.

2. Density and change in character of the site

The proposed permit would change the site from an existing single occupied residential site associated with the works yard into a six-RV residential development.

That is a major change in density and character.

The proposed layout would place multiple RV sites in close proximity to where we currently live. This would significantly increase vehicle movement, people, activity, noise, loss of privacy, and day-to-day intensity of use.

For personal health and privacy reasons, I am not providing private medical details in this public submission. However, I can say that the current low-density and private nature of the site is important to my ability to continue living here. If six RV sites are placed around my current home, I do not believe I would be able to continue living here.

I am concerned that the proposal could effectively force us out even without a formal eviction.

3. The property is an active highways works yard and may be incompatible with residential RV accommodation

To my knowledge, 4000 Central Road is the only highways yard on Hornby Island. It supports road safety by providing salt, sand, equipment, storage, and road-maintenance response during hazardous conditions.

In bad weather, large trucks, backhoes, loaders, and other equipment may need to start work very early in the morning, including around 4:00 a.m., in order to maintain safe road conditions.

This creates a foreseeable land-use conflict.

New RV residents may reasonably expect residential quiet, privacy, and peaceful enjoyment. At the same time, the highways yard must be able to operate when road safety requires it. Those two uses may not be compatible on the same small site.

The proposed permit condition requiring residential uses to comply with noise regulations does not, by itself, explain how conflicts will be handled between residential occupants and essential highways-yard operations.

I ask the LTC to consider:

- whether residential RV accommodation is compatible with an active highways works yard;
- whether residents would be formally advised that they are living within or beside an active essential-service yard;
- whether future noise complaints could interfere with necessary early-morning road-safety operations;
- whether public safety operations could be constrained by residential expectations;
- whether a noise and operations management plan should be required;
- and whether this is an appropriate site for residential densification at all.

In my view, the proposal should not be approved unless the LTC is satisfied that residential occupancy will not interfere with the essential public-safety function of the highways yard and that residents will not be placed in a location where conflict with normal or emergency highways operations is predictable.

4. The proposed plan still appears uncertain

The site plan contains several notes showing that important details are not final. For example, it refers to approximate locations, final siting being subject to tree retention and servicing alignment, and the location of a proposed new driveway being “TBD” based on truck and RV turning movements and access.

This suggests the proposal is not yet sufficiently resolved.

Before any approval, I ask that the LTC require clear final information regarding:

- exact RV site locations;
- whether our existing site is included, replaced, or displaced;

- access and traffic flow;
- large truck and emergency vehicle movement;
- driveway safety;
- parking;
- water supply;
- septic capacity;
- garbage and recycling;
- screening and buffers;
- tree retention;
- construction impacts;
- fire/emergency access;
- and the effect on the existing occupants.

5. Servicing, water, septic, and health concerns

The proposed use is not short-term camping. It is described as residential accommodation in RVs.

That makes servicing especially important.

The proposed permit itself states that it is not a building permit or siting and use permit and does not relieve the permittee from securing other approvals necessary for the proposed land use.

Recent Islands Trust OCP/LUB review materials and Island Health referral comments have raised concerns about water, sewage, additional residential density, and RVs as dwellings. I ask the LTC to consider those concerns directly in relation to this specific six-RV-site proposal.

At minimum, the applicant should be required to demonstrate that the proposal has appropriate approvals and capacity for:

- drinking water;
- septic and sewerage;
- garbage and recycling;
- emergency access;
- noise impacts;
- and long-term residential occupancy.

6. Prior Islands Trust discussions show that RV residential use, temporary worker housing, and campground-style uses require careful review

I understand that Temporary Use Permits are discretionary and assessed on their own merits. I am not suggesting that this application formally binds future decisions.

However, previous Islands Trust materials show that RV residential use, temporary worker housing, campground uses, density, water, and sewerage have been treated as serious planning issues.

Past Hornby LTC materials have discussed temporary worker housing and RV accommodation through TUPs, but those discussions also recognized that density and zoning limitations matter.

The Hornby Land Use Bylaw also contains specific provisions for residential RV use, density, and campground zones. This proposal should therefore not be treated as a simple matter of placing RVs on land. It is a multi-site residential land use.

Previous campground-related reports also show that Islands Trust has carefully considered campground scale, historical use, and whether uses have expanded beyond what was authorized.

I ask the LTC to assess this application in that same careful way.

7. Established garden and site use

The site includes an established garden that supplies most of our fresh green vegetables and herbs during the growing season. The garden is an important part of our use and enjoyment of the property.

Any relocation or redevelopment that removes or substantially affects the garden would have a real impact on our household, even if the RV itself could physically be moved.

8. Request to refuse or defer

I respectfully ask the Hornby Island Local Trust Committee to refuse PL-TUP-2026-0161.

If the LTC is not prepared to refuse the application at this stage, I respectfully ask that the application be deferred until the following issues are fully addressed:

1. Whether the six proposed RV sites include or replace the existing occupied site;
2. Whether the applicant is relying on relocation of existing tenants;
3. Whether the existing residential occupants can remain safely, privately, and peacefully on the site;
4. Whether the proposed residential RV use is compatible with an active highways works yard;

5. Whether early-morning highways operations, salt/sand work, large trucks, backhoes, and emergency road-safety work can continue without residential conflict;
6. Whether a noise and operations management plan is required;
7. Whether final RV locations, access, servicing, parking, screening, tree retention, and buffers have been clearly established;
8. Whether Island Health, water, sewerage, septic, emergency access, and waste-management concerns have been fully addressed;
9. Whether the proposal should proceed by Temporary Use Permit at all, rather than through a fuller rezoning or policy process;
10. Whether the proposed permit conditions are sufficient to prevent displacement, land-use conflict, and harm to existing occupants.

9. Alternative conditions if the permit is approved

If the LTC decides to approve the TUP despite these concerns, I respectfully ask that the permit include strong conditions, including:

- the existing occupied residential site must be clearly identified on the plan;
- the permit must not be used to require relocation of the existing occupants without lawful authority;
- no additional RV sites may be occupied until servicing, access, emergency access, water, septic, garbage, recycling, parking, and screening are fully approved and in place;
- the applicant must provide written disclosure to future RV occupants that the site is an active highways works yard with early-morning and emergency road-safety operations;
- the applicant must provide a noise and operations management plan;
- the applicant must provide adequate buffering and separation from existing occupants, neighbouring uses, and public roads;
- the applicant must protect existing tree cover wherever possible;
- construction and servicing work must not interfere with the existing occupants' access, utilities, privacy, safety, or ability to remain in their home;
- and the permit must clearly state whether the six RV sites include the existing RV site or are in addition to it.

Conclusion

I appreciate that the Local Trust Committee is considering a difficult housing issue. However, this application appears to place the burden of that housing proposal on the existing occupants and on an active essential-service highways yard.

This is not only a private tenancy concern. It is a planning concern involving density, compatibility, public safety, servicing, noise, displacement risk, and whether residential RV accommodation is appropriate in this location.

For these reasons, I respectfully ask the Local Trust Committee to refuse PL-TUP-2026-0161, or at minimum to defer the application until the unresolved issues above are fully addressed.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Sincerely,

Tim Peters
Jodi Alton



References and source links for ease of review:

1. Islands Trust – Hornby Current Applications page, PL-TUP-2026-0161
<https://islandstrust.bc.ca/island-planning/hornby/current-applications/>
2. Local Government Act, Temporary Use Permit provisions, including public notice requirements
https://www.bclaws.gov.bc.ca/civix/document/id/complete/statreg/r15001_14
3. Islands Trust – Hornby Island Local Trust Area Bylaws <https://islandstrust.bc.ca/island-planning/hornby/bylaws/>
4. Hornby LTC July 16, 2021 agenda package – discussion of expedited Temporary Use Permits for worker housing and RV accommodation https://islandstrust.bc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/HO-LTC_2021-07-16_RM_AGD_PKG-1.pdf
5. Hornby LTC October 8, 2021 agenda package – worker accommodation TUP batching and campground/land-use discussions https://islandstrust.bc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/HO-LTC_2021-10-08_RM_AGD_PKG.pdf
6. Hornby LTC March 26, 2021 agenda package – campground/legal non-conforming use discussion https://islandstrust.bc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/ho-ltc_2021-03-26_rm_agd_pkg.pdf
7. Hornby OCP/LUB Review – March 21, 2025 staff report, including Suitable Land Analysis and Island Health referral comments <https://webfiles.islandstrust.bc.ca/islands/local->

[trust-areas/hornby/current-projects/Comprehensive%20OCP%20Review/2.%20Staff%20Reports/2025-03-21%20Staff%20Report.pdf](#)

8. Comox Valley Regional District Electoral Areas Noise Control Regulations Bylaw No. 102

[https://www.comoxvalleyrd.ca/sites/default/files/2022-09/102_noise_control_consolidated_20220830_0.pdf](#)