

**From:** Gregg Sayer [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 21, 2023 5:07 PM  
**To:** Alex Allen <[aallen@islandstrust.bc.ca](mailto:aallen@islandstrust.bc.ca)>; [gscott@islandstrust.ca](mailto:gscott@islandstrust.ca); Timothy Peterson <[tpeterson@islandstrust.bc.ca](mailto:tpeterson@islandstrust.bc.ca)>  
**Cc:** [pattheplanner54@gmail.com](mailto:pattheplanner54@gmail.com); northinfo <[northinfo@islandstrust.bc.ca](mailto:northinfo@islandstrust.bc.ca)>; Sonja Zupanec <[szupanec@islandstrust.bc.ca](mailto:szupanec@islandstrust.bc.ca)>  
**Subject:** A plea for leadership

Dear Alex, Grant, Timothy, Patricia & Sonja,

I'd like to start by admitting my bias. My wife and I have a dream to rebuild our old cabin on our family lot that my father acquired on Hornby in 1990. Recent interest rate hikes have waylaid this dream for the time being while we reassess the financial feasibility, but the **only thing** that makes this dream *even remotely accessible* for a middle-class BC family like ours is the financial model of STVRs.

That's my personal bias, now here's my plea to Alex, Grant and Timothy: **Please demonstrate leadership and move the community on to more fruitful conversations.**

Clearly, there's common cause to tackle housing availability for residents and safe-guarding water supply, but this fixation on STVRs is divisive and distracting.

Some assertions:

- The exact impact of STVR on housing stock on Hornby Island has **not** been established. Let's put the pitchforks away, folks.
- Personally speaking, restricting or banning STVRs would **not** open up my family's cabin for use for resident accommodation. We'd just keep it for use by ourselves and family and friends.
- Those already currently operating STVRs would be grandfathered under current bylaws. This means any new restrictions on STVRs would only handcuff a slim percentage of people (i.e. young people coming up; the next generation that wants to re-build; retirees looking for extra income). This is an unflattering example of NIMBYism: Closing the gates to others once you get into the warm, safe castle.
- Water conversation efforts should be directed at 100% of residents, not a slim minority. This is simply common sense.

Lastly, although everyone (including HISTRA) agrees that the poll taken at the Feb. 27<sup>th</sup>, 2023 meeting is not statistically robust, I argue that it is still **hard data** that *Trustees are obligated to interpret*. Each side had a vested interest in rounding up their supporters for this meeting. It was well-promoted and well-attended. Also, being hosted via Zoom, the barriers for community members to access this meeting were all but non-existent (as opposed to, say, a poorly promoted meeting where you had to physically be in some room).

And what was the community's temperature on this issue?

### **Almost 2/3rds (62%\*) of those polled want our community leaders to move on**

In conclusion, I appreciate the Trustees' efforts and I also value the slow wheels of democracy and would want it no other way, but I again urge you to end this fixation on a minor group of community members and please, **lead the community** towards practical solutions that actually address housing supply and water conservation.

With gratitude and respect,

Gregg Sayer & Renske Werner

\*No change (49%) + None of the above, need different approach (12%).