

From: Ken A-N <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, March 10, 2026 2:36 PM
To: Alex Allen <aallen@islandstrust.bc.ca>; Grant Scott <gscott@islandstrust.bc.ca>; Timothy Peterson <tpeterson@islandstrust.bc.ca>
Cc: northinfo <northinfo@islandstrust.bc.ca>; Sonja Zupanec <szupanec@islandstrust.bc.ca>; Hornby Island Short-Term Accomodation <[REDACTED]>; Wind & Waves <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Fwd: Principal Residence - related to STR

Alex Allen: aallen@islandstrust.bc.ca,

Grant Scott, gscott@islandstrust.bc.ca,

Tim Peterson, tpeterson@islandstrust.bc.ca,

Islands Trust Staff northinfo@islandstrust.bc.ca, szupanec@islandstrust.bc.ca

Regarding: 1. All residents, fulltimers and parttimers, should be permitted to apply
and if appropriate hold a Temporary Use Permit (TUP).

2. The Cap of 65 Short Term Rentals (STR) is too restrictive and this should be expanded.

3. The charge to rent a specific STR, must be taken into account with the cost of
a

TUP for the specific STR. We as owners try to keep our prices down and we propose

that the TUP have a sliding scale. Furthermore, there should be some coordination

and reforms for the cost of a license imposed by the Provincial Government.

Dear Trustees and Islands Trust Team,

Thank you for your ongoing diligence on behalf of Hornby Island.

I am a legacy cottage owner at [REDACTED]. My family has held this property for fifty years;

My parents built the cabin themselves using logs from the land. While we currently reside near Skutz Falls to be

close to family, our Hornby cottage remains a vital part of our lives.

We are currently working toward installing a new septic system as our budget allows, utilizing a Sun-Mar compost toilet in the interim.

I am writing to express my concern regarding the proposed regulations. Restricting Temporary Use Permits (TUPs)

exclusively to principal residents is overly restrictive and invasive. Furthermore, the proposed cap of 65 Short-Term Rentals

(STRs) threaten the local economy. I have seen firsthand the distress this causes, including a local cleaner moved to tears at a

meeting last summer over the potential loss of livelihood. I also recall Trustee Allen's prior assurances that existing STRs would be grandfathered in.

Under the current proposal, we would be unable to obtain a TUP.

Beyond the economic impact on the staff and tradespeople I employ for my STR, my rainwater collection

system—designed by expert Ken Nentwig—would also fail to meet the new criteria.

Finally, as you introduce new layers of bureaucracy, I urge you to be mindful of the cumulative financial burden on constituents.

I encourage the implementation of a sliding scale for TUP fees and better coordination with

Provincial licensing costs to ensure Hornby remains accessible for legacy owners and those owners who are trying to keep

their prices low.

Sincerely,

Ken Agar-Neman

I acknowledge and respect the K'omocks and Cowichan peoples on whose traditional territory I live. Their historical relationship with the land continues to this day.

Ken Agar-Newman

From: Ken A-N <[REDACTED]>

Date: Tue, 3 Mar 2026 at 18:14

Subject: Principal Residence - related to STR

To: Alex Allen <aallen@islandstrust.bc.ca>

Dear Trustee Allen,

We have our STR with our family cottage managed by Wind and Waves.

Tonight you mentioned permanent residents and keeping the money from STR on Hornby Island. I interpreted that you were implying non-permanent residents are not utilizing the local economy as much as permanent residents in terms of STR's and therefore should not be permitted to qualify for a STR.

My permanent residence is in the Skutz Falls area, so I do not live on Hornby Island.

With the costs of taxes, insurance upkeep and up-grades, I make barely enough money from

STR's to afford our legacy cottage at [REDACTED] Moreover, if it's sold on Hornby and if a trades person is from Hornby, I purchase and utilize local. Our management team, Wind and Waves is another example of us utilizing the local economy. This is the most cost effective way to manage our cottage.

I believe that in relation to STR's I utilize the local Hornby Island economy just as much as a permanent resident does in terms of their STR. Please correct me if I am missing something, otherwise please acknowledge our equal contribution to the local economy even though we aren't permanent residents.

Secondly we are replacing our compost toilet with a septic field even though we have a half acre lot. We have garnered a local Hornby Island expert for this work. We have planned to continue with rain water collection due to its conservative water use. Were you implying that half acre lots cannot meet the TUP due to sewer and water regulations? I believe our strategy regarding water and sewer should meet the TUP regulations.

Finally I believe that a 65 STR cap will be too restrictive.

This number appears to not be backed up with downstream analysis of the consequences. The ferry statistics that you mentioned did not divide day tourists, locals, or STR rentals users, and therefore wasn't helpful for any cap number you decided. It's frustrating for me, not to have the tools to survey these ferry travellers.

The Galapagos Islands example of 14 visitors you gave, while interesting, was also not relevant to Hornby Island due to the fact that 97 percent of the Galapagos Islands are a national park. Permanent residents (30,000 people) are only permitted to live on 3 percent of the Galapagos Islands land mass.

Were you also suggesting that permanent residents should live on only 3 percent of the Hornby Island landmass? I think not. While all these islands need protection, Hornby Island and the Galapagos Islands from all the facts are very dissimilar places.

Thank you for your thoughtful deliberations with this important matter.

With best wishes,

Ken Agar-Newman

I acknowledge and respect the Cowichan peoples on whose traditional territory I live. Their historical relationship with the land continues to this day.

Ken Agar-Newman