

From: Byron Corner [REDACTED]

Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2026 3:26 PM

To: Alex Allen <aallen@islandstrust.bc.ca>; Grant Scott <gscott@islandstrust.bc.ca>; Timothy Peterson <tpeterson@islandstrust.bc.ca>; northinfo <northinfo@islandstrust.bc.ca>

Subject: STVR Bylaws

Hello Alex, Grant and Tim

Happy St. Patrick's Day.

I appreciate the work you are doing. Thank-you.

I am a relatively recent full-time resident. I bought my place at market terms, didn't inherit it as it appears is the case for many STVR property owners. Lucky them although I am certainly blessed to have been able to buy a seaside property here on Hornby Island.

I try to sympathize with the statements about having a long-term family connection with Hornby Island by those who have inherited properties but I am unswayed by the argument that you need to allow me to rent as it is the only way I can keep a treasured family place. There is also the argument about the contribution made to the island by the STVR property owners. One of the foundations of Hornby Island I really like that influenced our decision to move here is the sense of community and the community involvement fueled by volunteers. I am a member of Hornby Fire & Rescue, on the Board of the Hornby Island Community Fund, a member of the HIRRA Recreation Committee and head of the WSBD well committee (private well for the benefit of various landowners in the Whaling Station Bay area). I gotta learn to say no. In any case, there are very few STVR owners on the volunteer committees and Boards of which I'm aware (a couple on the Community Fund Board), yet they want the character of Hornby Island to continue. I get it is hard to participate in the non-profit world without meaningful presence but not impossible.

As to what is currently being proposed, I'm not unhappy with a cap of 65. It seems like it is in the ballpark of comparables that Ian Thomson prepared and distributed last year. I'd need to understand your rationale for STVR owners to be full-time residents as I'm not against seasonal residents having one. I also want to understand "policing" and enforcement of a new bylaw as I expect what you propose will lead to a lot of non-compliant, non-TUP rentals. And finally, I'm not a fan of indefinite grandfathering. If you limit the TUPs for what is a dear, valuable resource like a STVR on Hornby Island, you drive up the intrinsic value of having a TUP. I can see offering those who currently have a complying rental the first opportunity to get a TUP with a term (5-10 years, staggered renewal dates), but when those TUPs expire I see no reason why I should be able to bid for one if I have a compliant offering and want to enter the STVR ownership world. Let the market dictate value and SVTR owners pay ... well actually, they won't pay, it will be factored into the rental price (unless you believe Donald Trump's argument that consumers don't pay tariffs LOL).

Thanks for taking the time to read this and see you on Friday.

Byron

